strong criticism made here is essentially fair and correct then the advisers to Mr. Foster have not been objective in their interpretation of the meaning of classified material. Let the people decide for themselves who is more nearly right. They have every right and reason to do so; it is their fate which hangs in the balance.

Replies to a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of my recent questionnaire, distributed to every resident of my district whose address was available through telephone directories.

The questionnaire covered two main fields—domestic and foreign affairs. I feel sure the views of my constituents as expressed through this questionnaire will be of special interest to my colleagues. The questionnaire results are as follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
Domestic affairs:			
1. Do you favor tax reduction without an equal reduction in Federal spending?	10	88	2
2. Do you favor stricter controls over agricultural production and marketing?	11	84	5
3. Do you prefer the present voluntary medical care program for the aged over a compulsory plan, financed by increased social security taxes?	76	20	4
4. Do you favor establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps similar to the CCC's of the thirties?	36	55	9
5. Do you favor the establishment of a domestic Peace Corps?	19	69	12
6. Do you favor aid to public schools below the college level?	36	58	6
7. Do you think the President is doing a good job in domestic affairs?	22	59	19
Foreign affairs:			
1. Should we continue to support the U.N.?	63	25	12
2. Would you favor elimination of the foreign aid program?	33	52	15
3. Do you favor substantial reduction in foreign aid?	84	9	7
4. Would you maintain the foreign aid program at about its present level?	15	64	21
5. Do you approve of the handling of the situation in Cuba?	28	62	10
6. Do you approve of the handling of the situation in the Congo?	20	49	31
7. Should the existing foreign Peace Corps program be expanded?	31	52	17
8. Do you think the President is doing a good job in foreign affairs?	26	53	21

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1963

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

Rabbi Gershon B. Chertoff, of the Temple B'nai Israel, of Elizabeth, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Sovereign of the universe, whose law is perfect: Do Thou instruct out of Thy law the Members of the Senate of these United States, that they might exercise just and rightful authority. Confer upon them the wisdom and understanding to convert righteousness into law, and justice into statute. Remove from them a sense of guilt in the employment of power, by alerting them to the ethic of power. Uphold them in their conviction that the complexities of international relations admit of no easy solutions: so that they shall pursue peace, not despair, and seek security with quiet confidence.

The days proclaimed by Daniel are at hand: *There shall be a time of trouble such as never has been since there was a nation.* Do Thou, O God, confirm Daniel's hope and trust in Thee that: *Every one of your people shall be delivered.*

May God bless you with every good, and keep you from all evil. May He enlighten your heart with lifegiving prudence, and favor you with enduring insights. May He befriend and prosper you with peace, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 21, 1963, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, March 25, 1963, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; and

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR WAIVED

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was ordered to be waived.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

STOCKPILING, STORAGE, AND DISTRIBUTION OF ESSENTIAL FOODSTUFFS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON STRENGTHENING RESEARCH ON UTILIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on "Strengthening Research on Utilization of Agricultural Commodities," dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Employees' compensation claims and expenses," for the fiscal year 1963, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the 7-month period ended January 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

AMENDMENT OF ACT ENTITLED "AN ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO REMOVE DANGEROUS OR UNSAFE BUILDINGS AND PARTS THEREOF, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES"

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF RETENTION BY GENERAL DYNAMICS/POMONA OF CERTAIN REFUNDS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of retention by General Dynamics/Pomona, a division of General Dynamics Corp., Pomona, Calif., of refunds related to illegally imposed local taxes included in the prices of Department of the Navy contracts, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF THE SUPPLY MANAGEMENT OF ELECTRIC LAMPS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the supply management of electric lamps within the Department of Defense, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF UNNECESSARY COSTS TO THE GOVERNMENT FOR PACKING SHIPMENTS OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS FOR CERTAIN ARMED SERVICES PERSONNEL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of unnecessary costs to the Government for packing shipments of household goods for Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps personnel, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT UNDER SALINE WATER ACT OF 1952

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on operations under the Saline Water Act of 1952, during calendar year 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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 General Assembly of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 115

"Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to reject the changes in timber taxation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury

"Whereas capital gains treatment of timber under the Internal Revenue Code of the United States has been a major factor in the progress of the State of Georgia in forest management and in the development and growth of forest resources during the past half century; and

"Whereas the substantial elimination of capital gains treatment to the owners of forest lands would constitute a most severe setback to the development of the timber and forestry industry in Georgia; and

"Whereas thousands of Georgians are dependent upon the forest industries for employment and their jobs are jeopardized by the proposed elimination of capital gains treatment of timber; and

"Whereas the taxing of income derived from the sale of timber at ordinary income rates by the United States would be disastrous to a major portion of the overall economy of the State of Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia:

"1. That the General Assembly of the State of Georgia does petition the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States on February 6, 1963."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 8

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation regarding the feasibility reports required in connection with applications for Federal small projects loans, and requiring such reports only when they are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan

"Whereas it has been the experience in the State of Wyoming that the detailed feasibility reports required in connection with the application for a Federal small projects loan are such that the cost of such feasibility reports are clearly out of proportion to the cost of many small supplemental water supply projects in Wyoming that could benefit from such a loan program; and

"Whereas for small supplemental water supply projects for entities within a growing and established agricultural economy, the detailed and costly feasibility studies which are necessary for large new projects are not needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary so that the feasibility reports required in connection with an application for a Federal small projects loan for a small supplemental water supply project be required only when such are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, and the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Commerce:

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 22

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior with reference to the killing of animals within the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park, by park rangers

"Whereas the animals that range within the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park in the State of Wyoming constitute a part of the natural resources of Wyoming; and

"Whereas the natural resources of the State of Wyoming should be utilized to the greatest good of the people of the State of Wyoming and of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the slaughter of over 4,500 head of elk in the past 2 years in Yellowstone National Park by the park rangers was a gross waste of an important natural resource as aforesaid; and

"Whereas better methods of control of these resources than those now being utilized by the National Park Service are available: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior be and are hereby memorialized to pass such laws and prescribe such regulations as necessary to prohibit the wanton killing of elk by the park rangers in Yellowstone National Park as has been the practice in the past to permit the State of Wyoming to trap and transplant the animals to other areas within the boundaries of the State of Wyoming and if trapping and transplanting practices do not give the necessary reductions, to permit the hunting of such animals in remote areas of the park; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress, WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 16

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to passing legislation which would place the timber industry of this country in a competitive position with foreign production through the establishment of import quotas or other means

"Whereas there is not a shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

"Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

"Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide the best working conditions, equal to or above other nations; and

"Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing out their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to such advantages as depreciated currency, low stumpage rates, noncompetitive bidding, less costly and restrictive forest practices, lower wage rates, high tariff rates on lumber shipped into Canada, lower charter rates for coastwide and intercoastal shipping, and a cooperative government; and

"Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about a sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

"Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing in all lumber-producing States with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they hereby are memorialized to give immediate attention and take the action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable basis of competition with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirement that foreign lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of taxes and deterioration of communities; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate."

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 23

"Joint memorial memorializing the U.S. Congress to oppose Federal legislation which would encroach on State-administered workmen's compensation programs

"Whereas the U.S. Congress by a series of amendments to the Social Security Act during the period 1956 to 1962 has extended and broadened the Social Security Act to provide disability and other benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases; and

"Whereas the workmen's compensation laws of the individual States were designed to be the basic and exclusive method and remedy providing benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases and their administration has, for over 50 years, been the function of the several industrial accident boards and commissions, based on the accepted principle that benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases be tailored to fit social and economic conditions at the local level; and

"Whereas the extension of the Social Security Act to provide benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases has resulted in duplication of benefits; and

"Whereas legislation resulting in further intrusion into the field of work-connected injuries and diseases constitutes a severe threat to the survival of State-administered workmen's compensation programs: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming and the Senate of such Legislature concurring are opposed to any legislation by the U.S. Congress which would infringe on the right of the State of Wyoming to enact and administer its own workmen's compensation laws and to further Federal encroachment into the field of State-administered workmen's compensation programs and strongly urge that the U.S. Congress again affirm that the workmen's compensation system is the basic program for compensating work-connected injuries and diseases; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, and the State legislatures of all States of the United States.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate,
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 25

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning the Federal Insurance Contribution Act and opposing any future increase in the social security tax rate

"Whereas the Federal Insurance Contribution Act was passed by Congress in 1935, effective January 1, 1937, establishing a social security tax rate of 2 percent on the first $3,000.00 of employee earnings to be paid in equal amounts of 1 percent by each the employer and the employee; and

"Whereas since January 1, 1937, the social security tax rate has increased from 2 percent of employee taxable earnings of $3,000 to 7½ percent of employee taxable earnings of $4,800, with further increases scheduled in 1966, and 1968 to reach a maximum of 9¼ percent; and

"Whereas the social security tax has become a heavy burden, as is presently programed, and will be more burdensome to the end that neither the profits of employers nor the wages of employees can absorb the tax increases; and

"Whereas in the interest of good government and sound economics the presently effective social security tax rate should not be further increased except on a voluntary basis and not as a result of further imposition of taxes levied upon both the employers and employees: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be, and they are hereby memorialized to amend the Federal Insurance Contribution Act to stabilize the social security tax at the rate effective as of January 1, 1963, with no further increase except on a voluntary basis; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, and to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Government Operations:

ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 13

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress to enact legislation governing the acquisition and relinquishment of legislative jurisdiction over Federal holdings within the 13 Western States

"Whereas general authority does not presently exist in Federal law for the Federal Government to restore to the States legislative jurisdiction over Federal holdings within the States; and

"Whereas in the late 1950's a special committee set up by the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments, in cooperation with a Federal Interdepartmental Committee established by the President, developed proposed Federal legislation governing the acquisition and relinquishment by the Federal Government of legislative jurisdiction over such Federal holdings; and

"Whereas the Council of State Governments and its affiliated organizations, including the National Legislative Conference, the Governors' Conference, the National Association of Attorneys General, the General Assembly of the States, and the Council's several regional conferences have gone on record in support of the proposed Federal legislation; and

"Whereas the suggested Federal act, which in its present form—S. 154—would apply to Federal holdings in all States, has not been enacted by Congress; and

"Whereas in view of the fact that the bulk of the Federal land holdings is located in the 13 Western States, and the lack of suitable Federal laws governing acquisition and relinquishment of legislative jurisdiction over such lands is of critical importance in the West; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That Congress be urged to enact legislation similar to S. 154, but applying only to the acquisition and relinquishment of legislative jurisdiction by the Federal Government over Federal holdings in the 13 Western States; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate."

Five joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to return to the State of Wyoming additional sections of land from the public domain

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the State of Wyoming is at a disadvantage due to the fact that in excess of 50 percent of the land area of the State is owned or controlled by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming has received 2 sections per township from the public domain for the support of public schools and whereas many States, including several Western States have received 4 sections per township for similar purposes: *now, therefore be it*

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America, be, and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to return to the State of Wyoming the two additional sections from the public domain the same as have been granted other States, or the equivalent thereof; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

"Approved 1:37 p.m., January 29, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 7

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation to make various areas of reclamation nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the costs allocated to flood control, navigation, and fish and wildlife benefits are now authorized by law as nonreimbursables; and

"Whereas many Federal reclamation projects provide recreational facilities, salinity control, sediment control, public transportation, protection of public health and protection of national defense benefits which are of more value to a river basin and to the Nation as a whole than they are to the irrigation water users under the projects; and

"Whereas it is no more logical to make the local irrigation water users pay for these benefits to the region and to the Nation than it would be to make them pay for flood control, navigation, and fish and wildlife benefits which are now nonreimbursables: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who favor legislation which would authorize (1) recreational, (2) general salinity control, (3) sediment control, (4) public transportation, (5) protection of public health, (6) promotion of national defense, and (7) fulfillment of international obligation benefits; to be nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON and the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

"Approved 1:32 p.m., January 29, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 9

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Bureau of Land Management, with reference to passing legislation granting 90 percent of all moneys from the sale, of or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals, on federally controlled minerals within the State of Wyoming to the State of Wyoming; the people of the sovereign State of Wyoming recognize that the United States of America controls over 50 percent of all the lands within the borders of the State of Wyoming, and over 70 percent of the minerals on, in or under the lands of the State of Wyoming.

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the surface and minerals constitute an important part of the life and economy of the State of Wyoming; and

"Whereas only 37½ percent of all royalties that the Federal Government collects on Federal lands in Wyoming is returned to the State; and

"Whereas the financial needs of the States are becoming more acute each year; and

"Whereas Alaska in its act of admission was given 90 percent of the mineral royalties on Federal lands and on private lands in which the Federal Government has reserved the minerals; and

"Whereas the tideland States have been granted the mineral rights on offshore submerged lands; and

"Whereas historically, Eastern States were given all of the land within their confines; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming and the Western States have been denied equality of treatment as given Alaska, tideland States, and the Eastern States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America, be and they are hereby memorialized to fairly and diligently consider the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming who favor legislation providing that 90 percent of all moneys received from the sale of or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals on federally controlled minerals within the State of Wyoming be paid by the Treasurer of the United States to the State of Wyoming to be used as the Legislature of the State of Wyoming may direct; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and to the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

"Approved 5:53 p.m., January 31, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 11

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed and with reference to the recognition of the rights and laws of the States of the United States relating to the control, development, appropriation and use of waters within the States boundaries

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the recognition by the Federal agencies of the rights and laws of the States relating to control, development, appropriation and use of waters within the States boundaries is one of the fundamental concepts of Wyoming law and of the reclamation law as stated in section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902; and

"Whereas at the present time there is uncertainty in regard to the validity of this fundamental concept of State and Federal law: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who favor Federal legislation providing for recognition of the rights of the State of Wyoming and her sister States to regulation and control the appropriation, distribution and use of underground and surface waters within their respective States, and to require compliance with such laws by the Federal agencies and their licensees; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, and the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

"Approved 9:05 a.m., February 2, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.
"MARTIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 24

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States to prevent by legislation, the curtailment, by departmental regulation, of the acquisition of rights-of-way across Federal lands in the State of Wyoming

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture have proposed to adopt similar regulations respecting the granting of rights-of-way for transmission lines across Federal land under their respective jurisdictions; and

"Whereas those regulations would provide that such rights-of-way would only be granted if the applying company agreed that any unused capacity of the transmission line constructed thereon could be appropriated by the Federal Government for the transmission of power generated by the United States through its agencies and, secondly, that the use of such transmission line would not, in the opinion of the Secretary, interfere with proposed sales of power by the United States; and

"Whereas such regulations would restrict the multiple use of the lands of the United States to the detriment of the industrial development of the State of Wyoming; and

"Whereas such regulations would constitute an usurpation by such departments of the power of Congress to prescribe the uses to be made of the land of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to prevent such usurpation of its authority and to continue the multiple use of such Federal lands in the State of Wyoming for the benefit of its citizens and to promote its development; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress, WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

"Approved, 9:27 p.m., February 15, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

Five joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Joint resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, That the Legislature of the State of Wyoming respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the

following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Upon demand of the legislatures of five States, no two of which shall share any common boundary, made within 2 years after the rendition of any judgment of the Supreme Court relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by this Constitution, such judgment shall be reviewed by a court composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States to be known as the Court of the Union. The sole issue before the Court of the Union shall be whether the power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States is a power granted to it under this Constitution.

" 'SEC. 2. Three-fourths of the justices of the Court of the Union shall constitute a quorum, but it shall require concurrence of a majority of the entire court to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court. In event of incapacity of the chief justices of the highest court of any State to sit upon the Court of the Union, his place shall be filled by another justice of such State court selected by affirmative vote of a majority of its membership.

" 'SEC. 3. On the first Monday of the third calendar month following the ratification of this amendment, the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States shall convene at the National Capitol, at which time the Court of the Union shall be organized and shall adopt rules governing its procedure.

" 'SEC. 4. Decisions of the Court of the Union upon matters within its jurisdiction shall be final and shall not thereafter be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of this Constitution.

" 'SEC. 5. The Congress shall make provision for the housing of the Court of the Union and the expenses of its operation.

" 'SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.'

"Be it further resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force and effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress for this State.

"Approved 10:24 p.m., February 14, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate."

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States reaffirming support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Committee

"Whereas the State of Wyoming is an inseparable part of the Federal Union; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land; and

"Whereas since its founding, the State of Wyoming has cherished, supported and defended the Constitution and the Government of the United States; and

"Whereas there are certain insidious movements alien to our free society which are engaged in a concerted effort to destroy our form of Government, the Constitution of the United States, the constitutions of the several States, and deny to the citizens of this Nation those rights, privileges and liberties which are fundamental to free men; and

"Whereas in the Congress of the United States there are duly authorized committees constituted to investigate the activities of those insidious movements and to make known their perfidy, for truth will render them impotent; and

"Whereas there is currently in progress an attack upon those legally established committees of the Congress of the United States by certain organizations and individuals designed to abolish or weaken those committees so that this Nation and its citizens will be denied their protection: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized that the Legislature of the State of Wyoming pledges and reaffirms its unequivocal support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Committee of the Congress of the United States, and openly condemns those organizations and individuals who would destroy those committees or reduce their effectiveness in the investigation and exposition of subversion and subversive organizations; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy; the Vice President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, John W. McCormack; U.S. Senator, Gale W. McGee; U.S. Senator, Milward L. Simpson; and Representative in Congress, William Henry Harrison.

"Approved 5:50 p.m., January 31, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate."

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 14

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would provide that the Federal Government may not, through legislative or judicial action restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, That the House of Representatives and the Senate of the 37th session, voting separately, concurring therein that this legislature respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following articles as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'Section 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

" 'Section 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy, relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

" 'Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.'

"Be it further resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

"Approved 1:56 p.m., February 9, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 15

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States, with reference to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to article V of the Constitution of the United States which would provide a change in the procedure for proposing a constitutional amendment

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, That the house of representatives and the senate of the 37th session, voting separately, concurring therein that this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" ' "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

" ' "SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission." '

"Be it further resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

"Approved 9:12 p.m., February 15, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 19

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere

"Whereas the people of the Western Hemisphere have for over 100 years had the privilege of determining, without outside intervention, their own form of government; and

"Whereas the United States of America has supported their privilege through enforcement of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine; and

"Whereas there now exists within this hemisphere a militant and aggressive arm of international communism, that has formed its roots in Cuba; and

"Whereas the existence of the Communist government of Cuba is dependent upon support from outside this hemisphere; and

"Whereas the avowed purpose of the Communist government of Cuba is to exhort its revolution throughout the Americas, with the aid of governments beyond our hemisphere; and

"Whereas this situation is not conducive to the continued peace, harmony, and progress among nations of free peoples in this hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider the welfare and interest of the people of Wyoming, the United States of America, and our sister republics throughout the Western Hemisphere who favor a strong and vigorous action through every available means to limit and reduce the Communist threat to our safety and well-being; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Senator GALE W. MCGEE, Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

"Approved 9:08 p.m., February 13, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.

"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.

"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 20

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning the Cooperative Extension Service and opposing the use of the Extension Service as a promotional arm of the Federal Government

"Whereas the Cooperative Extension Service was established as a means of conveying to the user the results and general education in the field of agriculture; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming bears the major portion of the cost of the program; and

"Whereas there are efforts being made to alter the traditional objectives of the Extension Service to one which promotes the agricultural program of the Federal administration, thus having political instead of educational aspects: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming, (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take whatever steps necessary to prohibit the use of the Cooperative Extension Service as a means of promoting political programs as a tool of the Federal administration, which, if continued, might necessitate a review of the whole extension program as to the intent thereof; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, and to the Governors of the 50 States.

"Approved 9:20 p.m., February 13, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.

"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.

"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would substantially eliminate the capital gains on the sale of timber and urging the congressional delegation from South Carolina to oppose, with all the strength at their disposal, the passage of such a measure

"Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina has been informed that a portion of the tax program of the President of the United States includes the substantial elimination of capital gains on the sale of timber; and

"Whereas this information has caused the general assembly and a large segment of the population of the State great concern in view of the fact that timber and forest products generally constitute the No. 1 farm crop of the State; and

"Whereas the enacting into law of the President's proposal will most certainly affect the economy of the State very adversely; and

"Whereas the general assembly notes that many less advantageous crops of this State have through recent years, been shifted to forests and that thousands of acres of land formerly planted in less productive crops are now planted in vast forests resulting in great financial gain; and

"Whereas the members of the general assembly believe that any effort to saddle this new industry of the State with an additional tax burden would serve to greatly discourage the further advancement of this most important crop: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which proposes the substantial elimination of the capital gains of the sale of timber; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Members of the congressional delegation from South Carolina are urged to oppose with all the strength at their command the enactment of this legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in the Congress and to each Member of the congressional delegation from South Carolina.

"INEZ WATSON,
"Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

"SENATE RESOLUTION 40

"Resolution relating to the air defense of the Nation in northwestern Alaska

"Whereas the Governor of Alaska and the Alaska delegation in Congress have continually expressed their alarm and complained to Federal defense officials regarding the defense gap along the western and northern coasts of Alaska; and

"Whereas the western and northern coasts of Alaska are the back door to the Nation; and

"Whereas it has been established for years that Soviet Russia has ringed western Alaska with air bases along the coast of and throughout Soviet Siberia posing a continuing threat to Alaska's meager interior defenses which are the defense frontier of the Nation; and

"Whereas while official attention is showered on a few Russian troops 60 miles from Florida and Soviet air surveillance of American ships at sea, Soviet reconnaissance planes have been flying over the American defense frontier territory of southwestern Alaska; and

"Whereas the area flown over by the Russians is without any American military base and the nearest defense bases are from 700 to 1,000 miles distant; and

"Whereas this entire frontier area so close to Russian bases is not immediately served by American reconnaissance and interceptor forces which are considered essential in the Caribbean area; and

"Whereas there is a former Air Force airfield now available at Nome which along with other sites along this defense perimeter could and should be used for the stationing of fighter interceptor and reconnaissance squadrons: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, is most respectfully urged to take immediate action for the realistic defense of this back door to the Nation by ordering that the Secretary of Defense locate two or three air fighter interceptor and reconnaissance squadrons along the northwest coast of Alaska; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be directed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Richard Russell, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee; the Honorable Carl Vinson, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the Senate, March 18, 1963.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,
"President of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 31

"Resolution relating to the restoration of medical care to owner-operators of fishing vessels and self-employed seamen under Federal law

"Whereas S. 978 has been introduced and referred to the Senate Commerce Committee to restore medical benefits to owner-operators of fishing vessels and other self-employed seamen; and

"Whereas the proposed legislation seeks to restore medical benefits to working owners and working part owners who have been deprived by administrative ruling of medical care in Public Health Service hospitals and other facilities since 1954; and

"Whereas it is only equitable that medical benefits be restored to this segment of the maritime force in recognition of the vital role it plays in the Nation's oldest industry: Be it

"Resolved, That the Congress is respectfully urged to give favorable consideration to the proposal to restore medical care benefits to owner-operators of fishing vessels and self-employed seamen as an equitable action and a forward step toward the revival of the Nation's maritime industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman, Senate Commerce Committee; the Honorable HERBERT BONNER, chairman, House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 25

"Whereas a serious need exists for increasing water flows on the lower Yakima River; and

"Whereas additional water storage for the Yakima River can be obtained by construction of a storage dam at the Bumping Lake Reservoir; and

"Whereas such a project would provide great benefit to the Yakima River Valley, particularly in the areas of fisheries, flood control, reclamation, and recreation; and

"Whereas the U.S. Department of the Interior has completed a study of this project; and

"Whereas Senators WARREN G. MAGNUSON and HENRY M. JACKSON have introduced legislation authorizing this project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the Senate of the State of Washington, respectfully petition that the President and the Congress of the United States enact legislation authorizing the Bumping Lake Reservoir project; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution immediately be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each Member in the Congress of the United States from the State of Washington.

"Attest.

"WARD BOWDEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 15

"Resolution relating to the national defense system in Alaska

"Whereas the Governor and congressional delegation of Alaska have again urgently renewed their representations that there is a defense gap in the national defense system in western Alaska; and

"Whereas the existence of this gap was demonstrated last week when Russian reconnaissance aircraft were allowed to violate American territory in western Alaska without challenge; and

"Whereas while it has been known for years that Alaska, the defense frontier of the Nation, has been ringed with Russian air and ground bases in Soviet Siberia 40 miles from American territory, national defense officials have been giving their attention to a handful of Russian troops located 90 miles from Florida; and

"Whereas existing American bases in Alaska are located from 700 to 1,000 miles from Alaska's defense perimeter leaving western Alaska with meager radar coverage and completely without on-the-scene fighter interceptor and reconnaissance support; and

"Whereas an adequate airfield for Air Force interceptor and reconnaissance planes already exists but is unused at Nome: Be it

"Resolved, That the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, is respectfully urged to direct that immediate action be taken to effect a realistic defense of Alaska as the continent's and Nation's defense frontier through the placement of two or three interceptor and reconnaissance squadrons along the northwest coast of Alaska; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be directed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Richard Russell, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee; the Honorable Carl Vinson, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the house March 19, 1963.

"BRUCE KENDALL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"PATRICIA R. SLACK,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Wayne County, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation relating to acquisition of Federal revenue stamps in connection with property transactions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N.Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to make Columbus Day, October 12, a Federal legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on March 6, 1963, the Senate of the State of Illinois considered and adopted Senate Joint Resolution 4 suggesting an article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The secretary of state of Illinois has transmitted a copy to me, and I ask unanimous consent for its inclusion as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That this general assembly respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.'

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission"; and be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of Illinois to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Adopted by the senate January 29, 1963.

"SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives, March 5, 1963.

"JOHN W. LEWIS, JR.,
"Speaker of House of Representatives.
"FREDRIC B. SELIKE,
"Clerk of House of Representatives."

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, last week the South Carolina Senate forwarded a resolution to me expressing appreciation to Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman for his action holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound. Today I have received a similar resolution from the South Carolina House of Representatives commending Secretary Freeman. This makes it unanimous on the part of the South Carolina General Assembly endorsing Secretary Freeman's price support program on cotton. While this resolution does not memorialize Congress, I do want this resolution placed in the RECORD as a testimonial of South Carolina's support to Secretary Freeman's cotton program. Therefore, I am asking that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House resolution to express the appreciation of the members of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound

Whereas cotton farmers will take a 10-percent reduction in the 1963 cotton acreage allotment and there is all indication that the cotton production cost per acre will continue at high or higher levels than the 1962 crop; and

Whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult for family-size farms to exist and provide the necessities of life for such families; and

Whereas the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture has announced the 1963 support rate on middling 1 inch upland cotton as 32.47 cents per pound and this decision of the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, is of material importance to cotton producers of South Carolina and the economy of the State; and

Whereas any reduction from this base support price would be punitive to the State's cotton growers and general economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the members of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina express appreciation to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. House of Representatives and to each Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from South Carolina and to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman.

Attest:

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WYOMING LEGISLATURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate an expression of the will of the people of Wyoming.

The Wyoming State Legislature voiced a belief of the people of Wyoming when it memorialized Congress to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who oppose the creation or extension of wilderness areas in Wyoming.

The 37th State Legislature of Wyoming is convinced that the creation of wilderness areas would interfere with the development of Wyoming's water resources, and would jeopardize the multiple-use concept of the areas which gives protection to the water, forage, timber, minerals, and recreational opportunities.

We should not prejudice the interests of the Rocky Mountain West by locking up in a Federal vault vast areas of land within our Western States.

It is the sense of Wyoming's lawmakers that the multiple-use concept, an effective guideline for over 50 years, has shaped the economy of the West and must not now be abandoned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint memorial be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 12

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming

Whereas bills have been introduced in the U.S. Congress to establish a national wilderness preservation system; and

Whereas these bills would create wilderness areas in Wyoming; and

Whereas the creation of wilderness areas would interfere with the development of Wyoming's water resources, and would jeopardize the multiple-use concept of the areas for the projection of water, forage, timber, minerals, and recreational opportunities, which multiple-use concept policy has been in effect for over 50 years, and has shaped the economy of the West: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who oppose the creation or extension of wilderness areas in Wyoming: that, furthermore, if such wilderness areas are necessary and desired in other States, that areas adjacent to centers of population be purchased and returned to the wilderness state, believing that such a program would make wilderness areas available to more people of the country than the creation of such areas in the West; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, and the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
Governor.
CHARLES G. IRWIN,
President of the Senate.
MARLIN T. KURTZ,
Speaker of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during the 26th session of the New Mexico State Legislature both houses passed House Joint Memorial No. 1, memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the insurance limit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to $25,000. I ask unanimous consent that Memorial No. 1 as passed by the New Mexico Legislature be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the insurance limit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to $25,000

Whereas a current evaluation of Federal bank deposit insurance in relation to the expansion of deposits in commercial and mutual savings banks made by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation evidences the advantages of increasing the present limit of $10,000 on insurance deposit accounts and supports to the preferable limit of $25,000; and

Whereas this evaluation is derived from projections through 1971 based on insurance operations for the 10-year period ending December 31, 1961; and

Whereas increasing the limit of deposit coverage to $25,000 would (1) have practically no effect on the Insurance Fund; (2) result in worthwhile extended opportunities for the depositing public of New Mexico and of the several States; (3) increase the circulating monetary media; (4) give assistance to the expanding economy of the several states; and (5) be of advantage to insured banks, whether small, medium or large size in New Mexico and the several States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the 88th Congress, 1st session, be respectfully memorialized to amend title 12 United States Code Annotated, section 1821, to increase the present limit of Federal insurance deposit coverage to the amount of $25,000; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the Senate, the Honorable LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK; to the U.S. Senators from New Mexico, the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON and the Honorable EDWIN L. MECHEM; and to the U.S. Representatives from New Mexico, the Honorable JOSEPH M. MONTOYA and the Honorable THOMAS G. MORRIS.

BRUCE KING,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
MACK EASLEY,
Speaker, Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during the 26th session of the New Mexico State Legislature both houses passed Senate Joint Memorial 11, a resolution urging the Congress of the United States to give all due consideration to the passage of H.R. 2332. I ask unanimous consent that Memorial 11 as passed by the New Mexico Legislature be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 11

Whereas H.R. 2332 was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives on January 18, 1963, and was referred to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs; and

Whereas the veterans of World War I in New Mexico consider that passage of H.R. 2332 by the Congress will favorably benefit the low-income veterans of World War I and their widows: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to give all due consideration to the passage of H.R. 2332; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be sent to New Mexico's congressional delegation, and to the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION OF NEW MEXICO STATE SENATE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during the 26th session of the New Mexico State Legislature the State senate passed Senate Memorial 15, memorializing the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Mexico in the Congress of the United States to protect the U.S. lumbering industry. I ask unanimous consent that Memorial 15 as passed by the New Mexico Senate be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE MEMORIAL 15

Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada and Mexico, due to advantages such as:

1. Depreciated currency;
2. Low stumpage rates;
3. Noncompetitive bidding;
4. Less costly and restrictive forest practices;
5. Lower wage rates;
6. High tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada and Mexico;
7. Low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping;
8. A cooperative Government; and

Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the worker, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 26th Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress and President of the United States of America, be respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WYOMING LEGISLATURE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am very pleased today to call to the attention of the Members of this body a joint memorial from the 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming. This memorial voices the support of the Wyoming Legislature for the resolution that I have been privileged to introduce in Congress to name the lake and recreational area that will be created by the Flaming Gorge Dam after the late Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney.

Mr. President, I am sure the Members of the body who served with Senator O'Mahoney and especially the 53 Members who have cosponsored this resolution, will concur in the language of this memorial and its tribute to the late "Senator Joe." This action is a further indication of the great works and record of this man and the nonpartisan support for this resolution to provide a permanent memorial to his name.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this memorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT MEMORIAL 18

Whereas for many years, the late Honorable Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of the State of Wyoming, labored to improve Wyoming and the West; and

Whereas because of the dedication and labors of men such as Joseph C. O'Mahoney, reclamation and water development and recreational facilities of the West have been developed and increased; and

Whereas a lake and recreational area will be created by the Flaming Gorge Dam on the Wyoming-Utah border, and it would be a suitable memorial to the late Joseph C. O'Mahoney to name said lake and recreational area created by the Flaming Gorge Dam the "O'Mahoney Lake and Recreation Area"; and

Whereas the name of such lake and recreational area after the late Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney would be indicative of his love for the State of Wyoming, his monumental record on reclamation projects throughout the West, and his interest and concern for people: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and the Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to name the lake and recreation area created by the Flaming Gorge Dam on the Wyoming-Utah border the "O'Mahoney Lake and Recreation Area"; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Livestock Association at its annual meeting in Wichita recently approved resolutions affecting the growth and development of their livestock industry in our State.

The resolutions deal with national problems, as well as State problems.

I want to call the Senate's attention to the resolutions adopted by the association affecting national programs and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON BRUCELLOSIS ERADICATION

Whereas calfhood vaccination is one of the most important tools we have in the eradication of brucellosis, and

Whereas some of the States surrounding Kansas are not yet modified certified; and

Whereas a large amount of money has been spent in the last 8 years in testing and vaccinating in the brucellosis eradication program: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association request the livestock sanitary commissioner, the State budget department, and the Governor, to endorse and approve, and for the Kansas Legislature to continue to appropriate funds to be used to pay for brucellosis calfhood vaccination at public expense until all States bordering Kansas are modified certified brucellosis States.

RESOLUTION ON THE 1964 WHEAT PROGRAM

Recent national legislation provides for a national wheat referendum to be held in 1963. This referendum provides for a wheat program starting with the 1964 crop.

Under this program such wheat will probably be channeled into use as a food grain. Since this will directly affect livestock production, and since many of our livestock producers also are wheat growers, we believe that livestock producers have a vital interest in this referendum.

We condemn the use of any Federal agency such as the Extension Service, the FHA, the ASCS, and others, as a means of selling any farm program. We feel that this is completely improper and that their role should be only in the administration and educational fields.

We find it all the more objectionable because we feel that the recent USDA publications (printed at taxpayers expense) are being used to promote the 1964 wheat program.

Therefore, we urge that all members of the Kansas Livestock Association vigorously let their reasons be known for supporting a no vote in the forthcoming wheat referendum.

RESOLUTION ON TAXES

Since the livestockman's income varies widely from year to year because of weather fluctuating prices, we are in favor of the proposed tax reform insofar as it provides for averaging the taxable income of farmers and livestock producers over a 5-year period.

We are in favor of a continuation of the present capital gains provision on capital assets, including the sale of breeding livestock.

However, we are strongly opposed to an administration sponsored capital gains tax on appreciation in property upon gift, transfer, or death. We feel few farmers and ranchers could get the necessary cash to close an estate without selling off land, livestock, or both: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association will vigorously oppose passage of such a bill.

RESOLUTION ON WATER RESOURCES

Whereas the Kansas Livestock Association feels that U.S. Senate bill 2246 providing for regional planning of water resources would create unnecessary bureaus: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association oppose this and any other bills of like content.

RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL LIVE STOCK AND MEAT BOARD

The Kansas Livestock Association and the Kansas Meat Industry Committee recommend the continuation of the National Live Stock and Meat Board under its present method of financing. They have always vigorously supported the nationwide program of research, education, and promotion conducted by this board.

Therefore, we ask all livestock producers and the officers of our Association to urge the Secretary of Agriculture to rescind P. & S. regulation, chapter II, part 201, which is scheduled to be effective July 1, 1963. This order would virtually eliminate the financing and seriously curtail the work of this board.

RESOLUTION ON REAFFIRMATION

Be it resolved by the Kansas Livestock Annual Convention at Wichita, Kans., March 16, 1963, That we reaffirm the following resolutions previously adopted:

1. The resolution urging steps be taken to expedite watershed planning.

2. The resolution to continue opposition to the establishment of the Prairie National Park in Pottawatomie County.

3. The resolution requesting that Lyon Creek Watershed have opportunity to develop their plan without interference from outside sources.

4. The resolutions on public relations pointing out that livestock continues to be a major segment of the Kansas economy.

Therefore, members of the association should be on the alert for opportunities to create better public relations.

BYPASSING OF VETERANS QUALIFIED FOR CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by the McKinstry-Jones Post No. 380, regarding the bypassing of veterans who are qualified for civil service appointments.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has developed a point preference system for veterans taking civil service examinations; and

Whereas this would indicate that the Congress intended to favor said veterans when applying for jobs in the field of civil service; and

Whereas the Post Office Department and other agencies coming under the civil service regulations have followed this policy; and

Whereas a situation has arisen in this community that would indicate appointments covered under civil service regulations are being made without considering the applicants' service in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas it is the belief of this post that such appointments should be made on the basis of ability and veterans preferences and not on the basis of previous or current political activity: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this post take all necessary action to inform the citizens of the community as to the situation as pertains to the appointment of applicants in the field of civil service; and be it further

Resolved, That this action be brought to the attention of all county committee members of all political parties in this area; and be it further resolved that this action be brought to the attention of the U.S. Congressman from this district, the U.S. Senators from this State, and the district, State, and national levels of this organization.

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. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1172. A bill to amend Public Law 86–518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86–518; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. EDMONDSON):

S. 1173. A bill to change the name of Short Mountain Lock and Dam and Reservoir in the State of Oklahoma to Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1174. A bill to provide assistance to the States in certain surveying and planning with respect to college facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1175. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1176. A bill for the relief of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1177. A bill for the relief of Richard A. Gagne; and

S. 1178. A bill for the relief of William B. Plumer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1179. A bill changing Memorial Day to the last Monday of May;

S. 1180. A bill for the relief of Robert Fair;

S. 1181. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Cafiso; and

S. 1182. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the first and last above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

S. 1183. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic detergents manufactured for use in the United States or imported for use in the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1184. A bill to amend and consolidate the laws providing for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1185. A bill relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 1186. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MCGEE:

S. 1187. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to equalize additional annuities in return for contributions of annuitants during service in excess of the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity under such act at the time of their retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF CONTRACTS WITH SHIPOWNERS DEALING WITH CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend Public Law 86–518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86–518. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement submitted to me by the proponents of this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1172) to amend Public Law 86–518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86–518, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The explanation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

Section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, requires that the operator of a subsidized vessel in the foreign trades, whenever such vessel operates in a domestic trade, shall pay annually to the Government that proportion of one twenty-fifth of the construction differential subsidy paid for such vessel as the gross revenue derived from the domestic trade bears to the gross revenue derived from the entire voyages completed during the preceding year. Public Law 86–518, which established the depreciation period of U.S.-flag vessels at 25 years, instead of 20 years as formerly, failed to take into account the effect of this changed depreciation period on vessels of various ages operating in the foreign trades when Public Law 86–518 was enacted.

Shipping interests affected thereby now ask that the refund base be recomputed by spreading the unallocated balance of the construction differential subsidy cost over the remaining years of the vessels' now 25-year life. For example, a vessel 5 years of age at time of enactment, with a construction differential subsidy cost of $2 million, would have used up one-fourth of its construction differential subsidy base. Applying the 25-year law, the vessel should have as its annual

base thereafter the remaining three-fourths of the subsidy payment divided by the balance of the vessel's present 25-year life, or 20 years. Under existing law the computation base would be $100,000, but enactment of this proposed amendment would reduce that base to $75,000 per annum over the longer remaining life of the vessel.

Proponents say that the Maritime Administration's position is that in computing the adjustment due the Government in such cases one twenty-fifth of the entire construction differential subsidy cost must be used annually as a base for subsidy refund, because of the prescribed 25-year life of the vessel.

However, they argue, a method of computation which spreads the balance of the construction differential subsidy base over the remaining years of the vessel's 25-year life is the most equitable and logical solution of the problem, in that it eliminates duplication of the base. Otherwise, assuming a vessel was 10 years old at the time of passage of Public Law 86–518, there would be the illogical situation where an operator would have passed one-half of his subsidy base, but then would have three-fifths of the base to use up over the balance of the vessel's life. In other words, he then would have to extinguish 110 one-hundredths of the construction differential subsidy base over the life of the vessel, or 110 percent. Under such an interpretation, the operator would have to pay a larger adjustment to the Government under section 506 than was intended by Congress when the 25-year-life statute was passed.

Section 2 provides a technical correction of an ambiguity in section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. Though section 506 provides for payment of the refund for domestic service on a formula based on the depreciable life of the vessel in question it has not made clear that the obligation to make such payments ends on the completion of the vessel's useful life. Section 2 eliminates this uncertainty.

CHANGE OF NAME OF SHORT MOUNTAIN LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OKLAHOMA, TO ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], I introduce a bill to change the name of Short Mountain lock and dam and reservoir, in the State of Oklahoma, to Robert S. Kerr lock and dam and reservoir.

It is unnecessary to speak of the late Senator's interest and leadership in resource development. His accomplishments in that field are legion.

In his beloved State, every community which has a project, either completed, under construction, or authorized, wishes to honor him by making its project a memorial to him and having it bear his name.

After careful consideration and after ascertaining the wishes of Mrs. Kerr and her family, the Oklahoma congressional delegation has come to the conclusion that this is the best and most logical project to bear the name of Robert S. Kerr.

First, it is in Le Flore County, Okla., the same county in which he had developed a beautiful ranch for his great herd of Angus cattle, and in which he and Mrs. Kerr built their beautiful home.

Second, it is the first large lock and dam in Oklahoma on the Arkansas River, through which traffic bound upstream to Tulsa, Muskogee, McAlester, Okmulgee, Henryetta, and Oklahoma City will pass, and through which downriver traffic will pass to ports of the world.

Third, it symbolizes the might and bigness of Bob Kerr. With each end of the dam anchored to a towering hill, and holding the mighty Arkansas River, to be used at man's will to generate power, to motivate traffic, to control floods, and to provide pleasure to man in recreational developments, its utility suggests the name we wish it to bear.

The Short Mountain lock and dam and reservoir wil be located entirely in Oklahoma. The dam will be about 8 miles south of the town of Sallisaw, Okla., and about 25 miles north of Wister, Okla. The dam will be a concrete and rolled earthfilled structure, with a total crest length of about 6,700 feet, and a maximum height of 64 feet above streambed. The concrete portion of the structure will contain a 2,500-foot spillway, topped by 50 steel tainter gates 50 feet high. A navigation lock 110 by 600 feet will be located at the left abutment, and a powerplant housing 4 units, with a total installed capacity of 110,000 kilowatts, will be located at the right abutment. The pool behind the dam will impound 500,000 acre-feet of water, and will have a surface area of about 42,000 acres.

The total cost of the lock, dam, and reservoir is estimated at $101 million at 1961 price levels. They are now being budgeted for advance planning, and are presently scheduled for completion in June 1970. The Short Mountain project is truly an imposing water-resource development. It will be the first large, multiple-purpose project to be encountered in Oklahoma by vessels moving upstream on the Arkansas navigation project, and will be the largest and most costly of the improvements for navigation.

This lock, dam, and reservoir will be a fitting memorial to Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, who was so very greatly instrumental in the development of public works for the Nation, including the Arkansas River Basin program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1173) to change the name of Short Mountain lock and dam and reservoir in the State of Oklahoma to Robert S. Kerr lock and dam and reservoir; introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. EDMONDSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for introducing the bill to change the name of the Short Mountain lock, dam, and reservoir, in Oklahoma, to the Robert S. Kerr lock, dam, and reservoir.

I know of no one in the Nation more entitled to this recognition than the late Senator Robert Kerr, of Oklahoma. Those of us in the Middle West are deeply indebted to him for his great vision in dealing with problems of conservation and the control of water runoff. I sincerely hope that early action and passage of the bill will occur.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES TO SURVEY AND PLAN EXPANSION OF COLLEGE FACILITIES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing Federal assistance to the States to survey and plan expansion of college facilities.

The bill was approved by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the last Congress as part of an omnibus measure expanding the National Defense Education Act, but was not brought to a vote in the Senate.

The bill is intended to stimulate the States, and the public at large, to recognize the extent of the problem we face and to begin making comprehensive plans for its solution. Wise planning will bring facilities for higher education to areas now without them, and will avoid duplicating facilities in other areas.

The President's manpower report to Congress this month pointed out that the trend in youth unemployment demands special concern and action. Alarming numbers of our youth lack work opportunities as well as the educational preparation necessary for a rewarding adult life.

One of every seven youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 now out of school is also out of work. Both lack of work opportunity and lack of suitable preparation are involved in this situation, and are combining to spread frustration and disillusion among large numbers of young people.

Our educational level is the highest in our history, but it will have to advance at a faster rate to keep pace with the growing complexities of the scientific age. The education received is often out of step with rising skill and versatility requirements of our advanced economy.

The manpower report also pointed out that shortages of qualified workers are particularly widespread in scientific, engineering, teaching, health, and other professional and technical fields, because expansion in scientific research, greater education and health needs have led to increased demand for such manpower.

These ordinarily are not occupations toward which unemployed workers can be directed. Extensive education and training are needed for such demands; the supply of well-trained personnel cannot be built up overnight from existing unemployed manpower resources.

The report underscored the need for effective planning to develop additional college facilities, adequate to the needs of our population and the demands of the time in which we live.

The college survey bill would provide up to $2,500,000 in matching grants to the States. It is a companion measure to my community college legislation,

which would assist the States in establishing and expanding 2-year public community colleges.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1174) to provide assistance to the States in certain surveying and planning with respect to college facilities, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CHANGE OF DATE OF MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to change the date of Memorial Day from the 30th of May to the last Monday of May in each year.

The practical reason for such a change is very simple. As it is now, Memorial Day may fall on any day of the week. This year, for example, it falls on Thursday; next year it will come on Friday, and so on.

If Memorial Day were to fall on a Monday each year, our people could count on a long weekend for relaxation and spiritual refreshment, just as they do now in observing Labor Day, the first Monday of September; and Thanksgiving, the fourth Thursday of November. This would work to the benefit not only of those millions of workers in offices and factories but also of their employers in scheduling their work.

But there is another reason, Mr. President, why a change to a Monday would be beneficial. I believe that more of our people would observe Memorial Day as a holiday and consequently pause to reflect upon the real meaning and purpose of this day.

We ought to be, and we are, thankful for every new day that our country is at peace—or, at least, not in a shooting war. At the same time, we should never let ourselves forget our gratitude to those departed for their supreme contribution to the preservation of freedom. Nor should we allow the new generations to forget.

I believe we can better achieve these aims, Mr. President, through the legislation I am offering.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1179) changing Memorial Day to the last Monday of May, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL BOXING COMMISSION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Davey Moore's death is another tragic milestone in the boxing industry's history of mishandled human beings. It underlines the desperate need for a National Boxing Commission with authority to require thorough physical examinations of all boxers.

Today, I am introducing a bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, and establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner.

This is the same bill which was before the last Congress as S. 1474. The need for this bill is even greater today than it was when the bill was previously introduced. Hearings before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee showed beyond any doubt that professional boxing has had too many connections with the underworld. Nothing has taken place since those hearings to indicate that professional boxing ever will, on its own initiative, free itself from control by racketeers and other undesirables.

The primary purpose of this bill is to aid the States in their efforts to drive the racketeers out of boxing and, thus, to end their monopolistic control of one of our most popular sports. Also the health of the boxers must be protected. If strong measures are not taken to clean up boxing, it will not survive as a major sport. If boxing cannot be cleaned up, then it should be abolished.

The sports tradition of our country has been enriched by the contributions of boxing, and many a young man has found that boxing can develop a sound body and strength of character. In many of our cities, boxing programs for boys have been an important factor in combating juvenile delinquency. In accord with the principles of the President's physical fitness program, the training these young men receive in the ring can be of great value.

The bill I am introducing will make it easier for State and local governments to do their job of regulating boxing and keeping the sport free of the criminal element. It will make it possible to insure that only those men who are in proper physical condition will be allowed in the ring. The bill is necessary because the interstate nature of boxing contests makes it impossible for any State to regulate boxing fully and effectively without Federal help. Many of the States whose own boxing commissions have made substantial efforts to regulate boxing within their States recognize that many of the problems are interstate in nature, and support this bill.

Mr. President, an article appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald recently reporting a statement made by the Boxing Writers Association before the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Professional Boxing. The boxing writers urged a strengthening of regulation of professional boxing to prevent the death of the sport. This statement highlights the problems confronting boxing today and emphasizes the need for this legislation. Just last week the New York Standard carried a story that the chairman of the New York investigating committee has introduced a bill calling for Federal regulation of professional boxing. I request unanimous consent that these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Standard, Mar. 19, 1963]

BILL TO ASK FEDERAL CHECK OF BOXING

A bill calling for Federal regulation of professional boxing will be introduced in the New York State Legislature Tuesday. Assemblyman Hayward H. Plumadore, Republican of Saranac Lake, who will submit the bill, also said he would ask for changes in State laws governing the sport.

Plumadore is chairman of the Joint Legislative Committee on Professional Boxing, which recently ended its inquiry into boxing following the death of Benny (Kid) Paret as a result of injuries suffered in a fight.

He does not expect any action to abolish boxing and wrestling, which also was covered in his unit's inquiry.

He said many of the injuries in competitive sports are caused by a lack of conditioning. That can be corrected by physical fitness programs, he added.

The final report of the Plumadore committee's study of boxing is due within 2 weeks.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

ABOLITION OF SPORT OPPOSED

NEW YORK, January 2.—The Boxing Writers Association today called for a strengthening of regulation of pro boxing and not the death of the sport in a statement to the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Professional Boxing.

The writers urged that candidates for jobs as officials, especially referees, should be screened carefully on the basis of personality, experience, and integrity, to assure a supply of qualified officials.

They also called for a new testing device for boxers to determine a young man's psychological attitude as a complement to the clinical examination now provided by the medical advisory board.

The writers asked a firmer supervision of training and urged that fighters, no matter what their status, should be required to space their fights in keeping with sound medical judgment. The present regulations were called inadequate.

"Even a victorious fighter might be subjected to an unreasonably heavy drain on his physical resources," the statement read. "We cannot stress this point too strongly. It is a vital matter."

The writers offered their opinion that the New York State Athletic Commission's record over a 40-year period supported the claim that nowhere in the world has boxing been better regulated and administered than in this State.

In conclusion, the writers' statement read:

"We have over the years divined a goodness in boxing. We deplore gangsterism and death and dishonesty, which does not mark us as men striking a singular posture.

"We seek with you a strengthening of boxing regulation and not the demise of the sport, either through legislation or atrophy. We believe it is important and in the public interest."

The committee was set up shortly after the death of welterweight Benny (Kid) Paret following his knockout loss to Emile Griffith in a television fight at Madison Square Garden last March.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce the bill, for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1182) to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF FIRE AND CASUALTY INSURANCE RATES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on December 1, 1962, Joseph C. O'Mahoney, a beloved and revered Member of this body for almost 30 years, died at the Naval Hospital at Bethesda, Md., at the age of 78. As the last act of Senator O'Mahoney's distinguished legislative career, he introduced in the Senate a bill to regulate fire and casualty insurance rates in the District of Columbia, in a manner consistent with his deep and abiding lifetime belief in competition as the guiding force in our free enterprise system.

Along with many other distinguished Members of this body, Senator O'Mahoney applauded the Supreme Court decision in the South-Eastern Underwriters case in 1945, which applied the Sherman Antitrust Act to certain monopolistic and anticompetitive practices in the fire insurance field. Senator O'Mahoney was instrumental in the enactment of the McCarran-Ferguson Act of 1945, which continued the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of insurance to the extent that such business was not regulated by State law.

Under his direction, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee conducted a 3-year study to examine the adequacy of State regulation and to measure the vitality of the insurance industry under the McCarran Act. I welcomed the opportunity to participate actively in these hearings, and joined with Senator O'Mahoney and the other members of the Judiciary Committee in Report No. 831, 87th Congress, filed in the Senate August 1961. The bill which Senator O'Mahoney introduced in the Senate on August 29, 1960, and which I reintroduced on January 23, 1961, reflected the views of the Judiciary Committee as contained in its report.

Along with Senator O'Mahoney, I was appalled to learn during the course of this study that certain of the monopolistic practices which the Supreme Court had condemned in the South-Eastern Underwriters case were actually sanctioned by the fire insurance rate law for the District of Columbia. This law had been enacted a few days prior to this decision, and Congress has never seen fit to amend it. I refer to the requirement in the District of Columbia fire rate law that compels all insurers to belong to the rating bureau. This forces companies to join a price-fixing combination and denies them the right of independence, even though membership in a rating bureau may be completely anathema to the philosophy and to the traditions of such companies. As the Judiciary Committee noted:

> There can be no doubt that coercion in insurance is the antithesis of the congressional purpose in enacting Public Law 15.

Laws which require membership in rating bureaus, or which eliminate all rate competition are in direct conflict with the McCarran Act.

In the course of this Antitrust Committee's insurance study, we learned that the casualty insurance rate law for the District of Columbia enacted in 1948 did not contain either this restrictive feature or other tight controls over rates which were in the early fire rate law. My essential purpose in introducing this bill today is to repeal the fire rate law and to apply the salutary principles of the casualty law to both fire and casualty insurance rates.

The original bills which Senator O'Mahoney and I introduced met wtih considerable opposition from certain groups in the insurance industry, primarily under the belief that they were designed as model bills upon which the States would be required to pattern their rate laws. This was not our intention, and is not now my purpose. I concur in the remarks of Senator MORSE, who cosponsored this bill with me, when he stated during the hearings before the District of Columbia Committee that the bill is intended to be a model of good legislation for the District of Columbia, and not as any congressional mandate that the States are obligated to follow.

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners has frequently encouraged the development of all-industry bills which have served as models. However, the Congress possesses no authority to establish model laws which the States shall be required to adopt. But, as Senator MORSE properly noted, if there is anything in a rate law enacted for the District of Columbia which the States find to be valuable, they would, of course, be free to draw from such laws whatever comfort they can in enacting their own laws. It should be noted, however, that the Constitution prohibits the enactment by the States of laws which conflict with valid Federal laws.

I think largely because of this unfortunate misconception concerning the original bills, the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which held hearings on this legislation last year, never saw fit to bring this issue to a vote. Regrettably, the full membership of the District Committee had no opportunity to register their views on this measure.

In the hearings which were conducted last year, the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia testified in favor of a rate bill which had been introduced by Senator BIBLE, chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. This bill repealed the fire rate law of 1944 and subjected fire rates to the provisions of the casualty rate law. In addition, it denied rate bureaus the status of aggrieved persons in opposing rate deviations. I consider this bill a very constructive measure in correcting the principal defects which the Antitrust Committee had found in the District of Columbia rate law. Therefore, during the hearings which were held last June, together with Senator MORSE, I agreed to support this bill, and to abandon the approach endorsed in the previous bills I had sponsored, provided a few basic amendments could be incorporated.

The bill which I introduce today is modeled after the original bill introduced by Senator BIBLE, at the request of Superintendent Jordan, but containing the amendments which I proposed last year. I am firmly convinced that there are now only minor differences separating my views from those of the insurance superintendent. It is my sincere hope that the superintendent will join with me and other industry groups in support of this bill, in order that the District Committee may act favorably upon the bill promptly, and that the Congress will have an opportunity to vote on this issue this year.

While the bill I introduce today adopts the approach proposed by Senator BIBLE, at the instance of Superintendent Jordan, I feel some amendments are necessary. One of these amendments would deny status as an aggrieved person to rating organizations, not only in opposing deviations, but also in opposition to independent rate filings. During the hearings last June, Superintendent Jordan indicated agreement with this amendment. The only major issue raised by these amendments is the requirement that like bureau and independent filings, deviated rate filings be effective upon filing. Such deviations, of course, remain subject to the right of subsequent disapproval by the superintendent if they do not comply with the standards of the act. This would also be true for either bureau or independent filings. Superintendent Jordan wants to keep deviations subject to the prior approval requirement, in order that he can deal effectively with the possibility of flash filings, that is, filings deliberately made at inadequate rates to capture a particular piece of business. However, in response to questions, he did say that flash filings had not been made under the file-and-use provision of the existing casualty rate law. The superintendent contended that flash filings cannot occur under the existing law, because of the power to retroactively disapprove certain filings. The bill which I offer today not only retains this authority the superintendent deems necessary to curb flash filings, but specifically makes it applicable to deviations, as well as basic filings. As now drafted, I believe that any differences we have with the insurance superintendent are minor. Nevertheless, I believe the principle must be preserved that deviations cannot be subjected to any more onerous requirements than obtain in the case of other rate filings.

The bill which I am introducing contains a number of other minor amendments to which the superintendent has raised no specific objections. These amendments would, first, expressly authorize public inspection of all filings; second, permit a filer to incorporate by reference any previously filed material open to public inspection; third, clarify the partial subscribership provision; and fourth, define the term "excessive and inadequate" rates. I want to point out that the definition of "inadequate rates" contained in this bill affords the superintendent an additional tool to combat the problem of flash filings. The superintendent's concern about flash filings is also met by the new provision included

in this bill which prescribed a 1-year minimum period for deviations.

Because of the importance of preserving reasonable competition in the insurance industry in the District of Columbia, Judge Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, appeared personally before the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce last year and urged the adoption of legislation substantially the same as that contained in the bill I am now proposing. I think the Congress ought to give great weight to the special competence of the experts in the Department of Justice on this vital issue. Only the magnitude of this issue would have caused the Assistant Attorney General to appear before the Subcommittee of the District of Columbia to testimony in favor of this remedial legislation. It is important, therefore, to note that Judge Loevinger concluded his testimony by saying:

> We urge that legislation be enacted to provide within the District the competitive climate which Congress intended to create in the insurance industry when it passed the McCarran Act; and to provide the States with an unequivocal expression of the type of regulation which Congress contemplated when it granted the States the authority to regulate this great industry and immunize it from the full impact of the antitrust laws.

I am entirely in agreement with the Assistant Attorney General that a competitive climate for the insurance industry should be provided by Congress for the District of Columbia. I believe that the bill which I introduce today would provide that climate, and I urge its serious consideration by the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1184) to amend and consolidate the laws providing for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS BETWEEN THE STATE OF OREGON AND THE C. & B. LIVESTOCK CO., INC.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

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. 1185) relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc., introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 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 (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 981), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept from the State of Oregon (without cost to the United States) a deed conveying to the United States all right, title, and interest of the State of Oregon in and to the following described land (together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon): the west half of the southwest quarter of section 22, township 4 North, Range 28 East, Willamette meridian, Oregon, such land being a part of a tract of land conveyed to the State of Oregon by patent numbered 1308889, dated September 17, 1954, pursuant to the aforementioned Act.

(b) Upon the receipt of a deed from the State of Oregon conveying to the United States the land described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by patent or other appropriate conveyance to the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, of Hermiston, Oregon (without cost to the United States), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such land (including all minerals contained therein), together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon, upon the condition that:

(1) The C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, convey to the United States fee simple title to the following described parcels of land (including all minerals contained therein), together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon: The west half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, lying south of U.S.R.S. canal "A", the east half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, lying south of U.S.R.S. canal "A", less the westerly 135 feet thereof; the east half of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22, less railroad right-of-way; that portion of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22 and of the north half of the northwest quarter of section 22, lying south and east of U.S.R.S. canal "A", excepting from said north half of said northwest quarter of section 22, that certain portion thereof as conveyed to the State of Oregon by deed recorded October 19, 1960, in deed book 260 at page 512, records of Umatilla County, Oregon. All being in township 4 north, range 28 east, of the Willamette meridian, in the county of Umatilla and State of Oregon. Excepting any and all roads and water rights-of-way.

(2) If it is determined after an appraisal by the Secretary of the Interior that the property to be conveyed to the United States by such company is of less value than the property to be conveyed to such company by the United States, the State of Oregon and the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, pay to the United States an amount equal to that difference in value, which amount shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) The conveyance to the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, authorized under subsection (b) of this section shall be made subject to a right-of-way in the land so conveyed for ditches or canals constructed under the authority of the United States, as authorized by the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 391).

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by patent or other appropriate conveyance to the State of Oregon all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those lands (together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon) conveyed to the United States by the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, pursuant to the first section of this Act; except that there shall be reserved to the United States all minerals in such lands, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

(b) The conveyance authorized under subsection (a) of this section shall be made subject to the same covenants, conditions, and limitations as those contained in patent numbered 1308889, dated September 17, 1954, referred to in the first section of this Act.

AUTHORIZATION FOR IRRIGATION OF ADDITIONAL LANDS, CROOKED RIVER FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, to provide for the irrigation of additional lands. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

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. 1186) to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 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 the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon", approved August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058), as amended, is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence of such section the following: "and the Crooked River project extension. The principal new works for the project extension shall include six pumping plants, canals, and related distribution and drainage facilities".

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the new works involved in the Crooked River project extension $995,000 (January 1962 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said extension.

SEC. 3. Power and energy required for irrigation pumping for the Crooked River project and the Crooked River project extension shall be made available by the Secretary of the Interior from the Dalles Dam powerplant and other Federal plants interconnected therewith at rates not to exceed the costs of such power and energy from the Dalles Dam, taking into account all costs of the dam, reservoir, and powerplant which are determined by the Secretary under provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to be properly allocable to such irrigation pumping power and energy.

TO AMEND THE JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR THE PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate ref-

erence, a joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific joint resolution to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this joint resolution, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary dated February 23, 1963, to the Vice President in regard to it and also a memorandum in regard to this joint resolution.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 381) is hereby amended by striking out the figure "$7,250" in section (b) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$15,000".

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

FEBRUARY 23, 1963.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I enclose a proposed draft joint resolution to authorize appropriations incident to U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property. The legislation would allow the increase of the maximum annual U.S. contribution to the Bureau from the present $7,250 to $15,000.

The Bureau, located in Geneva, Switzerland, is the secretariat of the International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property. The Union is composed of the 51 countries, including the United States, which are parties to the Convention of Paris for the Protection of Industrial Property. This Convention is and has been for more than 70 years the major instrumentality through which the patents, trademarks and industrial designs of U.S. inventors, industries, and business are assured protection in the other 50 member countries. Many millions of dollars are collected abroad each year for the assignment or licensing of these industrial property rights, and thus they are important dollar earners for this country.

The Bureau is in the process of complete reorganization and revitalization. We hope that, as a result of this reorganization, it will provide for increased services to the member countries, assist industrially less developed countries in their industrial property problems, and increase its publications in the English language. This reorganization and assumption of new tasks, together with the general increase in salaries and the rising costs of goods and services, make necessary an increase in the Bureau's budget (a background memorandum relating to the proposal is enclosed).

I believe it is in the best interests of the United States to raise its annual contribution to the Bureau in order that the extremely valuable and important services performed can be continued and increased in scope and efficiency. Our contribution to the total budget of the Industrial Property Union is expected to remain between 5 and 7 percent.

I hope that the Congress will be able to take action on this request during the current session since the recommended effective date of the increased contribution is January 1, 1963. The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR THE PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

The obligation of this Government to pay contributions to the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property results from the fact that the United States is party to the Convention of the International (Paris) Union for the Protection of Industrial Property, established in Paris on March 20, 1883, and revised at Washington on June 2, 1911 (38 Stat. 1645; TS 579), at The Hague on November 6, 1925 (47 Stat. 1789; TS 834); at London on June 2, 1934 (53 Stat. 1748; TS 941), and at Lisbon on October 31, 1958 (13 UST 1; TIAS 4931). In accordance with article 1 of the Convention, the countries to which the convention applies constituted themselves into a Union for the Protection of Industrial Property.

The convention provides basically that each country shall accord to nationals of other member countries the same protection with respect to industrial property rights that it accords its own nationals. Nationals of member countries are also accorded, throughout the Union, certain special rights and advantages, such as the right of priority and protection against arbitrary forfeiture of patents, if not immediately worked. The provisions governing priority are particularly important. Under these provisions, when an American inventor has filed for a patent in the United States or a member country on a given date, he has a 1-year period from the date of his first filing to file a corresponding patent application and acquire appropriate protection in other member countries. A similar 6-month right of priority applies to trademarks.

The convention also establishes an international office known as the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property which performs the following administrative functions: (1) Serves as a clearing house for information on and interpretation of patent and trademark laws; (2) serves as a medium to promote the ratification by members of revisions of the convention and the adherence of new members; (3) collects and publishes information relating to matters of general usefulness to members of the Union, and prepares a periodical paper concerning matters of interest to members of the Union; (4) holds itself at the service of members of the Union in order to supply them with any special information they may need on questions relating to the international system of industrial property; (5) handles the preparatory and administrative work of the conferences of revision.

The Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property provides that the budget of the International Bureau shall not exceed 140,000 Swiss francs (approximately $33,000). This amount was written in the convention in 1925.

Attempts were made at the Lisbon Conference in 1958 to raise this amount to 600,000 Swiss francs (approximately $140,000) by revising the convention. Such a revision, for which the United States voted at the diplomatic conference, would have required the unanimous decision of all member countries. The decision was vetoed by the Soviet bloc for political reasons, in retaliation for the conference's decision not to seat the representatives of the Eastern Zone of Germany. Thereupon, the conference adopted a simple resolution inviting the countries to raise their contributions to an extent which brought the ceiling of the Bureau's budget to 600,000 Swiss francs. This budget did not, of course, take into account any increased costs arising out of the proposed reorganization of the Bureau which was only approved by a committee of members of the Union in October 1962.

At the present time, the United States and almost all the other member countries pay their contributions on the basis recommended by the Lisbon resolution. The contribution of each State is computed according to a system in which countries belong in one of six classes. Each class is allotted a certain percentage of the total budget, and each state freely chooses the class in which it wants to belong. (The United States and five other countries belong to class I.) The percentage of each class may undergo slight variations from year to year, as the total number of the members and their appurtenance to a given class change. The present annual contribution of the United States and other countries in class I is approximately $7,000.

Congress gave authority in 1960 to the Department of State to pay on the basis of a yearly maximum of $7,250 (Public Law 86–614; 74 Stat. 381) which is roughly 5 percent of the present total budget with a $140,000 ceiling.

This ceiling, voted in 1958, is going to be insufficient in the next few years primarily for three reasons: (1) general increase in salaries, and the rising cost of printing, materials, and services; (2) the reorganization of the Bureau in order to increase its efficiency and usefulness to member states; (3) new activities. The salaries will be brought to a level comparable with the salaries paid by other intergovernmental organizations having their headquarters in Geneva. This is necessary for the recruitment of a truly international and high quality staff. The cost of printing, materials, and services has considerably increased in Switzerland in recent years. The most important new activities include increased efforts to have additional countries adhere to the Union; cooperation with the United Nations in industrial property matters; and technical-legal assistance to less developed countries.

A 15-member Committee of the Paris Union (called the "Permanent Bureau"), on which the United States is represented, has carefully studied the financial implications of the proposed future activities in a meeting held in October 1962. It estimated that the yearly amounts needed in the near future will be in the neighborhood of 900,000 Swiss francs (approximately $210,000). The question of increase was brought before this committee rather than before a diplomatic conference because the Soviet bloc countries would have probably again vetoed a revision of the convention in protest against the nonrecognition of East Germany. Thus it was necessary once again to resolve the question of an increase by way of a recommendation not requiring unanimity. Consequently, the committee adopted a resolution recommending that the supervisory authority

(i.e. the Swiss Government) "invite the Govments of the States members of the Paris Union to accept that the ceiling of that Union be raised to 900,000 Swiss francs per year and to pay their contributions on this basis from January 1, 1963."

This represents an increase of 50 percent and, assuming that the percentage of the countries belonging to class I would remain 5 percent of the total budget, would mean for the United States that its yearly contribution would increase by $3,500 (i.e., from the present $7,000 to $10,500; all amounts being approximative).

The Department of State recommends, however, that the authority sought from Congress allow us to contribute up to $15,000 per annum in order to avoid the need of seeking new authorizations in the next few years, should the $10,500 prove to be insufficient. It is, in fact, possible that the percentage of class I countries will become slightly higher, since some countries may change class or withdraw. The amount of $15,000 would allow for a 2-percent increase on this account. Furthermore, it is possible that because of increases in salary due to rising costs of living and other increases, the ceiling of $210,000 would prove to be inadequate. The amount of $15,000 would allow the raising of the ceiling to approximately $300,000 if contributions of class I members continue to represent about 5 percent of the total budget. If this percentage rises, the authority to pay $15,000 per annum would allow a budget of correspondingly less than $300,000. However, it is believed that an authorization to contribute not more than $15,000 per year will suffice for the foreseeable future.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be placed on S. 943 as a cosponsor, and that the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] be placed on the bill S. 1013 as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 987) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] be added, and that when the bill is again printed, it may include their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in behalf of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 887, related to the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of March 14, 1963:

S. 1100. A bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism: Mr. BYRD of West Virginia.

Authority of March 19, 1963:

S. 1117. A bill to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NORTHWEST POWER PREFERENCE BILL, S. 1007

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate that the public hearing on S. 1007, the Northwest power preference bill, previously scheduled by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to begin on April 2, has now been rescheduled to begin on Monday, April 1, at 10 a.m., in our committee hearing room.

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. JOHNSTON:

Statement by Representative ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, of South Carolina, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on March 14, 1963, on the subject of the 1963 tax message.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY AT DEDICATION OF O'HARE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, CHICAGO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last Saturday, President Kennedy spoke at the dedication of the O'Hare International Airport in Chicago.

I recommend to Senators a reading of his remarks on that occasion. They remind us how much our country owes to men such as "Butch" O'Hare, for whom the airport is named; at the same time, they demonstrate our need for such men in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the President's dedicatory address and also the text of a speech he delivered later that day at a luncheon in the Conrad Hilton Hotel.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE DEDICATION OF THE O'HARE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mayor Daley, Governor Kerner, Senator Douglas, Government and State officials, ladies and gentlemen: 21 years ago this year, a young Navy officer stood at the White House and was decorated by President Roosevelt with the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism extending far beyond the line of duty. I remember as a young naval officer myself how the extraordinary feat of "Butch" O'Hare captured the imagination not only of our Armed Forces but also of the country. His extraordinary act in protecting his ship, shooting down, while he was alone, shooting down five of the enemy, during difficult days in the Second War, gave this country hope and confidence not only in the quality and caliber of our fighting men, but also in the certainty of victory.

Therefore, 21 years later, I am proud to come to Chicago, to this airport, to take part in this act which commemorates his public service, his great naval service, and also reminds me of how much we owe to those who made this country of ours great.

I think one of the extraordinary facts of the Second War was this number of men who were highly decorated, particularly with the Congressional Medal of Honor, who later lost their lives in combat in later days. "Butch" O'Hare was one of them, being killed 18 months after the act of honor by the President of the United States, when his life could have been much easier. John Basilone, who got the Congressional Medal of Honor, in the Marine Corps, in Guadalcanal, and who was later killed on the beach at Iwo Jima, was another. But time after time, men who could have stayed at home and felt their duty done, went out again and some of them were killed. So today we not only dedicate the International Airport, but we also recall all those who made it possible. This is an extraordinary airport in an extraordinary city, in an extraordinary country, and it is a tribute to the constructive action of the Federal Government, the State government and the city government, under the distinguished leadership of your great mayor, Mayor Daley.

To keep these various interests working together and make this the most extraordinary airport in the world for this great city is an amazing feat. This airport lives up to its name. There is no other airport in the world where planes can make instrument landings on parallel runways, simultaneously. There is no other airport in the Nation which maintains three instrument landing systems. And there is no other airport in the world, and this should be a source of satisfaction to the people of Chicago, there is no other airport in the world which serves so many people and so many planes. Some 13.5 million airline travelers passed through O'Hare Airport last year. In 5 years it has gone from the 16th most active field in the country to the first, like so many other things about Chicago. During this airport's daily peak periods, an airliner lands and takes off every 43 seconds. Every day, one out of every five air travelers in this country passes through this airport, enough people in one day to equal the population of Bloomington, Ill. Every day, some 1,300 to 1,400 landings and takeoffs occur. So I think this airport is an extraordinary national asset named after an extraordinary American.

All of this traffic in and out of Chicago proves, as it has since the beginning of this country, that Chicago occupies a most important and vital strategic area in the United States, where all the lines of communication cross. That is why the future of this city is so bright. Indian canoes traveled this route from Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River before this was the United States.

And it will be doing the same thing in the year 2000. Railroads, highways—all the rest will come and meet in Chicago and make this a vital, booming city. These are all the things that can be done, but I think a good deal more must be done. One of the problems is with the people who live around the airports. I hope that the National Government, along with the airlines, will continue to work as hard as they can to make sure that the noise from these jets which take us in and out do not disturb the lives of a half-million people whose homes are in the im-

mediate area. In addition, air cargo is only beginning in importance. In addition, I think we must make a special effort at O'Hare and all our other airports to welcome the people who come from abroad. This may be the first view they have of America. We want them to know what a warm and vital and vigorous country this is. And I hope we will make every effort to make them at home, and to urge their countrymen to come and visit us.

Finally, we look forward to the day in aviation when we are going to travel three times the speed of sound, and go to any place in the world in a few hours. And when that happens, we want the United States to be in the lead, as it has been in the lead in jet transportation since the jet was invented. All in all, I am proud to be here in Chicago taking part in a great ceremony, honoring a great American to whom we owe much, looking to the past and saluting him and looking to the future and saluting the city of Chicago.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT A CIVIC LUNCHEON, CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. Mayor, Your Eminence, Rabbi Mann, Bishop Burrill, Senator Douglas, Mr. Logelin, Mr. Lee, distinguished guests, Mr. Smith, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to be in Chicago because I am struck every time I come by the strong public spirit which runs through this city in the determination to make Chicago second to none, and everything about Chicago to be the best, that men and women working together can provide. And also by the happy spirit of community effort which joins business, labor, the civic groups and all the rest, in selling Chicago to the people of Chicago, to the country, and the world.

As Mr. Smith said, all these things do not just happen; they are made to happen. And the reason they are made to happen, I think, in Chicago, is because of Mayor Daley. So I am glad to be here today.

I did not realize, which shows the advantage of getting out of Washington—I did not realize until I began to look up some of the details of O'Hare what an extraordinary effort this has been, the largest airport in the world here in the center of the United States. So I hope that Chicago will continue to tell its story, not only here but all across this country, of what a great metropolis it is, its energy and vitality, and its commitment to the future. I don't think that there is any doubt that if this country continues to grow, if we can maintain a rate of economic vitality and prosperity, that Chicago will be among the leaders, and that the future of O'Hare Airport, named as the mayor has said, after a great Chicagoan who died a good many thousands of miles away from here, that Chicago and O'Hare will be symbolic of the progress of this country.

There is, I think, the central thesis, however, that we face serious problems in this country in the decade ahead if we are going to maintain that growth, and I want to mention one of those problems because I think it concerns us all, in government, in the city, the National Government, the State, labor, management, all of us as citizens. I think the No. 1 domestic concern of the United States is going to be in the 1960's the question of jobs, jobs for a tidal wave of men and women who are going to be hitting our labor market in the next 5 years. It is a concern which requires the united effort of all of us. Some people may think it strange that jobs, which was the great issue of the thirties, when we were in a depression, should also be the great concern of the sixties, when we enjoy a relative period of economic prosperity. The difficulty in the thirties was that there was an inordinately low supply of jobs for the men and women who wished to find work.

The difficulty now is the tremendously high manpower demand which exceeds the supply of jobs. But now, as then, every effort must be made by all of us to strengthen the economy so that we can find work for the people who want it. This involves not only Chicago in this country, but it involves our position of leadership in the world. Mr. Khrushchev has said that the hinge of history would move when he was able to demonstrate that his system could outproduce ours. The hinge of history will move if we are not able to find jobs for our people, not only during recessions, but also during periods of prosperity; and there are three reasons why I regard this as the No. 1 problem we are going to face in this country in the coming years, and it is serious enough to warrant a careful examination by all of us to realize that it cannot be reduced by platitudes and hopes, and the effect of this problem is being felt and will be felt here in Chicago, Ill., and across the country. There are three reasons for it: First is the labor released by the revolution in farm technology. Agriculture has been this Nation's largest employer, engaging more people than steel, automobiles, and public utilities, and the transportation industries combined.

But now one farmer can produce the food and fiber needed for 25 Americans; compared to only 7 at the turn of the century. New fertilizers, insecticides, research, and all the rest have made this one of the great productive miracles of all time, has been one of the great stories for the United States around the world in contrast to the failure of our adversaries, but it is a fact that since 1947 our farms have increased their output 30 percent, at the very time that the manhours worked on those farms were cut in half. Farm employment during that period declined by 3 million, an average of 200,000 a year; comparable to the population o' the city of Akron, Ohio, being thrown out of work every 12 months. In the last 2 years alone, farm employment dropped by a half million, while farm production and farm income were both rising. It is estimated that, disturbing as it may sound, only 1 out of every 10 boys growing up on the farms of the United States will find a living in agriculture.

This leads us to the second growing tide of manpower, our Nation's youth.

The crest of the postwar baby flood has swept through our elementary and secondary schools and is now about to engulf the labor force. Last year, for example, 2.8 million young Americans reached the age of 16. This year, 3.8 million will be coming into the labor market at that age. Altogether, in the 1960's, 26 million new young workers will enter the labor market, an increase of 40 percent over the 1950's, and a far greater number than this country has ever had to absorb and train in our history.

Already workers under the age of 25, although they comprise less than one-fifth of our labor force, constitute more than one third of our unemployed. Last year, the unemployment rate for men age 25 and over was 4.4 percent. But for those age 20 to 24 it was 9 percent, and for those 14 to 19 it was a shocking 13 percent. Although young people are staying in school longer than their fathers, the rate of school dropouts, 4 out of every 10, is too high, for job openings for the untrained are declining, in factories, mines, farms, and railroads, in the construction and service industries.

Moreover, the jobless rate is always highest among the unskilled. In our modern society, even high school graduates find that their skills are inadequate. But Labor Department surveys show that their rate of unemployment is at least far below that of school dropouts, not only in the year of leaving school, but in the later years.

The latest surveys also show that unemployment rates among college graduates are much lower than among those coming out of high school. But unfortunately, only 1 out of every 10 finish college. In short, as challenging as it will be to provide, first, jobs for the 26 million new young workers entering the labor market in the 1960's, far more difficult will be the problem of absorbing the 7.5 million who will not even finish high school, including nearly 2½ million who will not even finish the eighth grade.

I ask you to mark these figures well, for youth unemployment poses one of the most expensive and explosive social and economic problems now facing this country and this city. In the last decade, for example, arrests of youth increased 86 percent. What will the figure be for the next decade when the net increase of potential young workers in the labor force rises to 15 times as fast as it did in the 1950's?

Finally, underlying all of these trends is the third phenomenon, both cursed and praised, and that is technological advance, known loosely by the name of automation. During the last 6 years, the Nation increased its manufacturing output by nearly 20 percent, but it did so with 800,000 fewer production workers, and the gain in white collar jobs did not offset this loss. Since the Second World War, the real output of the private economy has risen 67 percent, with only a 3-percent rise in man-hours.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. Increasing productivity and advancing technological skills are essential to our ability to compete and to progress. But we also have an obligation to find the nearly 2 million jobs which are displaced by these advances.

This city is no stranger to any of these problems. You have seen your railroads laying off machinists and boilermakers, as the proportion of diesel locomotives rose from less than 15 percent of all locomotives in 1947 to 97 percent today. You have seen your downstate coal mines laying off workers as new machinery makes it possible for 46 men to dig the coal that 100 men dug in 1947. And you have seen your steel mills employ 79 men to produce the steel products which required 100 men only 10 years ago. Chicago, I might add parenthetically, also proves the exception to this pattern since it now takes 10 men to manage the Cubs instead of 1.

This is not a blue collar problem alone. Office and clerical workers are increasingly being displaced by automatic computers and processes. The Farm Home Administration of the U.S. Government processes 35 percent more loans per employee than it did only 2 years ago.

This administration intends to press ahead with Government economy, but we also have to find in the private economy jobs for these people who are willing.

All these trends you have seen in this city and State, workers displaced by automation, school dropouts roaming the streets, men looking for work who have left the farm, the mine, the factory, the railroad, or the distressed area. You have your share of jobless Negroes and women and older workers and all the rest, even though under Mayor Daley's hard-driving leadership this city is creating new jobs faster than almost any city in the country. The same is true on a larger scale of the Nation as a whole. Our civilian labor force grew by nearly 12 million during the last 15 years. But the number of jobs grew by only 10 million. In the last 5 years we saw an annual increase of only 175,000 private jobs, outside of agriculture, compared to 700,000 in each of the previous 10 years. Our total gross national product output grew at a rate of only 3 percent, while unemployment remained continuously above 5 percent. And last year's loss of manhours, in terms of those willing but unable to find full-time work, was a staggering 1 billion work days, equivalent to shutting

down the entire country with no production, no services, and no pay for over 3 weeks.

Some 14 million Americans had some unemployment in 1962, and 28 percent of last year's unemployed were out of work 15 weeks or longer. Fifteen percent were out of work a full 6 months or longer.

This Nation must do better than that.

The trouble is that each of these figures grow worse, after each recession, and each one is bound to grow worse in the sixties as the labor force increases even faster, unless we take actions to reverse these trends and make the most of the manpower. Unless we step up our rate of growth, unless we create a supply of jobs which is more equal to the demand, our rate of unemployment will steadily and swiftly climb to the recession level of 7 percent, even without a recession. Without full employment, consumer markets are below their potential, without strong consumer demand plant capacity is not fully in use, without full plant utilization profit margins are reduced, without higher profits investment lags, and so the sagging spiral continues downward.

Our task is to reverse this spiral, to recognize it in the first place, and no single magic solution will solve all of our manpower problems. Above all, we need to release the brake of wartime tax rates which are now holding down growth at the very time we need more growth in order to create more jobs. Ten million dollars more in tax savings in the hands of American consumers and investors, as I have proposed to the Congress, will be multiplied many times in new markets, new equipment, new jobs, new payrolls, and then still more consumption and investment.

As this decade is unique in terms of the trends converging upon it, so is 1963 uniquely qualified to be the year that we cut Federal taxes. Inflationary pressures are at bay, no world crisis strains our resources, the dollar is strong, new investment incentives have been enacted, world war material prices are stable, and the number of idle men and machines can clearly absorb this expansion. But tax reduction alone is not enough if we are to attack unemployment in those areas and among those workers where the need is greatest.

Tax reduction alone will not employ the unskilled or bring business to a distressed area, and tax reduction alone is not, therefore, the only program we must put forward. To mention but a few, we urgently need to improve our schools and colleges, to reduce the number of dropouts, to reduce the number of unskilled workers, to keep young people out of the labor market until they are ready for the jobs which automation creates, instead of those it is sure to replace.

We urgently need a youth employment opportunities program to give young people training and job experience instead of hanging around the streets, out of work, and out of hope. We need to step up our efforts for aid to distressed areas, for the retraining of the unemployed, particularly in those areas where it has been chronic, for more security for our aged, for improving our housing and our transportation industries, and for ending race discrimination in education and employment, which helps increase, of course, the chronic unemployment of minority groups.

These are all controversial measures. There may possibly be others that are needed or others that are better, but at least it is a problem that we should all concentrate our attention on and not merely assume it is going to be settled if we ignore it.

O'Hare Airport was not built in that spirit and this problem will not be solved unless we concentrate the best energies of this country on the solution of a serious national problem. I have no doubt these problems will some day be solved. The question is will they be solved in ways which impoverish us, with restrictions on the workweek, or inefficiency, or in competition, or will they be solved in ways which enrich us by expanding our economy and putting people to work.

The choice is up to us all, to you here in Chicago, to those of us in Washington; depends on the will of the people and the will of the Congress.

Twenty-five hundred years ago the Greek poet Alcaeus laid down the principle which best sums up the greatness of Chicago: "Not houses firmly roofed," he wrote, "or the stones of walls well builded, nay, nor canals and dockyards make the city—but men able to use their opportunities."

Chicago is blessed to have such men at their head, and my fervent hope is that the United States of America in meeting the needs of this decade will also be peopled by "men able to use their opportunities."

Thank you.

DR. WALTER P. WEBB

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, each generation is privileged to know certain individuals of whom it readily can be said that they carry the torch of wisdom, from which untold numbers light their own fires of thought and learning.

One of that number of wise men, Dr. Walter Prescott Webb, the eminent Texas and Southwest historian, recently was torn from this life by a tragic traffic accident.

It was the same Dr. Webb, professor emeritus of the University of Texas, who provided "A Tribute to the Southwest" for the official inaugural program, January 20, 1961, from which I am privileged to quote the following:

There is something infectious about the magic of the Southwest. Some are immune to it, but there are others who have no resistence, and who must spend the rest of their lives dreaming of the incredible sweep of the desert, of great golden mesas with purple shadows, and tremendous stars appearing at dusk in a turquoise sky.

And I am one of those.

On March 17, 1963, the Dallas Morning News published an article written by Dr. J. Frank Dobie, who walked, talked, and taught with Dr. Webb for many years. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

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

[From the Dallas Morning News, Mar. 17, 1963]

ON THE PROJECTED SHADOW OF WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB

(By J. Frank Dobie)

I cannot speak freely of Walter Webb apart from personal life. Each of us was born in the year 1888 and reared in the country. We were underling instructors together, he in history and I in English, in the University of Texas; we came to know each other better along in the thirties. The evening he was killed in a car accident, March 8, 1963, I and two other men were sitting down to dinner as guests of Frank Wardlaw, director of the University of Texas Press, all of us expecting Webb to appear before long.

Many times in newspapers and elsewhere I've seen the names of Roy Bedichek, naturalist and humanist, Walter Prescott Webb, historian and thinker, and Frank Dobie linked together as a triumvirate of writers. Bedichek, the dearest comrade of my life, died in 1959. We three not infrequently went out in the country late in the day to cook steak and eat it along with a bottle of beer. Bedichek was the planner of these parties, also the cook. He saw that each man paid his part of the expenses. There was no host. There was not much drinking. Webb didn't care for beer. A sip of wine suited him. If he took whisky, he didn't take more than a jigger without water.

The site for our camp suppers came to be Friday Mountain Ranch in the hills about 17 miles southwest of Austin. It consists of approximately a section of land; an ancient two-storied rock house on it was once a kind of academy. After Webb acquired the place it entered into his bones—into the very fibers of his being. He spent an enormous amount of time and money restoring the soil and bringing back a turf of grass. Bear Creek, normally running, twists through the land. Webb dammed it, compounding a fine hole of water. The water, the soil, and the grass restored him as much as he restored the land.

In 1945 or 1946 Roy Bedichek was provided with a grant of money by a civilized man who demanded anonymity. He spent a year at Friday Mountain batching and writing the book published in 1947, "Adventures With a Texas Naturalist." Webb wanted humanity to benefit from the land. Without living on it and there associating with himself and with nature, free from everything else but the occupation of writing, Bedichek probably could not have achieved the classic that he did achieve.

It was only after rains broke the terrible drought of the fifties that grass really came back on Friday Mountain land. In 1962 it was at its prime and Walter Webb was also.

He wrote an essay, published in Harper's and then reprinted in Reader's Digest, telling of the poverty of his boyhood and of a stranger named Hinds in New York who sent him books to read and aided him in getting a college education. Hinds died many years ago. Webb never saw him and remained to the end concerned over some way to pay him back. His paying back seems to have lain in aiding certain struggling and able students.

He was always on the side of humanity, the people. One of his books, "Divided We Stand" (1937), analyzes the dearth of prosperity in the South while the North burgeoned and for a long while treated the South pretty much as a colony. Webb himself prospered through investing earnings from teaching and writing—especially from two textbooks—in real estate.

Webb had a dim view of certain English teachers under whom he had studied in the university. He wanted to write but learned by himself the craft of writing. Some time after World War I, he was avidly reading O. Henry and writing some short stories of his own. One that I remember was based on an electric sign above Joske's store in San Antonio that flashed every night, showing a cowboy roping a steer. Webb taught for a while in a San Antonio high school.

His superiority as a historian lies to a marked degree in power of thought, in revealing the meaning of things as well as characters, and in interpreting the ever-evolving currents of human affairs. His last big book, "The Great Frontier" (1958), interprets the Western Hemisphere as a frontier for the expansion of Europe. It says plainly and emphatically that America has been consuming irreplaceable resources and that the future of such a policy is not bright. This book came out during the outrage of McCarthyism, and some fanatics, without reading it, slammed it as a rebuke to free enterprise.

When Webb took a stand, he took it. If the radical right seemed to him unjust and undemocratic the radical left annoyed him. He was not a crusader and was not contentious. Much went on in his mind that he never gave words to. He sometimes wished, he once told me, that he didn't have to think. One time while we were walking along the railroad about Third Street in Austin, we stopped beside the oldtime steam locomotive. It was stationary but was throbbing with power. Webb said, "That is the greatest manifestation of power in the world."

Whether Webb actually ever hated anybody or not I cannot say; I never heard him express hatred toward anybody. He was more inclined to set forth the facts about a man than to praise or condemn. He was tolerant of the vagaries of individuals.

He developed as a professor and historian under the late Dr. Eugene C. Barker, for years head of the history department of the University of Texas. The older Barker grew, the more conservative he grew. His directness and his integrity were admirable. I myself owe considerable to him. He came to think that the masses of mankind need a kind of dictatorial direction in religion, in politics, and in other regions.

While Dr. Barker became hostile to the New Deal, active against Homer Price Rainey as president of the University of Texas, and was standing with the by-no-means-intellectual regents who deposed Rainey, Webb was for Rainey, also for Franklin D. Roosevelt, as he was later for Truman. But he was never against Barker. "I did not understand him," I heard him say, "but he stood by me. He was generous. He stood for fine things. I remember him with respect and gratitude."

The first Mrs. Webb, after having been married to Walter for more than 43 years, died in the summer of 1960, survived by a daughter, Mildred, of whom Dr. Webb as well as Mrs. Webb was very fond. In December of 1961 he married the widow of the late Maury Maverick, of San Antonio, a very spritely mind and a delightful lady. Considering his love for her and her marrying him, he said, "This is an unexpected dividend from life."

Any man who has seen and been a part of life wants to leave it before decomposing into a senile vegetable. Webb died standing up, as Caesar considered it mete for a man to die. In a flash he passed from wisdom and happiness to whatever death means. No person who has added as much to the heritage of human life as Walter Webb added ceases to be. His living, thinking, writing, standing up will surely continue as parts of his projected shadow.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on this date 142 years ago the people of Greece, unwilling to tolerate any longer the oppressive domination imposed by their Ottoman conquerors, began an all-out struggle for their freedom—a struggle which was to last for more than 6 years, and was to culminate, in 1827, in the establishment of an independent Greek state. It is entirely appropriate that we here in the Senate, and Americans everywhere, pause to commemorate this occasion and to pay tribute to the valiant courage and indomitable spirit of the Greek people.

The entire Western civilization owes an incalculable debt to the Greeks for the contributions they have made to almost every facet of modern life. In architecture, literature, philosophy, and sculpture, to mention only a few, the imagination and creativity of the Greeks have served as sources of inspiration to all of us over the years. But the Greeks are perhaps best noted for their political theories. Their early philosophers are recognized as the true architects of democracy, believing as they did in the dignity of the individual man and the supremacy of the law. It is indeed ironic that the Greek nation, so steeped in democratic principles, should have been subjected for so long to the despotic rule of alien tyrants. But the people of Greece, united by the dream of national political independence, and sharing the will and determination to be free, were ultimately successful in reestablishing a democratic state, which has survived countless threats from would-be aggressors, even in the span of our own history.

The struggle to maintain the independence won in 1827 has not been easy. But with a maximum of perseverance and a minimum of outside assistance, the Greek people have built a state which today stands as a bastion of freedom in the turbulent eastern Mediterranean area. In a locale where constant vigilance and courage are vital in order to protect against Communist advances, the Greeks have proven themselves capable of resisting the onward push of the Communists. The Greeks are continuing to strengthen the economic and social fibers of their nation, and have become a valuable and trusted ally in the NATO pact of nations.

We Americans can never completely repay our debt to the Greek nation and people, who have contributed so significantly to the development of democratic ideals and institutions. We are indeed proud of and grateful to the more than 1½ million Americans of Greek descent who have done so much to strengthen democracy and freedom in our own land.

In my own State of Massachusetts, there are many eminent citizens of Greek descent to whom I wish to pay special tribute today. Their influence is widely felt throughout the Commonwealth, and they have provided constructive leadership in many aspects of our community life.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by him in tribute to the 142d anniversary of Greek independence.

The Senator from New York calls attention to the many fine contributions which the Greeks have made to the Western civilization, and points out the fact that Greece has been a significant outpost of freedom in the free world today.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

I am happy to pay tribute today to the 142d anniversary of Greek independence. One hundred and forty-two years ago today—in 1821—the freedom loving Greeks cast away the dark forces of oppression and set out on a new course of liberty and self-determination.

On this significant day, Americans should pause and remember the many fine contributions the Greeks have made to Western civilization. We need only to look about us here in Washington at the many Government buildings inspired by Greek architecture and Greek culture. In 18th-century America, architects turned to Greek prototypes in an effort to anchor our art upon the best ideals of the past in a desire to find lasting monuments to the spirit of human achievement.

American Government today reflects the concept of the Greek city-state which has served for centuries as a forerunner of government by and for the people. Greece has inspired and enriched many areas of our own society—in art, literature, music, to mention only a few.

The culture of the United States has been vastly enriched not only by the Greek heritage but also by the manifold contributions that American citizens of Greek descent have made to the building of our nation. In work and in play, American citizens of Greek origin have done their part and more in fulfilling the vital functions of citizenship and enriching our society.

Also noteworthy is the fact that Greece has been a significant outpost of freedom in the free world today. Only 15 years ago, the liberty of Greece was threatened with the black cloud of communism. It was possible, as a result of determined free world resistance and the full backing of the United States, for the heroic people of Greece to throw off the Communist guerrillas and to reestablish an independent nation which today is a vital part of the free world. The Greek example clearly demonstrates that freedom and independence are cherished principles of the Greek people today.

I am happy to take this opportunity to salute the Greek people: their heritage has contributed immeasurably to our own; their spirit of freedom has set a dramatic example for the free world.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, March 25 marks the 142d anniversary of Greek Independence Day. It is a day of great significance for Greek people everywhere, since it commemorates the successful outcome of Greece's centuries-long struggle against the domination of the Ottoman Empire.

This anniversary gives us an occasion to consider the importance of Greece to the free world. In the first place, the history, philosophy, and literature of ancient and modern Greece are a continuing source of inspiration for freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. One of the two cradles of Western civilization, ancient Greece gave birth to such vital traditions as democratic government, individual liberties, and the rule of law.

In recent times Greece has played an important role in the evolution of the cold war. In the aftermath of World War II, Greece was wracked by civil dissension and imperiled by Communist infiltration. These dangers were eliminated through the valiant efforts of Greek patriots and assistance from the United States. The repulsion of the Communist menace in Greece marked an early turning point in the cold war. Additional economic aid through the Marshall plan enabled Greece to rebuild her economy.

Greece is now a member of the Council of Europe, NATO, and the Balkan Pact with Turkey and Yugoslavia, and last year she became an associate member of the European Economic Community. Greece is thus a valued partner in the community of free nations. Its continuing prosperity and freedom are a

matter of vital concern to us all as we observe the 142d anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

IMPORTANCE OF GREECE TO AMERICA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today is Greek Independence Day, a day of special significance for our own great Republic.

Without the philosophy and principles bequeathed to our Founding Fathers by the ancient Greeks, we today might not enjoy the fruits of representative government firmly based on individual freedom.

President Monroe recognized our great debt to Greece when, 142 years ago, he announced the New World's sympathy for the Greeks then striving to sunder the shackles of foreign domination. Since then, the ties between our two countries have continued to be close, and the United States has particularly benefited from those million and a half Americans of Hellenic background who have enriched our Nation in so many fields, and are amongst our most distinguished citizens.

I treasure my own associations with that great people, and take special pride in the award of Commander of the Royal Order of Phoenix bestowed on me last year by the King of Greece through his Consul General.

Modern Greece has the distinction of having fought communism longer than any other nation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and is one of our most trusted allies in the cold war with Communist tyranny. As in the past, she is today a bulwark of freedom, and a cherished friend of the United States.

Mr. President, Louis H. Simons of the Beaver County Times made an interesting proposal in the March 6 edition of that newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that his article, "Bring Foreign Youth to United States To Study Our Ways" be inserted in the RECORD.

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

PEACE CORPS IN REVERSE: BRING FOREIGN YOUTH TO UNITED STATES TO STUDY OUR WAYS

(By Louis H. Simons)

The Peace Corps marked its second anniversary last Friday and a blurb received here from Washington had a lot of nice things to say about the organization. This included the statement that 1 year ago there were 698 volunteers working abroad in 12 countries and that today there are 4,595 either overseas or in training for programs in 44 countries. Congress appropriated $59 million for the second fiscal year.

The anniversary appears to be an appropriate time to evaluate the Peace Corps' contributions in the broad perspective of world events. And in any consideration of their work there is bound to be unanimity in the conviction that the Corps' achievements are deserving of their country's commendation.

In these extraordinary times, however, we must regard the work of the Corps in relation to its impact on the revolutionary change brought on by Marxian ideology. In this context, we must consider the Corps as constituting nothing more than a mere gesture in the promotion of understanding among nations.

The most urgent problem in these times is to find ways and means to stem the tide of communism. It is the most pressing problem that will be occupying the attention of the Western World for many years to come. Therefore, every endeavor should be keyed to the general theme of doing something about it. The powerful Soviet colossus poses a long-range threat to all free nations.

(The Soviets have invaded India, they are making headway in southeast Asia and are now strongly entrenched only 90 miles off the Florida coast.)

But the Peace Corps, although directly concerned with foreign affairs, is unable to be effective in this enterprise. Such an undertaking would prove beyond its capacity. It work is confined within certain narrow limitations. The members of this worthy group are admittedly overwhelmed by the magnitude of the tasks before them. And in the performance of their special skills they are regarded, locally, as ambassadors of good will.

It must be acknowledged, however, that something of great depth and substance must be done about the dangerous imbalance in the world today. Something has got to be done to implant the American idea into the consciousness of the common man in the underdeveloped countries. This must be achieved in a manner that will reach great multitudes in the briefest possible time.

What is the answer? Perhaps the approach has been suggested in a statement made to Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, by Ashadevi, an associate of the late Mahatma Gandhi. "They (the Peace Corps) must bring more than science and technology," the distinguished woman told the Director. "They must be carriers of your best values and ideals. Can your Peace Corps touch the idealism of America and bring that to us?"

Of course they can. The men and women in the Peace Corps have fulfilled unusual requirements to qualify for their mission. But they can accomplish comparatively little. The immensity of the task is generally understood. There must be some other way.

Indeed, there is another way. The idealism of America can be made to pervade the underprivileged areas of the world by a peace corps in reverse. This can be done by the simple procedure of getting their own people to come over here so that they could sense the mood and idealism of the American people.

Who should qualify for the mission in reverse? These should be selected not from the oil barons of the Near East, but from the populaces who live in poverty over the world's richest oil deposits; from among those who are kept down by an antique feudalism; from the areas where there is no middle class; from those parts of the world where there appears to be inherent instability by reason of disease and hunger. An actual case will serve to illustrate.

In recent months an administrator of elementary schools in Kenya, Africa, came to this country on a Fulbright scholarship. The pupils under his supervision numbered 230,000. He took some courses in a great university and then spent several weeks as an observer in the elementary schools of Elizabeth Borough in Allegheny County. Before his departure he explained what he had learned in a typical American public school. Among other things, he said this:

"In Kenya we give the children in the fourth grade a final examination to determine their fitness to continue with their education, and in the eighth grade we give another test that further reduces the number that can go on into high school. When I get back those examinations will be discontinued, for we not only got the cream of the crop in our high schools, we got the cream of the cream."

That the idealism of America rubbed off on the Kenyan educator is beyond any doubt.

It is essential that qualified young people with good minds, who are underprivileged, be brought here to our high schools and universities. Let them come so that they may discern for themselves the true concept of democracy. Let them be the carriers of our best values and ideals. In a word, let them become imbued with the spirit of free men in a free society.

With this type of Peace Corps, we can help the weaker nations mobilize the spirit and capacities of their people and thereby create a bulwark against the Communist threat.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on this day, 142 years ago, Greece won its independence from the Ottoman Empire.

The Greek war of independence, like ours, was a long, bitter struggle and is historically interesting because it showed how stubbornly a people can cling to a democratic tradition despite years of dictatorial oppression.

The Greek democratic theory, of course, is the ancestor of ours. If there had been no Greece, would there be an America? Or would there be a Senate in which I could stand to speak admiringly of the Greeks? An academic question, perhaps, but a fascinating one.

Democracy was not an inevitable historical development. The Egyptian civilization stood for several thousand years without finding any necessity for it.

But Egypt, of course, had the disadvantage of being flat. One man could survey and rule a lot of country and a lot of people.

But in the privacy of their mountains, the Greeks learned to be free and individualistic. They developed a theory of democracy with so much appeal that it spread through the world and has endured to this day.

The Greeks have defended that theory more than once. They defended it against Persians, against the Turkish emirs, against the Nazis and against the Communists.

A long democratic tradition and the will to defend it has left its mark. It has given the Greeks dignity and pride. On this anniversary of their nation's independence, Greeks everywhere and their descendants certainly deserve a congratulatory salute—and a nod of thanks.

GEORGIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS ON POULTRY, BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION, AND OPPOSITION TO CHANGE IN TIMBER TAX

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, which recently concluded its annual session, adopted three resolutions concerning matters of great importance to the people of my State.

Unreasonable and discriminatory import levies imposed by the European Common Market countries are inflicting great economic damage on the poultry industry of Georgia, which brings the State $500 million a year directly, and indirectly is responsible for an annual business of $2.5 billion.

The general assembly rightly fears that unfair import levies on U.S. poultry, if allowed to stand, can lead to similar inequities concerning other agricultural products of this country. I join my fellow Georgians in urging that every effort

be made to remove discriminatory import levies on poultry and to prevent the imposition of any similar barriers on U.S. agricultural products.

Another resolution calls for construction of a bridge across one of nature's true wonderlands, the Okefenokee Swamp, in south Georgia. As proposed, the bridge would connect the northern and southeastern ends of State Highway No. 177.

In the third resolution the general assembly urges that no changes be made in the present capital gains tax laws relating to the cutting or disposal of timber.

Mr. President, for myself and in behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

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

H.R. 170

Resolution urging construction of a bridge across the Okefenokee Swamp connecting State Highway No. 177; and for other purposes

Whereas State Highway No. 177 has been constructed so that the northern portion thereof extends southward from U.S. highway No. 23 and the southern portion extends northeasterly from U.S. No. 441 into the Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas there is a 16-mile gap between the northern and southeastern terminus of said highway; and

Whereas it is possible and feasible to construct a 16-mile, 6-foot vertical clearance, tangent, two lane level concrete bridge with pulloff parking areas to complete said highway; and

Whereas said bridge would have a 6-foot vertical clearance, permitting sufficient clearance for passage of boats and wildlife thereunder; and

Whereas the right-of-way for such bridge would not exceed 50 feet in width, thus leaving the tall and majestic cypress trees which abound in said area, thereby providing an abundance of natural shade, beauty and scenic views; and

Whereas the erection, maintenance, and use of this proposed bridge would not in any way be harmful to fish, serpents or wildlife, which inhabit said area; and

Whereas through the employment of appropriate wildlife rangers, restrictions prohibiting the use of firearms as a protection to wildlife population could be easily imposed; and

Whereas a tourist attraction of this type would be the only one of its kind on the North American Continent; and

Whereas the assistance afforded to the students of the study of biology, entomology, wildlife and forestry would be untold; and

Whereas construction of this bridge would provide a national landmark that would greatly assist private, commercial and military aviation; and

Whereas construction of this proposed bridge would furnish a bountiful market for employment in a depressed area which is suffering from a critical unemployment problem; and

Whereas the construction of this project would make available and accessible to the general public the natural beauty possessed by this vast wilderness known as the Land of the Trembling Earth, who would never have an opportunity to observe it otherwise; and

Whereas the benefits to be derived from the construction of this bridge would be many times the cost of the initial investment in its construction cost; and

Whereas the author of this resolution, in the early twenties, was employed and assisted in surveying and building many miles of piling track railroads throughout the Okefenokee Swamp and is fully aware that this bridge is feasible and could be built at a reasonable cost; and

Whereas completion of Georgia Highway No. 177 would connect the Stephen C. Foster State Park and the Laurel S. Walker State Park: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body does hereby solicit from all members of the Georgia congressional delegation their cooperation and support in seeking the completion of the connection of Georgia Highway No. 177 by the erection of a 16-mile bridge to be constructed through the heart of the Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge; be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby recommend and request the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Roads, to approve and begin construction of this project; be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby recommend and request the U.S. Department of Interior to approve and begin construction of this project; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby authorized and instructed to transmit to the Director of the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Secretary of Interior, and to each and every Member of the Georgia congressional delegation, a copy of this resolution.

In house, read and adopted, February 27, 1963.

GLENN W. ELLARD,
Clerk.

In senate, read and adopted, March 4, 1963.

GEORGE D. STEWART,
Secretary.

H.R. 206

Resolution urging the Governor of the State of Georgia and the Georgia congressional delegation to resist any changes in the present capital gains tax laws, relating to the cutting or disposal of timber, and for other purposes

Whereas forest land comprises 25,772,200 acres, 69 percent of the total land area of the State; and

Whereas 23,931,100 acres are in private ownership and constitute 93 percent of the total forest land; and

Whereas these forest lands are providing approximately a gross return of $1 billion to the State's economy through forest industries; and

Whereas forest industry represents the third largest dollar volume of industry and supports 200,000 or more persons annually; and

Whereas Georgia has led the Nation in reforestation for many years, having converted almost 700,000 acres from cropland to trees under the soil bank program in recent years; and

Whereas investments are made for long periods of time during which they are continuously subject to many hazards, such as fire, insects, disease, and market fluctuations; and

Whereas the State and Federal Governments have encouraged forest land owners to develop previously unproductive lands for timber products; and

Whereas Georgia leads the Nation in the number of acres under the tree farm program; and

Whereas an incentive must exist to encourage the production of crops that must be produced over two or more decades before any substantial financial return is realized; and

Whereas the capital gains tax treatment on long-term timber gains recognizes these various factors; and

Whereas this type of tax treatment has been effective in stimulating private forest owners to adopt management plans and programs to produce timber to meet the national needs; and

Whereas private forest land is in a wide variety of ownerships with 197,000 owners in Georgia; and

Whereas the repeal of capital gains taxation will materially reduce the ability of private individuals and industry to continue reforestation and will accelerate the cutting of present timber growth; and

Whereas, forestry has made its greatest advances during the last 20 years as the result of stimulus of capital gains: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Governor of the State of Georgia and all Members of the Georgia congressional delegation are urged to do everything in their power to maintain the present capital gains tax treatment regarding the cutting or disposal of timber; be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Governor of the State of Georgia and to each member of the Georgia congressional delegation.

In the house, read and adopted, March 6, 1963.

GLENN W. ELLARD,
Clerk.

H.R. 142

Resolution calling upon the President to take certain measures relating to the poultry industry; and for other purposes

Whereas the U.S. poultry industry has developed a $50 million a year market in the Common Market countries, primarily West Germany; and

Whereas the market has grown each year and could continue to increase considerably in the absence of unreasonable and discriminatory barriers; and

Whereas the U.S. poultry industry has done extensive promotion in these countries so that consumption and local production have also increased; and

Whereas the imposition of gate prices and variable import levies have brought about a loss of this valuable market; and

Whereas levies on U.S. poultry were increased from approximately 16 percent to approximately 43 percent on whole broilers and 320 percent on certain parts; and

Whereas U.S. imports from Common Market countries have continued to increase each year; and

Whereas Georgia producers and processors were shipping over 4¾ million pounds per month prior to the first levies, with shipments dropping to approximately 1½ million pounds per month following the first levy and to practically nothing following the additional levy; and

Whereas this means a direct loss to Georgia of $16 million of export income; and

Whereas additional losses through depressed domestic prices might result if this volume is continually forced back into domestic channels; and

Whereas the loss of these poultry exports which generated $80 million of business for the State annually means a loss to feed, ports, utilities, banking, insurance, transportation, paper, retail, wholesale, and many other industries; and

Whereas the levies in question are contrary to the general agreement on tariffs and trade; and

Whereas immediate action to obtain fair import levies on U.S. poultry is of vital importance to the Georgia poultry industry which represents over 32 percent of total farm income and brings the State $500 million a year directly, and generates $2½ billion a year business; and

Whereas 160,000 Georgians earn their living from poultry and others benefit indirectly from this giant agri-business; and

Whereas this is a forerunner of problems for other commodities which might be avoided if the U.S. Government acts forcefully and settles this one; and

Whereas the United States is now exporting one-sixteenth of our agricultural production and Georgia is exporting one-fifth of its production; and

Whereas 41,600 Georgia farmworkers may be attributed to the production of farm products for export; and

Whereas quick results might serve as a deterrent of other problems which would affect the State and Nation; and

Whereas the barriers proposed by the Common Market would destroy the competitive position our farm products have gained through efficiency; and

Whereas the loss of agricultural exports which may result if the Common Market agricultural proposals are imposed on our agricultural products will weaken our ability to carry the heavy financial burden which the United States now assumes in the effort to protect and strengthen the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That this body does recommend that the Georgia congressional delegation continue and redouble its efforts for immediate action and that this body further recommends that President Kennedy take immediate steps including use of the retaliatory powers of the Trade Expansion Act if necessary, to obtain prompt removal of these unfair and discriminatory levies; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby authorized and directed to forward appropriate copy of this resolution to each Member of the U.S. Congress from Georgia, President John F. Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, and Ambassador Christian Herter.

In house, read and adopted February 20, 1963.

GLENN W. ELLARD,
Clerk.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider the nominations for the Department of Commerce only.

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 Capt. Albert J. Carpenter, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF THE SEA BY OIL—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the certified text of amendments of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil—Executive C, 88th Congress, 1st session—sent to the Senate today by the President, and that the document be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to acceptance, I transmit herewith a certified text of amendments of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, which were adopted by a Conference of Contracting Governments convened at London on April 11, 1962. The amendments would strengthen and expand the present Convention in ways deemed advantageous to United States interests.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the amendments.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 25, 1963*

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Bernard M. Decker, of Illinois, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar in the Department of Commerce will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. PROUTY obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator defer to me for a moment so I may ask the Senator from Vermont to yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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 may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I shall not ask for the yeas and nays on the vote to confirm the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce, but I wish the RECORD to show that I am unalterably opposed to his appointment.

I have been in politics long enough to understand the meaning of political debts, but I resent very deeply that in this instance Mr. Roosevelt is being rewarded for what some consider to be "below the belt" political attacks against a distinguished Member of the Senate, whose views I do not always share but for whom I have the highest personal respect—rewarded by appointment to an office for which, in my judgment, he is not qualified.

If Mr. Roosevelt's activities of the past several years were subjected to close scrutiny, I believe the inescapable conclusion would be reached that, to say the least, he lacks the experience, the administrative ability, and the sense of public and personal responsibility essential to the proper fulfillment of his duties as Under Secretary of Commerce.

Inasmuch as there are persistent rumors to the effect that Mr. Roosevelt may become Secretary of Commerce, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a biographical sketch of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.; a biographical sketch of the present very distinguished and able Secretary of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges; and a biographical sketch of Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, who was designated by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of Commerce.

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

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. was born on August 17, 1914, at Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada. After graduating from Groton School, Groton, Mass., he received his A.B. from Harvard College in 1937 and his L.L.B. degree from the University of Virginia in 1940.

As a graduate of the Harvard naval ROTC he was called to active duty in March 1941, and served until 1946. He was awarded the Secretary of Navy's commendation, the Legion of Merit, the Silver Star, and the Purple Heart.

Mr. Roosevelt practiced law from 1946 to 1958 as a senior partner in the firm of Roosevelt and Freidin of New York City. He was a Member of Congress from 1949 through 1954 representing the 20th District of New York.

Since 1957 Mr. Roosevelt has been owner and manager of the Roosevelt Automobile Co. of Washington, D.C., U.S. distributor of Fiat and Jaguar automobiles.

Mr. Roosevelt returned to politics in 1960 and campaigned for President Kennedy in his primary and general election campaigns.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE LUTHER H. HODGES

Luther Hartwell Hodges was born March 9, 1898, in Pittsylvania County, Va.

He attended public schools in Leaksville and Spray, N.C., his family having moved to this area in the year 1900. Following graduation from high school in 1915, he entered the University of North Carolina and was graduated in 1919 with the A.B. degree. He served briefly in the U.S. Army, in which he held the rank of lieutenant.

Following his military service, he began his career in the textile industry starting as

secretary to the manager of a local textile mill in the Leaksville-Spray area, and in 1938, following several intermediate promotions, he was made general manager in charge of manufacturing for Marshall Field & Co. In 1943 he became vice president of that corporation.

He was head of the Textile Division of OPA in 1944, and consultant to the Secretary of Agriculture in 1945.

In 1950, upon retirement from private business, he spent over a year in West Germany as head of the Industry Division of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and was consultant to the State Department in the latter months of 1951 on the International Management Conference.

In November 1952 he was elected Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina, and succeeded to the governorship in November 1954 upon the death of the then Governor, William B. Umstead. Governor Hodges was reelected Governor of North Carolina in November 1956, and his term ended in January 1961.

He is past chairman of the Southern Governors' Conference and of the Southern Region Education Board. He was one of the nine American Governors to make an extensive tour of the Soviet Union in the summer of 1959 and was subsequently in charge of his State's trade and industry mission to Europe in November 1959.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ADM. LEWIS L. STRAUSS

Lewis L. Strauss was born in Charleston, W. Va., on January 31, 1896, and educated in the Richmond, Va., public schools.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Years 1917–19: Secretary to Herbert C. Hoover (then U.S. Food Administrator and Chairman of the Commission for the Relief of Belgium) in relief operations in Belgium and elsewhere overseas, and in the U.S. Food Administration. Served as U.S. Delegate at Final Armistice Convention.

Years 1941–46: In Naval Reserve 1926; active duty from February 1941 to May 1946; successively promoted through officer grades to the rank of rear admiral, being one of the first Reserve officers to reach that rank. Navy assignments included:

Years 1941–43: Staff assistant to the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance. General Inspection of Ordnance;

Years 1943–44: Assistant Chief of Procurement and Material; Special Assistant to the Vice Chief of Naval Operations;

Years 1944–46: Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy; Navy member of the Army-Navy Munitions Board;

Years 1945–56: Navy member of the Interdepartmental Committee on Atomic Energy.

Year 1946: Appointed member of the first Atomic Energy Commission; resigned in April 1950.

Years 1946–52: Served as a member of the Naval Research Advisory Committee (the Office of Naval Research, was established following Admiral Strauss' recommendations to Secretary of the Navy Forrestal).

Year 1950: Appointed consultant to Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

Years 1950–58: Adviser on occasions to congressional and executive agencies studying and reporting on production and procurement problems for the Department of Defense.

Year 1953: Completed report on hazardous duty and other special pays, requested by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

Year 1953: Appointed special assistant to President Eisenhower on March 9.

Years 1953–58: Nominated by President to be Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission on June 24, confirmed by the Senate on June 27, and took oath of office on July 2. Retired at end of 5-year term, June 30, 1958.

Years 1955 and 1958: Chairman of U.S. delegation to the United Nations Conferences on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, held at Geneva, Switzerland, August 8–20, 1955, and September 1–13, 1958. Developed concept which resulted in President Eisenhower's speech of December 8, 1953, before the United Nations General Assembly. Administered the actions taken to implement that program, representing the U.S. Government at the sessions at the United Nations and as chairman of the U.S. delegation to the first meeting of the International Atomic Energy Agency. (Proposed the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.)

Year 1958: Appointed special assistant to the President on matters concerning atoms for peace.

Year 1958: Appointed on October 24 as Secretary of Commerce; took oath of office, November 13.

BUSINESS SERVICE

Years 1919–46: Associated with the investment firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., New York, N.Y. Became partner in 1929, resigning in 1946 to take office as AEC Commissioner. At same time relinquished all business directorships.

At various times was director of business enterprises, including Radio Corp. of America, National Broadcasting Co., General American Transportation Corp., U.S. Rubber Co., Industrial Rayon Corp., Hudson and Manhattan Railroad, Rockefeller Bros., Inc., Rockefeller Center, Inc., Merchants Fire Assurance Corp., etc.

DECORATIONS, HONORS, AND DEGREES

Awarded the Distinguished Service Medal; and the Legion of Merit with Gold Star (Navy) in lieu of a second award and an Oak Leaf Cluster (Army) in lieu of a third award.

Officer of the Legion of Honor (France); Grand Officer, Order of Leopold (Belgium); and other decorations from foreign governments.

Year 1958: Awarded the Medal of Freedom by President Eisenhower in person in July.

Recipient of 23 honorary degrees from colleges and universities in the United States and abroad.

TRUSTEESHIPS AND OTHER OFFICES

President of the board of trustees of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

Trustee of the Hampton Institute, the Sloan-Kettering Institute Memorial Center for Cancer and Allied Diseases, the New York Institute for the Crippled and the Disabled, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Belgian-American Educational Foundation, Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., Virginia Museum of Fine Arts at Richmond and Congregation Emanu-El of the city of New York (also its past president).

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, if an evaluation is made of the records of these three individuals, I am sure Mr. Roosevelt's will be notable only for its lack of notability.

In her column which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 12, Doris Fleeson capsuled the situation very effectively. When referring to Mr. Roosevelt she wrote:

Most Members of Congress wish the appointment had not been made. They would like to get rid of it quietly. Democrats in particular hope that Mr. Roosevelt will sink into decent obscurity.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, since this is an important nomination, which has engaged the interest and attention of the country, and since I have known Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., personally for not less than 17 years, I think I owe an explanation to the Senate as to why I have interposed no objection to the confirmation of his nomination, and why I do not interpose one now, especially in view of the seriousness with which his qualifications have been analyzed in the committee which considered the matter and the very serious, interesting, and important analysis which has been made by my distinguished colleague from Vermont.

Mr. President, I interpose no objection to the confirmation of the nomination for two reasons.

First. I believe that the President is entitled to the widest latitude and discretion in the choice of his assistants and that the confirmation process should not be utilized to deny to the President the assistants he seeks, unless we find some reasons over, above, and beyond a matter of judgment—that is, ideology, venality, immorality, or some obvious and clear inability to carry out the functions of the appointed office.

All those are very apparent reasons for objecting. There are many other reasons which may come closer to the borderline.

I have stated the general policy which has motivated me in my attitude toward the confirming of nominations of other appointees, when before the Senate—and we have considered a number of them on which there have been very close debates. I remember very well, Mr. President, a nomination the confirmation of which I opposed very strongly, recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency, if I recall correctly, for a position on the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank. I felt that the record, which demonstrated an attitude of mind upon the question of segregation and discrimination in our country and the enforcement of civil rights of Americans—a matter quite removed from the bases of judgment exercised by the President, in the choice of the appointees for that particular job—dictated that that nomination should not be confirmed.

Mr. President, I find no such situation here now. Whatever may be said for or against Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.—whom, as I say, I have know personally for 17 years—there is no element of an extraneous set of considerations, other than his capacity, his outlook—as my colleague so properly explained—his experience, his administrative ability, and his sense of public accountability, to qualify or disqualify him for the position.

Mr. President, what the Senator from Vermont has said on that subject—and I say this in order to be helpful to a man I know well—should be taken to heart with the deepest seriousness by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. I hope he will listen to the words of the Senator from Vermont and perhaps even more than he does to mine, because that will do him far more good in making something of a life for him in the future, as the son of so distinguished and historic an American President as Franklin D. Roosevelt.

So, Mr. President, I say that, according to my own definition of what is proper in the way of the confirming process, I did not find those elements which

would entitle me to object to the confirmation of the nomination.

Second. I believe Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., upon this record, has done at least some things which I and most of us wish he had not done.

I have little doubt that my dear friend and colleague who was the subject of the matter about which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] spoke, was consulted about this nomination. I have no doubt the recommendation would not have been made without his consent. Knowing him as I do, he would not have had it within his heart to turn Mr. Roosevelt down, in spite of whatever deep grief he may have been made to suffer.

Mr. President, I say, in conclusion, that the nominee has a fine opportunity before him.

Incidentally, and while I say this for myself, I am sure I speak for others, I do not think anybody need fear that Mr. Roosevelt's name will come before us for nomination as Secretary of Commerce unless he demonstrates by his future career a very different order of "performance and public accountability"—to use the words of my colleague from Vermont—from that which he has evidenced thus far. Here is yet another opportunity, given to few men, to demonstrate capacity, performance, and ability in the service of the Nation in one's lifetime. I express the hope and expectation that this opportunity will be used in the true spirit of a son of a four-time President of the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH subsequently said: Mr. President, I support the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

I have known Mr. Roosevelt personally for many years—first as a youth when his father was elected President of the United States, and later when he returned to civilian life after having served his country courageously for more than 5 years as a naval officer during World War II.

It was with interest that I watched as he followed his distinguished father into the public life of this Nation and won his seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. His service during the 5 years when he represented the 20th District of New York was exemplary. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, he was active, able, and effective. He ably supported the passage of legislation important to the progress of our country.

Through the vagaries and vicissitudes of politics, with which most of us in this Chamber are familiar, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., in 1954, was temporarily removed from what I believe to be the mainstream of his life—the field of public service. He returned to the practice of law in New York City where he had previously practiced immediately after his period of service in World War II.

After 3 more years as a successful attorney, he entered business in 1957—and in an especially competitive area, the distribution of automobiles. His business acumen, judgment, and energy helped his firm to be chosen by two world-famous European automobile companies as their U.S. outlet, responsible for the sale of their cars in an area embracing more than 20 States. The men who headed these European companies are capable businessmen, and I am confident that it was on a hard-headed business basis that they appointed Mr. Roosevelt, appraised the results of his work, and retained him for the past 6 years. The top executive officer of one of these companies was quoted as having said, after the announcement of Mr. Roosevelt's appointment was announced by President Kennedy, that replacing him would be a difficult task.

As I review Mr. Roosevelt's record over a 22-year period of adult life, it appears clear to me that he is an effective person—a man who gets tasks done. During that period he became a distinguished naval officer, having progressed from lieutenant, junior grade, to commander, and having been entrusted with ship command. He was cited several times for meritorious performance of duties, as well as for "conspicuous bravery" in combat. Following this service he became an effective Representative in Congress, an attorney at law, and a businessman.

Mr. Roosevelt's record of success is not, however, the only reason why I endorse his appointment. His confirmation by the Senate is merited because I am convinced that the capacities and talents he will bring to his new position will help to advance the economic and business interests of our country. I believe the Department of Commerce will be a more valuable and more useful instrumentality with Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., as one of its top officials.

The Commerce Department has served our Nation for the past 60 years. At present it has approximately 30,000 employees. It comprises more than a dozen agencies, each carrying out programs that are essential to our Nation's economic growth and to the well-being of our 187 million citizens. Included are such important agencies as the Census Bureau, the Patent Office, the National Bureau of Standards, the Maritime Administration, the Business, and Defense Services Administration, the Bureau of International Commerce, the Area Redevelopment Administration, the Weather Bureau, and the U.S. Travel Service.

Some of these agencies are important to us mainly because their work enables the business community of this Nation to function more effectively, to prosper and expand, to create more jobs for American workers, to raise the American standard of living, and to provide the industrial capacity that is so essential to national defense. Other Commerce agencies serve both the business community and the general public, and contribute to our individual and national well-being.

In the aggregate, the activities of the Department of Commerce are important. Some of them are vital to national strength and progress. And these programs are being made even more valuable and useful under the kind of inspiring leadership and capable direction which Secretary Hodges has given to the Department during the past 2 years. This has been the Commerce Department's period of exceptional service.

The principal reason for this is because the Commerce Department under Luther H. Hodges is fulfilling its rightful role as the American businessman's principal spokesman in the economic councils of the Federal Government.

The Commerce Department, with Secretary Hodges at the helm, enjoys the confidence and support of the U.S. business community, and is conveying the businessman's point of view with increasing emphasis to the President, his advisers, and the other executive departments and agencies. These views are being listened to with respect, and they are being reflected in new national goals and programs. For example, the business community and the Commerce Department contributed to the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The President's current tax program incorporates many of the businessman's ideas—and the Commerce Department's ideas—on how our national economy can be stimulated and accelerated by removing some of the tax shackles which have for years impeded the growth of American business firms. The Commerce Department is also responsible for implementing the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, which is now beginning to bear fruit and provide jobs for workers who live in economically depressed areas.

In one of our most important goals and most critical problems, the Commerce Department has major responsibility for stimulating increased sales of American products in foreign countries. This is essential to the solution of our international balance-of-payments problem.

I am confident, Mr. President, that colleagues will agree when I say that the Department of Commerce has progressed in the past 2 years, and that the Department's effectiveness in carrying out its new activities and responsibilities will have significant and far-reaching effects on our future national growth and development.

I am equally sure that all of us realize that to carry out these programs successfully the Commerce Department needs leadership of the highest order—leadership that emphasizes imagination, energy, determination and sound thinking.

This is the kind of leadership that Secretary Hodges is providing, and it is the kind of leadership that Mr. Roosevelt will also bring to the Department. Mr. Hodges' effectiveness and competence will be enhanced by having Mr. Roosevelt as his principal assistant, because in addition to his general qualifications, Mr. Roosevelt has other, more specific attributes that are especially applicable to the work he will be doing. I mention these:

First. He enjoys the personal friendship, respect and confidence of the President and his advisers. This will provide yet another channel through which the views and opinions of the business community can be effectively conveyed to the White House.

Second. He has a good understanding of the legislative branch and the legislative process, as well as a personal relationship with many Members of Congress. Thus he is uniquely competent to represent the Commerce Department to the Members and committees on the Hill, and to speak accurately and authoritatively before them on behalf of the U.S. business community.

Third. As Secretary Hodges recently commented, Mr. Roosevelt has the happy faculty of being able to work with other people. This ability will help to implement those programs for which the Commerce Department shares responsibility with other executive departments and agencies, where the Department must work closely with these other groups in carrying out such multifaceted programs as export expansion, area redevelopment, civilian technology, job retraining and other national efforts involving several agencies.

Fourth. In addition, Mr. Roosevelt is both knowledgeable and experienced in the field of foreign trade. The most important program of the Commerce Department, as I have said, is to implement the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, expand our exports, and thus improve our unfavorable balance of payments. Accomplishing this means educating, stimulating and assisting thousands of American manufacturing firms to go out and fight for their rightful share of foreign markets. It involves working closely with the Honorable Christian Herter and others in negotiating with nations the new arrangements for the international exchange of goods. It also means protecting the interests of American firms in such negotiations, and in providing them Government assistance of various kinds if they should be adversely and unavoidably affected by the revolution in international commerce that is now in depth and scope in the world. With his knowledge and practical business experience in foreign trade, plus his energy, dedication and rapport with people, Mr. Roosevelt can contribute greatly to the realization of our national goals in this tremendously important field of international commerce.

I have mentioned, Mr. President, the attributes, both general and specific, that I believe make Mr. Roosevelt eminently qualified to serve as Under Secretary of Commerce. There is also one other reason why I am so wholeheartedly in favor of this nomination, and it is this: Both the President and Secretary Hodges, after thoughtful consideration, want Mr. Roosevelt to serve in this post. Mr. Hodges was consulted fully, in advance, by the President concerning this appointment; and I believe that Mr. Hodges expressed his own true convictions when he publicly described Mr. Roosevelt as a dynamic and gifted person, as well as a successful businessman, and when he said that he will be delighted to have a man of Mr. Roosevelt's capability as his principal assistant. I also have genuine respect for the President's ability to select the people who can best serve the Nation, and I believe this faculty has been demonstrated by the outstanding performance of the President's Cabinet and most other key officials of the executive branch during the past 2 years. Mr. Roosevelt's performance will be no less successful.

I believe, Mr. President, that when Mr. Roosevelt actually begins to serve as Under Secretary of Commerce, both the business community and the American people will be as well pleased with his performance as they are now with the performance of Secretary Hodges and the other dedicated, competent leaders who serve the President and the Nation so well.

Mr. Roosevelt is bringing to this position intelligence, education, integrity, energy, sound basic knowledge of the field of work, the faculty of getting jobs done, the ability to cooperate with other people, and the determination and persistence to become a valuable, competent, dedicated public servant. I do not know what else we can, or should, ask of him. Mr. President, Mr. Roosevelt is worthy of confirmation, and I am confident that most of my colleagues will agree that he is eminently qualified to serve as Under Secretary of Commerce of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that the vote of the junior Senator from Wyoming on the Roosevelt nomination was "nay."

NOMINATION OF RICHARD H. HOLTON

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard H. Holton, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, I was not present during the call of the Executive Calendar, when the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce was under consideration and his nomination was confirmed.

I have known Mr. Roosevelt for many years, as a legislator and as a friend. I know his philosophy of life. He has great ability. He has untiring energy. He understands legislative problems. He understands business problems. In my opinion, he will make an excellent record as Under Secretary of Commerce.

I congratulate the President for nominating him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

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

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF 1913 OHIO FLOODS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by him concerning the 1913 floods in Ohio.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LAUSCHE

This is a significant date in Ohio history. Fifty years ago my State faced one of the major problems of the first half century. Many Ohio communities were faced with oblivion—and all because of disastrous flooding—a result of a severe and tremendous storm, which accelerated the melting of heavy snow and ice covered rivers.

One portion of the State did not hesitate in facing its problem squarely. Recovering from the major flood of recorded history in the area, as much as 11 feet in the center of urban communities, the citizens of the Great Miami Valley reaching from Piqua to Hamilton, Ohio, saw dawn breaking on new and better days ahead. These citizens, having returned from burying their dead and facing property losses estimated at over $100 million, banded together to write a new law—enabling assessments on their properties in the amount each benefited, which after much study and planning provided a major wonder of the world, the Miami Conservancy District.

The cost of this protection, $34 million, has long since been paid for by the valley property owners—not the Federal Government or the State government—but by the people themselves. Even today this valley pays its own way for flood control projects in areas rural in 1913—urban now—and still without outside aid.

Today is the anniversary date of the great flood in the communities in the Miami Valley. Tonight in Dayton—that metropolis of industry, commerce, and education—the citizens will pause and remember. They are not celebrating a flood—they are observing 50 years of economic and commercial development—and this in a community that 50 years ago was devastated, virtually destroyed.

Much has been written and spoken about the great leadership required to motivate this recovery, but the property owners, large and small, have accomplished this gigantic task which has done so much to make Ohio great.

Tonight, as those citizens gather to reflect and ponder their contribution to the recovery of their valley, they carry in their hearts a pride in the knowledge that their community has done much to build the economy of the State and of the Nation.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by him on the subject of Byelorussian Independence Day.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LAUSCHE

The Byelorussians form one of the lesser known and less numerous of the Slavic peoples. This is partly because they probably never numbered more than 10 million and partly because they have been overshadowed by their far more numerous and powerful

neighbors. One reason we know so little about them is because they have been subjected to alien rule and oppressed by foreigners in their homeland. For centuries the Russians have done their utmost to eliminate the Byelorussians as a distinct national entity. But we know from history that these people formed a distinct national group between Poland and Moscow long before the rise of modern Russia as the colossus of the Slavic world.

The czarist rulers of Russia failed to eliminate the Byelorussians as an ethnic group. The more these people were oppressed by their Russian masters, the more they hung to their ethnic and national ideals, and longed for the day of their deliverance. This came about at last early in 1918. On March 25 of that year the Byelorussians National Republic was proclaimed, with its capital in the historic city of Minsk. Soon this Republic was recognized by the governments of many countries, and it looked as if the new state was to attain sovereignty in historic Byelorussia. Unfortunately the independence thus attained and jubilantly proclaimed did not last long. Russian Communists attacked and overran it early in 1921, thus putting an end to the Byelorussian Republic.

Since then some 10 million Byelorussians have lived under the oppressive Soviet totalitarian regime. But the Byelorussians have not abandoned their ultimate goal, national freedom and independence. On this 45th anniversary celebration of their Independence Day we ardently pray for their deliverance from Soviet tyranny. We also wish that we could do more for them, by showing our determination to help these people combat Communist totalitarianism with all the means at our disposal short of open warfare. We could, however, be of considerable aid to these poeple in their fight for freedom by refusing to make concessions to the Kremlin in the Cuban question as well as on the Berlin issue, and also by broadcasting in the Byelorussian and Ukrainian languages our determination to oppose communism. I know full well that some or even all of these measures cannot easily liberate the Byelorussian people from Soviet tyranny, but I am sure they will serve as a definite boon to their sacred cause.

THE NEW LIBERALS: ARE THEY REALLY "20TH-CENTURY TORIES"?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report contains a keenly perceptive essay entitled, "The New Liberals: Are They Really '20th-Century Tories'?"

Its author is the senior Senator from South Dakota, whose highly professional and entertaining skill as an author is well known to his colleagues.

Senator MUNDT's thesis is that the present-day liberals of both parties are not liberals at all, in the original sense of the word. They have altered the meaning of "liberal."

The essence of the essay can be caught in these excerpts:

It is my conviction that those who inaccurately describe themselves as "liberals," while persistently advocating policies and programs promoting authoritarian government, might be described more accurately as the "20th-century tories."

Somewhere along the line these tories have lost confidence in the American people and have—by some curious form of self-delusionment—convinced themselves that only the Federal politicians are motivated by a high sense of ethics; only the Federal politicians can be trusted to do what is right; and only the Federal politicians can understand and provide what the people need and want.

Thus, these misnamed and misdirected liberals continue to chip away at the power, the rights and the free choice of the people while transferring to big-time politicians in Washington the authority to determine the people's destiny.

Senator MUNDT with his characteristic and constant fairness, gives assurance that no charges of insincerity or ulterior motives are made; but points out rather that they seek a fundamental and deplorable change of emphasis and place of National Government in the lives of Americans. He puts it in this language:

This does not imply that these self-proclaimed but thoroughly deluded liberals are evil men. It definitely does mean, however, that they would substitute for a government devoted to promoting the general welfare one imbued with the paternalistic concepts of ancient times and tory governments.

The function of such government would be to provide for the general welfare rather than to promote the conditions through which the people can advance themselves in accordance with their desires, desserts, and abilities.

They have lost sight of, or propose to destroy, the careful distinction between the responsibility of the Federal Government to "provide for the common defense" and the responsibility of the Central Government only to "promote the general welfare" as it is set out so clearly and meticulously in the preamble to our Constitution.

Mr. President, I fully subscribe to the reasoning and conclusions set out by the Senator from South Dakota.

I highly commend this thoughtful and well-reasoned article to the Senate. Those who carelessly use the words, "liberal" and "conservative" to describe today's political philosophies will find in it something of a shock.

Senator MUNDT seeks to debunk this tendency to pin labels as "forensic fakery." He seeks to distinguish between what he calls today's "linguistic liberals" and the philosophy espoused by Jefferson, Wilson, and Senator Wheeler.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the March 25 edition of the U.S. News & World Report be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the U.S. News & World Report magazine, Mar. 25, 1963]

THE NEW LIBERALS: ARE THEY REALLY 20TH-CENTURY TORIES?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Who are today's political liberals? What do they stand for? How do they compare with the liberals of an earlier day—such men as Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson? In this article, a prominent Republican Senator examines the present-day liberals of both parties. His finding: They have altered the meaning of the word "liberal." The ideal has moved from preservation of individual freedom to the concentration of power in authoritarian government. And the liberals have become the American tories of the 20th century.)

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota)

"All down the ages, the fight of the true liberals has been to take power from the executive and give it to the legislative branch. Now the so-called liberals want to give more power to the executive."—Former Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Democrat, of Montana.

Nobody familiar with our political history of the past three decades can deny that Burt Wheeler, of Montana, is rightfully one of the great fighting liberals of this era. It is likewise pertinent that his liberalism was demonstrated on the floor of the U.S. Senate and in his public career rather than in the safe, serene atmosphere of a college classroom or the impersonal and untested philippics of a book.

Senator Wheeler expressed his convictions with a consistent courage that made him an effective advocate willing to wager his reputation and political future on the logic and wisdom of his viewpoints.

As a consequence, when former Senator Wheeler speaks of today's liberalism and the curious and irrational projects which its present-day disciples advocate, he speaks as an authority on what comprises genuine liberalism in public life and what principles and concepts give validity to the term "liberal" as a political philosophy. Thus, he serves the Nation well when he bluntly calls attention to the fact that our latter-day liberals have deserted the traditional liberal crusade and have, strangely enough, associated themselves with power drives similar to those of the Tories of early America.

It is my conviction that those who inaccurately describe themselves as liberals, while persistently advocating policies and programs promoting authoritarian government, might be described more accurately as the "20th-century tories."

THERE IS A SHIFT TOWARD AN AUTHORITARIAN AMERICAN STATE

Somewhere along the line these tories have lost confidence in the American people and have—by some curious form of self-delusionment—convinced themselves that only the Federal politicians are motivated by a high sense of ethics; only the Federal politicians can be trusted to do what is right; and only the Federal politicians can understand and provide what the people need and want.

Thus, these misnamed and misdirected liberals continue to chip away at the power, the rights, and the free choice of the people while transferring to bigtime politicians in Washington the authority to determine the people's destiny.

This does not imply that these self-proclaimed but thoroughly deluded liberals are evil men. It definitely does mean, however, that they would substitute for a government devoted to promoting the general welfare one imbued with the paternalistic concepts of ancient times and Tory governments.

The function of such government would be to provide for the general welfare rather than to promote the conditions through which the people can advance themselves in accordance with their desires, desserts, and abilities.

They have lost sight of, or propose to destroy, the careful distinction between the responsibility of the Federal Government to "provide for the common defense" and the responsibility of the Central Government only to "promote the general welfare" as it is set out so clearly and meticulously in the preamble to our Constitution.

Our wise and prudent constitutional forefathers evaluated and weighed every word before it was enshrined in our great charter of freedom.

It was with specific purpose and prudent forethought that they drew the distinction between the terms "promote" and "provide." They deliberately emphasized their conception of the vast difference between Federal responsibilities for the common defense and the promoting of the general welfare.

The programs and projects which our modern liberals espouse eliminate that difference and shift to the Federal state the same responsibilities and authority for the

general welfare that are rightly exercised by it in maintaining the common defense.

BACK TO AN AGE OF TORYISM

By placing primary trust in bigtime politicians, instead of in the people our Government was designed to serve—not control—these illegitimate liberals revive a golden age of toryism when the king—Federal Government—could do no wrong.

During the past 30 years, the growing influence of those I prefer to designate as "20th-century tories"—instead of identifying them as "liberal"—has made an important but unfortunate impact upon our national destiny. We have been following a global drift toward overcentralization of Government and glorification of the central politician over the rights and privileges of the individual.

We live in an era of big Government with big powers. We are witnessing a shift toward an authoritarian American state in which big politicians hold the whip and in which "whom you know" in Government circles seems likely to replace "what you know."

As yet, this consolidated central state is neither Socialist nor Communist nor Fascist in nature. But, neither is there anything remotely liberal about its design. It is bigtime politics in action.

Regardless of which "ism" it eventually embraces or which embraces it, it would be a careless student of history who could not see that our basic American concepts of private ownership, reward of merit, self-determination, and effective control of the politicians by the people are being threatened.

This switch of emphasis, and the exaltation of the Federal politician at the expense of the private citizen, is a deplorable change. It is the more deplorable because it has been promoted by a sustained drive for concentrated political power led by self-designated liberals who have practiced a semantic sham unprecedented in political history. It is a sham because it espouses the same type of proposals for expanding political controls over the people as advocated by the reactionaries, the tories, and the royalists of the past.

RECOGNIZING A TRUE LIBERAL

The true, tried, tested liberal of history and of today is the private citizen or public official who advocates maintenance or extension of individual liberties free alike from the power and the encroachments of an economic or political monopoly.

It is the danger—and presence—of a political monopoly and of programs moving toward that ugly goal which is the "blind spot" in the thinking of today's liberals who are so busy looking at the problems of our times that they fail to see the even greater perils created by their proposals for solution.

Our American dream has evolved from the idealistic concept that proper ethics, sound morals, good judgment, prudent economy, and wise decisions are not the monopoly of those holding positions of power and authority in Washington.

It is an ideal our current pretenders to the liberal label seem unable to comprehend or to accept.

While the Republican Party has excelled its major adversary in clinging to this liberal ideal which has had its greatest fruition on American soil and which has provided more happiness for more people and greater individual liberties than man has attained in any other era or area of human history, it must be admitted that some Republicans, also, have succumbed to the seductive concept that the people must be pushed around by their political officials rather than have them retain the power and push the politicians toward the goals which they desire.

It is not, however, my intent to identify basic republicanism with true liberalism nor to stigmatize all Democrats as people seeking personal and political power after the manner of tories.

Rather, it is my purpose to point up the forensic fakery involved in trying to identify a candidate, a party or a cause involved in seeking more power over more people through Central Government, with any realistic, accurate, honest or historic relationship with liberalism unless the relationship is to show how these "linguistic liberals" differ sharply and deeply from programs and philosophies of such recognized liberals as Jefferson, Wilson, and Wheeler.

One of the great responsibilities of any administration is to protect and wisely use what we usually term, "the American system." To me, the American system means that system which seeks to provide a maximum of opportunity and freedom for our individual citizens. It is a system which manifests confidence in its people. It is a system which has produced results unequaled and unexcelled by any other, any place, any time.

WE MAY BE DESTROYING THE SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES

Those who would change our system to place basic responsibility for progress in the hands of Federal politicians instead of with the local citizens and governments are turning back the clock of history.

If one were to accept the pratings of the current crop of self-appointed liberals as providing courses of action and programs of progress which are, in fact, liberal in nature, one would logically be forced to conclude that the greatest liberals of current history are such advocates of concentrated power as Khrushchev, Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Salazar and Castro.

WHAT DICTATORS PROMISED

Each promised the more abundant life, better schooling, better health, better economic opportunities and greater well-being to their people.

Each sought to provide them by reducing areas of self-determination and free choice enjoyed by the private citizen and by expanding areas of control and power enjoyed by the politicians in their lands.

Each failed to achieve the degrees of well-being and human happiness enjoyed by the peoples of free countries where even the right to err in judgment is an inherent part of any system which provides unlimited rights to succeed and to aspire.

How, then, can one recognize an actual liberal in the great American tradition and in conformity with the true meaning of the term as shaped by the flow of human history? Obviously, not by accepting the unsupported boast of an ambitious politician who proclaims, "I am a liberal." A real liberal must be tested by his actions, his programs, his goals and his methods just as we test the veracity and worth of any sloganeer or propagandist who hopes to persuade by rhetoric rather than reason.

There is available a test which every intelligent and thoughtful citizen should use to decide whether any public proposal or public personality is in fact liberal in conception and nature.

Simply stated, a man or a program is appropriately described as liberal if identified with circumscribing excessive power over the people from any source whether it be concentrated economic, political or hereditary power.

On the other hand, if any man or program is identified with expanding and increasing the power of politicians or economic tycoons over the average citizen, that smacks of reactionism, toryism, and has no place anywhere in the dictionary of valid liberalism.

This do-it-yourself test of whether a political party, an individual citizen or a proposed change is in fact liberal in nature can be employed by applying the following tests to any given circumstance:

1. Does the proposal expand individual freedom or does it expand the power and authority of the central state?

2. Does the proposal give a greater choice to the greatest number or does it give greater decisions to be made by a steadily decreasing number of politicians at the top?

3. Does it enlarge the powers and opportunities of all citizens to determine their own destiny or does it give greater power and additional opportunity to politicians at the Federal level to determine the destiny of all citizens?

After examining a public proposal or a suggested reform; after analyzing speeches, votes and positions of a politician or a public figure; after studying recommendations of an organization, a political party or a reform group, and after asking the foregoing questions and relating your honest answers to the steps which have been advocated, you will know whether what is proposed is actually liberal, or reactionary and paternalistic in conception.

With clarification of its character, one can still be for or against a proposal or consider it wise or unwise, but it will be assured that no literate and prudent citizen will be found supporting an issue or cause on the pretext it is liberal when, in fact, it is demonstrably a step backward toward the eras of the overpowering central state.

Since 1776, the march of human freedom in this republic has been in the direction of expanding and protecting the rights of self-determination by each citizen.

We have been moving toward a more effective implementation of the goals set out in our Declaration of Independence and in the preamble to our Constitution.

We have endeavored to extend the vote to all citizens; to correct imbalances of political power between urban and rural areas; to reform our electoral college system so every citizen shall have the right to exercise equitable authority through the vote he casts for a President.

AN EBB TIDE OF FREEDOM

But the ebb tide of freedom is in motion in our country. It is imperative that we seriously question ourselves as to whether, in our impatience to get things done and to bring about improvements, we may be destroying a system of checks and balances which has helped shape the basic formula by which, in less than 200 years, we have developed a system so successful that no other country has remotely approximated it.

Not only have we provided more happiness and more opportunity for more people than the world has ever seen, but we are today also contributing to the support of over 80 less fortunate, or perhaps less prudent, countries in the world.

We have done all this under a constitutional charter of freedom providing for the most liberal Government in the world—one in which the wishes and ideals of the people can predominate.

The light of human liberty burns brightest when the will of man is given free rein—uncontrollable by the politicians of his time and place.

Let us not reduce that light to a mere smudge pot of low-level security by casting aside our traditions in reckless pursuit of illusionary goals that require subjugation of the individual to achieve the false promises of any form of authoritative or totalitarian government.

Let us examine each proposal with an analytic test rather than accepting or rejecting it because of a political label or a mistaken notion that because it is noble in objective it must be liberal in nature.

All Americans are challenged these days—but the greatest challenge is to the real American liberal. If he is true to the liberal heritage which is his, he cannot embrace

concepts of collectivism or of centralized controls which would have been as much anathema to Thomas Jefferson as they are to the real constitutional libertarians of today.

RETRAINING WORKERS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on the editorial page of today's Wall Street Journal there is an interesting article on the retraining of workers. The Journal reporter selected Connecticut and Massachusetts for his study, and in general a very favorable impression emerges of the retraining programs that have been set up in these two States.

Even before Congress approved the Manpower Development and Training Act, early in 1962, Connecticut had initiated a program to teach unemployed workers new skills that could be used by businesses located in the area where the workers reside.

The results in Connecticut have been most satisfactory. To quote the Journal:

> Proper retraining can help many unemployed individuals, provided they want to work. Here in Connecticut nearly 2,100 jobless men and women have completed courses since 1959, ranging from 4 weeks in welding to 18 weeks in typing. Nearly all immediately got jobs in their new fields.

The article goes on to describe briefly how Connecticut officials approach this problem. It is an excellent example of how the American system can work. State officials and businessmen consult and cooperate with each other, labor market surveys are made, and not until it is determined that there is a need for certain types of skills is a training program started.

And now that the Federal Government helps to finance approved training programs, we have both Federal and State governments working together with private industry, to help unemployed persons find a good job.

Not only do these retraining programs help thousands of people enjoy a better life. They also help businesses find workers trained in important, even essential, skills, workers who otherwise might not be available in the local labor market.

I want to highly commend the Connecticut officials, and the Connecticut businessmen who have cooperated with them, for their work in setting up "no nonsense, businesslike programs." The success that has been achieved in my State is a tribute to their dedication and to their intelligent approach to helping the unemployed find a new place in their communities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, "Retraining Workers, Two States Find It Pays To Pick Students Carefully," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

RETRAINING WORKERS—TWO STATES FIND IT PAYS TO PICK STUDENTS CAREFULLY

(By Ralph E. Winter)

HARTFORD, CONN.—Retraining idle workers with skills to fill labor vacancies sounds like a simple and noncontroversial solution to at least part of the Nation's unemployment problem.

In Washington, Congress has appropriated money and whipped up blueprints for massive retraining programs. The trouble is, though, that out in the shops and classrooms retraining often proves to be difficult, frustrating and unrewarding. For example, only about half of 5,000 unemployed West Virginians trained in State and Federal programs, often run just for the sake of having a program, found work in their new fields.

This contrasts with results in Massachusetts and Connecticut, where the States began practical retraining on their own long before Federal programs were set up. Nearly all of the 3,700 workers retrained in these two States during the last 4 years are working at better jobs.

Retraining officials here, however, long ago lost any Cinderella-like illusions they may have had about retraining magic. "Retraining is a salvage operation to help individuals without a marketable skill, not a real solution to unemployment," asserts Edwin Gooding, Boston Federal Reserve Bank economist who studied retraining in the two States.

"Most of the unemployed couldn't fill the jobs where most openings are if you trained them 100 years," adds John J. Higgiston, manpower coordinator for Connecticut's education department.

WASHINGTON'S PLANS

Washington officials apparently do not agree. For, although the size and scope of the Federal effort has not been finally determined, the 1962 Manpower Development and Training Act is designed to retrain up to 570,000 people in the next 3 years at a Federal cost of $430 million.

In addition, the year-old Area Redevelopment administration plans to spend $14.5 million during the next 4 years on retraining the unemployed in depressed areas. And Congress is considering a youth conservation program involving retraining for young people.

The quality of job retraining, like education in general, is hard to evaluate. Results depend upon intangibles such as the individual's native ability and such pragmatic things as the number and kinds of jobs available. "Paradoxically, retraining is most successful where it is needed least in terms of numbers of unemployed," says Mr. Gooding.

Any evaulation of retraining in West Virginia, for example, must take into consideration the high rate of joblessness, about double the national average, caused by a drop in demand for coal miners and lack of widespread industrial diversification. There just are no jobs even for many of the retrained. Industrialized southern New England offers more varied job opportunities.

Even here, no one claims retraining can make a big dent in unemployed rolls, now accounting for more than 6 percent of the Nation's work force. Only economic expansion that sharply boosts job openings can do that. Most workers now rejected for lack of skill probably would find jobs without Government retraining if business were booming, economists agree.

CONNECTICUT'S RESULTS

However, proper retraining can help many unemployed individuals, provided they want to work. Here in Connecticut nearly 2,100 jobless men and women have completed courses since 1959, ranging from 4 weeks in welding to 18 weeks of typing. Nearly all immediately got jobs in their new fields.

John Perry, Jr., 34, a periodically unemployed father of six from Montville, Conn., is an example. "I was working at construction labor, but I got laid off every winter so I decided to take a pipefitter course," he says. "I'm starting at $1.95 an hour on what should be a steady job," he adds.

Rene E. Theroux, 20, an apprentice electrician, demonstrates the upgrading retraining often gives income. On his last job as a maintenance worker he made $1.60 an hour. As an apprentice he draws $2.11 an hour.

In Massachusetts 1,600 adults have been retrained since 1958. Graduates with a year on the job have increased their incomes an average of $1,000 a year, or 35 percent, according to Mr. Gooding of the Federal Reserve.

Yankee retraining officials attribute the high placement rate to no nonsense, businesslike programs, in contrast to what they consider a shotgun welfare approach in some other places. West Virginia is an example. Among the factors retraining officials have learned are necessary ingredients are close cooperation with industry, careful selection of courses, high admission standards and concentration on younger people.

A NUMBERS GAME

"Some Federal people and State politicians are playing a numbers game," observes one State training official. "They just want us to hurry up and get a lot of people in some kind of training."

So far, Connecticut and Massachusetts have resisted such pressure. Connecticut, for example, does not set up classes "until area employers tell us they want a retraining program," says Thomas J. Yoczik, coordinator of manpower training in the State's department of labor. "Then we start with a labor market survey to determine skill needs. And we don't overtrain. If companies say they want 90 machine operators, we train 60 and add more classes later if necessary," he adds.

One result of tailoring courses to employers' requirements: Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn., has hired 1,036 trainees so far, often employing entire classes the day after graduation.

"This program has been very good for us because we were consulted in advance," says Lawrence Crowley, trade training coordinator for Electric Boat. "The men we hire work out extremely well because their training covers skills we need." The company sends two of its own training supervisors to the State-run classes at least once a week to answer questions and keep track of progress of individual students.

"We find that the welders who were trained to our specifications work out very well," agrees an official of Crusader Lancer Corp., North Grosvenor Dale, Conn., maker of immersion gas water heaters.

Failure to pin down job openings can cause a flasco. Rhode Island officials just assumed, without questioning many employers to find actual openings, that growing use of electronic data processing would make it easy for persons trained to operate and program computers to find jobs. But after more than 4 months of training, graduates of the State's computer course found openings scarce.

Another principle New England authorities follow is to avoid the jobless who have records of being unable to hold any job. Unfortunately, many of them can't absorb training either.

"Many of the unemployed are not well educated enough to benefit from what we understand as vocational education," says Mr. Gooding. "To include them we would have to create new courses including basic reading, writing, grammar, and arithmetic."

STANDARDS ARE HIGH

Connecticut and Massachusetts officials are convinced that high admission requirements are a major reason for their success. Only persons scoring high enough on general intelligence tests and specific aptitude tests to indicate probable success in the field are allowed to enter a course.

"We select about one applicant out of three for retraining," says Connecticut's Mr. Yoczik.

Even size can be a factor. Massachusetts authorities recently turned down a 275-

pound applicant who wanted to train for tree care work involving climbing trees to remove dead or diseased limbs.

"We are not going to be caught dead training people who are inadequate," adds Connecticut's Mr. Higgiston. "That would destroy employer confidence in the program. We can and do drop anyone who has the wrong attitude, doesn't attend regularly or can't do the work."

Another factor aiding success of retraining in the two New England States is concentration on younger workers who have many productive years ahead of them. In Connecticut few trainees are more than 40 years old. In a typical Massachusetts group more than half were less than 25 years old and another 25 percent were younger than 35. West Virginia's placement ratio is held down by a higher proportion of trainees over 40, officials admit.

Although their State-fashioned programs have been successful over a broad range of courses, both Massachusetts and Connecticut were unable to resist the lure of Federal funds. But Connecticut, while welcoming Federal money, has some complaints. "When we ran our own program, starting a new class was simple, but under the Federal program I have to make 26 copies of every document and get 9 different signatures," complains Mr. Yoczik.

ADMINISTRATION TAX PLAN

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, more and more, as people throughout the Nation study the administration's tax cut and tax reform plan, as people look at the sluggish state of the national economy, and as people observe higher State and local taxes in the offing, it becomes clear that the President's tax proposals are inadequate.

One of Honolulu's fine daily newspapers, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, ably edited by William H. Ewing, has analyzed the situation with great care and perception. The last three paragraphs of its March 15 editorial tell the story succinctly and clearly:

> For every dollar the taxpayer saves at the Federal level, he may find he will have to pay an equal or greater amount to his local or State government.
>
> So where is the great shot in the arm to the economy that the Kennedy tax program is designed to produce?
>
> The Kennedy tax cut may well go down in history as the great illusion of 1963.

This is in line with what I told the people of Hawaii on January 31, just after the President submitted his tax plan to Congress. I said then, in an address over radio station KGU, Honolulu:

> Because the President has spread his tax cut proposals over 3 years, many experts fear the reduction will be too small to relieve unemployment to any great extent.

I also pointed out that social security taxes on workers and their employers had just gone up all over the country and that State and local taxes were rising. In addition, I noted that the President wants corporations to pay their taxes much sooner than in the past, and that, as a result, corporations may pay more tax money to the Government during the next 3 years than they did before.

With all these factors, people and businesses may actually have far less to spend and invest than the administration hopes. So the stimulus to the economy may be minor, when what we need is a major injection.

Because of the great interest everywhere in taxes, unemployment, and our Nation's fiscal picture, the Star-Bulletin editorial is most timely and informative I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD. I also ask to have printed my January 31 KGU radio script on the same subject.

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

[From the Honolulu Star Bulletin, Mar. 15, 1963]

TAKING UP THE SLACK

Even if President Kennedy gets the Federal tax cuts he wants, the American taxpayer in most cases will be no better off.

States and local governments are moving right in to take up the slack—and in some cases to add an even heavier burden.

Governor Burns deplores any general tax increase for Hawaii at this time, but has indicated he approves a higher fuel tax to pay for the State-accelerated roadbuilding program. Mayor Blaisdell has asked the city council to approve an increase in the real property tax. Although these won't hit all taxpayers, they will affect enough so that any saving in Federal taxes, provided cuts are voted will be lost in additional local and State levies.

This is true across the country. Business Week magazine reports that 44 of the 47 State legislatures meeting this year are considering total tax increases of $1.5 billion.

This increase, which may be on the conservative side, would bring the State tax bite on individuals and corporations to $22 billion. That's more than a 7 percent increase over last year, and double the total of 10 years ago.

While proposals range from an increased corporation tax in Connecticut to a gift tax in New Mexico, sales taxes remain in the easiest and most politically appealing way for legislators to boost revenue, Business Week reports.

Eight of the 14 States that do not now have a broad-based sales tax will consider one, while at least 13 other States will propose raising existing sales tax rates. All told, sales taxes should account for $1.3 billion of the total State tax increase this year.

A mixed bag of selective sales tax increases on gasoline, cigarettes, and liquor will be voted on by lawmakers in 15 States. In addition motor vehicle license fees may rise in six, including Hawaii, where it has been proposed that the automobile weight tax be doubled.

Pressures on States to raise more and more cash are relentless. While the Federal budget has registered several dips in spending over the past 10 years, State expenditures have risen in an almost straight line. In recent years, nearly two-thirds of the States spent more money than they took in. In 1961, there were 29 States operating in the red.

On the municipal level, few cities enjoy the kind of home rule that would enable them to keep their fiscal house in order and still provide the services their citizens demand. While States normally reserve income and sales taxes for themselves, they usually forbid their cities to operate at a deficit. The result is an annual tug-of-war between city hall and taxpayer groups over whether nuisance taxes should be levied or services cut.

New York's Mayor Robert F. Wagner, with a city income greater than the entire Federal Government's in 1933, says he's now faced with the unpleasant task of either trimming essential services or imposing an array of unpopular levies such as a payroll tax, an auto use tax, an overnight parking fee, or taxes on beer and liquor licenses.

Other cities have similar problems. And, to the city taxpayer burdened by nuisance taxes, it often seems that his mayor's definition of essential services gets broader each year. But, as New York's Budget Director William W. Shea points out, those who cry for economy often change their tune when it comes to a pet service.

Generally speaking, we would prefer to see cities and States providing more of the services and taking a larger share of the tax dollar than the Federal Government. The closer taxing and spending power is to the voter, the greater his influence over it, the better chance there is of rational limits to Government spending.

But the point in this case is that for every dollar the taxpayer saves at the Federal level, he may find he will have to pay an equal or greater amount to his local or State government.

So where is the great shot in the arm to the economy that the Kennedy tax program is designed to produce?

The Kennedy tax cut may well go down in history as the great illusion of 1963.

REMARKS BY SENATOR FONG ON RADIO STATION KGU, JANUARY 31, 1963

Good evening, friends. The President's long-awaited tax plan is now before Congress. It is a plan with two main parts: one, reductions in tax rates for persons and for businesses; two, many changes in such items as personal deductions, dividend treatment, capital gains, and mineral depletion which will partly offset the lower tax rates.

The President says lower tax rates will save $13.6 billion in income taxes, while the other tax changes he proposes will put a tax bite on persons and businesses of $3.4 billion. So the net tax reduction would be $10.2 billion.

Now Congress must decide whether the tax cuts are big enough to stimulate our lagging national economy, whether the reforms are fair and just, and whether the tax changes are timed to take effect so as to do the most good.

Our Nation's economy rose about 3 percent last year and shows no signs of doing any better this year. This rise was not enough to reduce unemployment significantly. Unemployment continued at more than 5 percent throughout 1962 and still exceeds 5 percent today. Every year we need more than 1 million new jobs just to take care of the men and women entering the labor force.

Because the President has spread his tax cut proposals over 3 years, many experts fear the reduction will be too small to relieve unemployment to any great extent. For individuals and for business with profits under $25,000, the President wants the lower rates to be effective starting next July; for other business, not until next January. So the impact in the year beginning next July would be only $4 billion in Federal income taxes.

Meantime, social security taxes on workers and their employers have just gone up all over the country. State and local taxes are in an upward trend in America and still climbing. Here in Hawaii, for example, the Governor has announced he wants an increase in gasoline taxes and the City Council of Honolulu is considering a raise in the property tax rate.

In addition, the President wants corporations to pay their taxes much sooner than in the past. As a result, corporations may pay more tax money to the Government during the next 3 years than they did before. Corporations may not get the promised percentage basis of reduction until 1969, whereas the economy needs a boost in 1963.

With all these factors, people and businesses may actually have far less to spend

and invest than the administration hopes. So the stimulus to the economy may be minor, when what we need is a major injection.

Congress must carefully assess the overall impact of the President's tax plan. At the same time, Congress must study the so-called reforms to make sure they are fair and just to taxpayers.

For example, I am disturbed that the President wants workers who are off the job because of illness to be taxed on money they receive under sick pay plans. This may well cause hardship to families trying to make ends meet on sick pay while the head of the family cannot work.

I am disturbed also by the President's plan to tax workers on the amount their employers pay toward premiums for employees' group term life insurance.

I am happy that the President proposes to liberalize the deduction allowed for expenses of child care of a working parent. I am also happy about the proposed tax breaks for the elderly. These would exempt from taxation single persons over 65 with income under $2,900 and married couples under $5,800. Elderly persons would not have to file tax returns unless the earned at least $1,800, instead of $1,200 as now.

Without question the tax bill is the most important domestic issue before Congress today. Next Wednesday, the House Ways and Means Committee is scheduled to start some 7 weeks of hearings. Writing the bill may take 7 more weeks, with passage by the House perhaps in June. Senate Finance Committee hearings and action may take another 2 months, followed by floor debate and then conferences between House and Senate Members to iron out differences. So it looks as if summer is the earliest that Congress could complete action on such a complex bill.

What Congress finally does will depend a great deal on the size of the Federal budget deficit. The President now predicts almost a $12 billion deficit in 1964. If by July an even higher deficit appears likely, Congress may not reduce taxes as much as the President wants. So the President must hold the line on Federal spending. This is indispensable to enactment of tax cuts large enough to invigorate our national economy.

Thank you for listening, friends. Until next week at this same time, this is your Senator, HIRAM FONG, saying goodnight and aloha from the Nation's Capital.

EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL WELFARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON—an "unabashed partisan of education"—went to Atlantic City in New Jersey recently to address the American Association of School Administrators. At that time the Vice President described to the school administrators the challenge and promise facing not only education, but our entire democratic society. He asked his audience to see beyond the "mountains of immediate problems" and to see in the distance "even higher mountains which should not be ignored in determining the course for the present." And he also asked the people of America to recognize their own strengths, to see the weaknesses of nations ruled by force, and to fulfill the cause of freedom "through the policies we pursue as leaders of the grand alliance of freemen."

Mr. President, the address was an inspiring summary which should be shared by many other Americans. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., FEBRUARY 17, 1963

CHALLENGE AND PROMISE

In the early years of his administration, President Franklin Roosevelt was a strong advocate of the U.S. Navy. He loved the sea, he had served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and he believed a modern, two-ocean Navy was essential to our security. The story is told of an encounter F.D.R. had with the Army Chief of Staff at that time, Gen. Malin Craig.

The general and the President had been holding many conferences on the defense budget. The President noted some discomfort on the part of the general and asked him to speak frankly. General Craig is said to have replied, "Mr. President, I don't mind that when you refer to the Army you always say 'they'—but I would be more comfortable if, when you refer to the Navy, you did not always say 'we.' "

Whenever I meet with public school administrators or teachers, I have to guard against a longstanding personal inclination to use "we" in references to "them and us." Today the typical public school principal is a 40-year-old man, with 14 years of experience, who works 55 hours a week and who is paid $6,181 a year. Thirty years ago my first jobs after college were as principal of small schools in the Southwest—and if both my age and experience were considerably less than today's average, I can say that the paycheck was in proportion, also.

That experience left its indelible impression. I make no apology today for continuing to be an unabashed partisan of education, or the untiring champion of our administrators and teachers whose work is so vital to the strength, stability, and success of our country and our cause in this century.

In coming here today, it is not my purpose to take the time of this informed and responsible audience to discuss those questions and topics to which your attention is given continuously. Instead, it is my purpose to talk with you about the broad challenges—and broader opportunities—of this period of your Nation's leadership and freedom in the world.

DRAMATIC CHANGE

As school administrators, you are acutely aware that this is a time of decisive and dramatic change in public education. The basic concepts of education's mission and purpose are undergoing revision. The role and leadership of public schools to our society is changing. You—and all associated with public education—are faced with mountains of immediate problems which must be dealt with immediately. At the same time, you can see in the distance even higher mountains which should not be ignored in determining the course for the present.

In world affairs now, we are passing through a period of change—one of the most profound such periods in history—in which it is difficult to achieve answers which are both quick and responsible. As seldom before, the hasty answer is unlikely to be the right and lasting answer. It is most important to our national success that we understand, first, that only the strong can afford to be patient, and, second, that the tide of world affairs is running with us—not against us—and that our staying power is the key to our ultimate success.

OUR POSITION AND POLICY

In this perspective, then, let me make to you several key points about the position and the policy of this America at this period in the affairs of the world.

1. To display patience is not the same as displaying weakness. If we are to be patient and prudent, it is mandatory that we also be prepared. This assault which communism has mounted against us aims at the total destruction of our freedoms. We must maintain our strength on a scale commensurate with the clear and present danger to our survival.

2. The strength of our position depends upon the collective total strength of the free world. If the prospects and high promise of the future are to be realized, we cannot—and we will not—permit the penetration of the perimeter of the free world by Communist aggression, and subversion or default on our own part. Each attack, each threat, each bluff and bluster must be met—and this we shall do.

3. The ultimate success of our cause depends not merely upon preserving the integrity of the free world from assaults from without. That success rests upon the uses we make and the strength we build from the resources which lie within the free world. We must and we shall pursue on a day-to-day and a year-to-year basis a positive program of adding to the strength of our own free world community.

In speaking of a world divided, of a world part free and part slave, we cannot—and we do not—accept this division as permanent, eternal, and unchanging. Men cannot live as freemen as long as they must live under the shadow of what Winston Churchill once called "the two giant marauders of war and tyranny." We do not propose to accept for our children and our children's children a life of constant threat and constant fear of nuclear destruction. There is no ceiling on the price we are willing to pay to preserve ourselves and the free world and to maintain the strength of the free civilizations until the forces of history have wrought the great changes which will improve the condition of man and the climate for peace.

TO BREAK THE BONDS

It is on this point that I believe Americans need to keep their thinking straight at this time—and to recognize the full significance of the forces we see at work within the Communist world. We are not dealing in abstracts. We are not dealing in intangibles or theory. There is clear and growing evidence that influences are now at work within the Communist world which may well break the bonds with which the Communists have shackled both themselves and the people they rule.

In the nations of the Communist bloc, the future is not being controlled by the mechanical and arbitrary laws conceived by antisocial and mystical Marx. The aspiration of the different national groups now living under Communist rule are being asserted and the course of the present clearly contradicts Communist assumptions about its own future.

When the Communist empire was established—reaching from the shores of the Adriatic to the seas of Japan and from the North Pole to the Himalayas—first Stalin and then Khrushchev proclaimed it as an irrevocable shift in the "balance of world forces" in favor of the Communists. That empire was supposed to live forever. The countries captured and controlled by the Communists were to be united in a single cohesive unit which would move forward with a singular will to rule the world. Like all the visions of world domination of the past, this Communist vision is being shattered and a vital process of disintegration in the Communist camp has begun before our eyes.

Instead of assuming—as too many among us have assumed—that communism is an irresistible wave of the future, we must realistically reassess the record—which contradicts that assumption.

COMMUNIST FAILURE

The proof of this last half of the 20th century is convincing that communism is failing as both an international conspiracy and as a domestic economic system.

1. Of the more than 50 countries which have moved from colonial status to independence since World War II, Communists have failed to win control of a single one.

2. In every country under Communist control, the Communist system has failed to produce enough food to make possible improvements and advances in the standard of living for the people under their subjugation.

3. On the mainland of China, the application of the Communist system has tragically failed to resolve the basic problems of that country.

4. After almost two decades of indoctrination and thought control, Communists have not been able to overcome the deep antagonism and hostility of the peoples of the satellite states of Eastern Europe.

5. Within the Soviet Union itself, the Communist leadership is plagued with growing problems about the allocation of limited resources, conflicts over policy decisions, and stirrings among the people aspiring to greater intellectual freedom, a larger voice in their own affairs, and for greater opportunity to enjoy the fruits of their own labors.

The Communist vision and dream of solidarity within an empire ruled by force is fading. The Russian Communists and the Chinese Communists are experiencing a division which places the inner debates of the free world in perspective as passing disagreements. The Russians have, to all intents and purposes, cut off economic and military aid to the Chinese. They have tried to undercut Chinese influence within the Communist movement. They have mobilized other parties outside Russia to criticize and challenge Chinese positions. The Russian attempts to whip the Chinese into line have only produced greater defiance—and open and bitter conflict.

On our part, there is no value in attempting to guess when or whether the conflicts between Peiping and Moscow will reach a formal break. What matters to us is that a change of historical significance is under way in this relationship within the Communist bloc. And this conflict is not merely ideological dispute. It is a conflict of basic national interests.

OLD TIMES CHANGING

The Chinese Communists are refusing to accept the old line of Lenin and Stalin that whatever is good for the Soviet Union is good for Communists everywhere. The Chinese reaction to Russian domination of the Communist empire is a reaction against a basically unnatural system—a system running counter to fundamental forces of history and human nature.

With this great new force asserting itself within the Communist empire, it must continue to be the object of our policy to make sure that communism is not permitted to bring the world down in ruins before collapsing itself from within. The split between Communist Russia and Communist China does not relieve us of any immediate dangers or threats. Neither is it likely to bring improvements in the world climate during the years immediately ahead. Should we of the West relinquish either our vigilance or our unity, the forces of communism would be quick to seize upon the opening thus presented to fulfill their ambition of burying us.

What this situation does demand of us is to maintain the strength to permit patience and to preserve the patience to permit the free world's strength to work its influence upon the disintegration from within the Communist bloc. The world we face today is vastly different than most Americans imagined it could be as recently as 10 or even 5 years ago. We must recognize that change has come.

RECOGNIZE OUR STRENGTH

As a people, we of America must—above all else—examine and reexamine our national attitudes. We will deny and betray the opportunity of the future if we fail to recognize fully the strength of our national position today. We cannot win the future if we allow our confidence to be impaired by false cries of those who monger the idea that we are losing the present. Our efforts as a Nation—our sacrifices as a people—have preserved freedom against the high tide of Communist danger. Our success in the past permits us to have confidence in the future—and Americans must carry such confidence into the period of challenge and change which will dominate the remaining years of this century.

While this is and will continue to be a time of peril for freedom, we will be stronger as a Nation and we will be a stronger force as leaders of the cause of freedom if we realistically and honestly recognize that we have come upon one of the great moments of promise in mankind's history—and it is our destiny to fulfill that promise through the policies we pursue as leaders of the grand alliance of freemen.

LOBBYING IN WASHINGTON

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, Felton West, chief of the Washington bureau of the Houston Post, has written an outstanding series of articles on lobbying in Washington. The inadequate regulation of lobbyists has troubled Members of Congress for several years. I believe that Mr. West's series indicates that our concern is not misplaced. I therefore ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the text of the articles.

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

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—LOBBYING ACT OF 1946 NEEDS OVERHAUL JOB

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—Every few years an incident comes to light that prompts Members of Congress and the public to say, "For shame, look how brazen those lobbyists are getting." Or words to that effect.

There will be an investigation, maybe a particular culprit will be identified and shamed, rarely even convicted for violating a law. But usually that is the end of it, until the next case that stirs the imagination.

Meanwhile, the persuasive and enduring lobbyist, as one writer described him, goes right on persuading and enduring, his profession getting more widespread and powerful all the time, with nobody paying much attention to it. At least, not enough attention to find out much about it and disturb it.

The last case that stirred Congress and the country much was in 1956, when the late Senator Francis Case, Republican of South Dakota, dropped the bombshell that he had been offered a $2,500 campaign contribution he thought was strictly to get his vote on the Harris-Fulbright bill to relieve natural gas of Federal regulation.

Congress was shocked, though not too shocked to go ahead and pass the bill. Although indicating he favored the bill, President Eisenhower was so shocked that he vetoed it because of such arrogant activities.

The incident touched off a Justice Department investigation and prosecution that led to the only convictions so far under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946—Elmer Patman and John Neff each drew a $2,500 fine and a 1-year suspended sentence and their company, the Superior Oil Co., was fined $10,000.

SENATE GROUP RAPPED LOBBYING ACT

It also touched off a lengthy investigation by a special Senate committee, headed by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas. Congress authorized the committee to spend more than $400,000 looking at the whole subject of lobbying and the adequacy of the 1946 law, along with studying campaign contributions.

This committee produced an interesting final report that pointed fingers of scorn at weaknesses of the 1946 law. It recommended a complete substitute.

But, as so often happens when the furor over an initial disclosure dies down and a serious report on the problem necessarily comes along much later in competition with more current sensations, the suggestions for strengthening the law fell on deaf ears.

Since then, there have been occasional speeches critical of lobbying, even a few remarks by the President of the United States, but nobody has been pushing for reform.

So when Congress came back from the hustings in early January, there was still waiting for it that army of persuaders considerably outnumbering it, still doing business just as usual not telling anybody much about it, some of its troops registered as lobbyists, some not, although doing the same things as the registrants, some disclosing their sources of money and their spending, some not.

LOBBYISTS QUICK TO PICK UP CHECK

There are close to 1,200 lobbyists in this army, at least—and if the truth were known, probably hundreds more.

They include many friends of the reelected Congressmen, many as close as their most influential constituents back home. And soon a lot will be close friends of the new Congressmen, if they did not get that way during their election campaigns last fall.

The lobbyists are ready to wine and dine the lawmakers at the drop of a hat, pick up the checks for their parties, do all sorts of favors whether asked or not. A lobbyist is eager to please.

They'll meet a lot of Congressmen in the lobbies outside the legislative halls. That is how they got their name, hanging around legislativies lobbies, starting with that of the British House of Commons.

But nowadays most of their work will be done elsewhere.

Many will direct as much of their attention to you voters back in the Congressman's district as directly as to the Congressman. They hope your pressure on him will have more effect than theirs, which it probably will.

As long as the lobbyists keep within the bounds of propriety and beyond bribery, there is nothing improper about what they are doing. They are within their rights and their clients' rights of freedom of speech, assembly and petition guaranteed by the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. In fact, they undoubtedly perform a valuable service. One or more of them may even be representing you, indirectly if not directly.

Congress and the courts have taken the position that lobbyists should not and could not be limited.

The only special law they are subject to is the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946, which to start with was misnamed—it is not a regulatory law at all but merely a disclosure requirement.

But this law is one of the most confusing ones ever put on the books. It was vague and indefinite, poorly written. Court decisions have weakened it. Few people understand it, including the highest-paid lobbyists.

It has become a Washington joke. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, recently called it a "farce." It is inconceivable that the Congressmen who wrote it intended for lobby disclosure to turn out to be the botched-up job it is.

The law creates the impression lobbyists are regulated, or their activities well disclosed, when they are not, which may be as much a disservice to the country as no law at all.

There are people registered under it who doubtless did not need to register, while probably others who are really professional lobbyists are not registered, or at least are not reporting their spending. Some follow the advice, "If in doubt, register and report." Others give themselves the benefit of the doubt.

No agency of the Government is designated to see that lobbyists do report or pay any attention to what they do report. The reports are just accepted and filed. Nobody is designated to report violations.

Nobody has been prosecuted since 1956.

Senator John F. Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, said after the Neff-Case incident in that year that the lobbying act was practically worthless. The main thing wrong, he said was its failure to make anybody responsible for administering and enforcing it.

Twice he introduced bills to improve the law, one of the main changes being to make the Department of Justice administer it. But the bills got nowhere.

Now, as President, Mr. Kennedy has complained bitterly at least once about powerful lobbying that he said misrepresented the facts on his proposals to Congress. His legislative program has taken some big lumps from several lobbies. Big lobbies are opposing all his major legislative proposals, though at the same time he has big lobbies giving him some support.

Recently the President was reported to be discouraged over the power of lobbies, feeling that some are more persuasive and powerful than the Office of the President.

But so far, since becoming President, he has left the lobby problem strictly in Congress hands, not recommending any reform legislation on the subject.

Meanwhile, lobbying is getting to be bigger business all the time.

Although no recent estimate is available on how much is really spent on lobbying, a House investigating committee estimated in 1950 that, in all its ramifications, it was a billion-dollar industry then. It has been growing ever since, even though disclosed spending figures do not indicate it.

And thanks to a change in the Federal tax laws last year that amounts to an incentive to lobbying, such activity in Washington, State capitals, and local communities may increase in the next few years at a rate much faster than in the past.

Whether this is good or bad, the fact is that the law and the machinery the Federal Government has for disclosure of such activity are puny.

In the Supreme Court opinion upholding the constitutionality of the lobbying act, Chief Justice Earl Warren said Congress has not tried to prohibit pressures but "wants only to know who is being hired, who is putting up the money, and how much."

Unfortunately, under the present law, neither you nor Congress knows much about that. And nothing is likely to be done about it this year.

[From the Houston Post Feb. 4, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—SPENDING REPORTS OF LOBBYISTS FAIL TO KEEP PACE

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—For the first quarter of 1962, quarterly reports required by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act were filed by 1,187 individuals and organizations.

Only 643 of them listed expenditures for lobbying.

In 1961, 312 pressure groups and their lobbyists reported lobbying expenditures that totaled $3,770,108—the smallest annual total of lobby spending since 1947, the first full year of operation of the lobbying act.

The total of spending reported in 1962 is not yet available, but in the first 6 months of the year 273 organizations and their lobbyists reported spending $2,007,866. If as much was spent in the second half of the year as in the first, the year's total would still be about $1 million less than the spending of $5,191,856 reported in 1947.

Since, as the New York Times observed in early 1962, "there is abundant evidence that Washington's 'Third House' has waxed fatter and richer with each passing biennium," the decline in reported expenditures would seem to indicate the lobbying regulation act is not working well as a disclosure requirement.

In view of the inflation since 1947 and the many controversial matters before Congress in 1961 and 1962, it is rather unlikely that lobby spending was actually less than in 1947. It is more likely that considerably less of the total spent is being reported now than in past years.

The total reported spent in a year ballooned to $10,303,204 in 1950. Since 1952, however, it has ranged between $3 and $4 million a year.

The count of 1,187 individuals and organizations who filed reports during the first quarter of 1962 is the best indication available of the number of lobbyists active at that time. But there could have been many more, such is the state of confusion over the law and the lack of administration and enforcement.

Between January 1 and October 30 of last year, 367 individuals and organizations registered with the Clerk of the House and the Senate as lobbyists, as required by the law. The average number of registrations a year is 383.

The total number of registrations since enactment of the law in 1946 was 6,504 as of October 30, which represented only 4,586 different lobbyists or groups because some registered more than once or registered for two or more organizations.

There is no accurate way of telling how many of the 4,586 were still lobbying, unless you assume that all who were filed the quarterly reports. Many are dead and haven't reported the fact; nobody has wiped their names off the rolls. Others perhaps once thought they needed to file reports but don't think so now. Some of them and others may be violating the law by not reporting, or not registering.

But nobody is checking up to see. The law does not require notice of discontinuance of legislative representation.

The Justice Department will investigate complaints of noncompliance and either bring about voluntary compliance or prosecute if it thinks the facts warrant it, a spokesman said. But it does not consider itself the policing agent for lobbying. Somebody has to bring it complaints and no particular person is designated to do this.

Through warnings, the Department has brought about voluntary compliance in a few cases in recent years after investigations that stemmed from inquiries by Congressmen, the spokesman said. But it has not prosecuted anybody for illegal lobbying since the Neff-Patman-Superior Oil case in 1956.

In the whole history of the lobbying act there have been only five cases taken to court, with convictions only in the 1956 case.

The 4,586 different lobbyists registered since 1946 included 3,798 individuals, 231 public relations and law firms and 557 organizations.

For most of the statistics in this story, the public is indebted to Congressional Quarterly, a Washington research organization, which compiles registration and spending statistics periodically and is the only source for such information unless one wants to wade laboriously through the spending reports and compile them himself.

No official agency keeps tabs on them. The House clerk and Senate secretary merely accept and file the lobby reports and prepare alphabetical lists of those registering and reporting, showing their clients, their total contributions and total expenses, for publication quarterly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The lobby law is considered so weak that if there were not so much uncertainty about what it does require, many people now filing reports probably would not be.

"After 17 years," said an influential and affluent lobbyist who dutifully files reports in spite of his contention that it is a clerical nuisance serving no worthwhile purpose, "I still don't know what the law means."

By its own language, the law applies to those persons and organizations which receive or spend money for the principal purpose of influencing directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of legislation by Congress.

The law says every person or organization paid to influence legislation shall register with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, identifying himself and his employer and disclosing the source and amount of his compensation, expense money, and the nature of his expenses.

Exceptions to this are persons who merely appear before committees of Congress, public officials acting in their official capacity, and newspapers or periodicals, their owners or employees, as long as they do nothing outside the ordinary course of business to influence legislation. The law does not state any similar exemption for radio or television.

Those receiving contributions are required to keep accounts and keep receipts for expenditures of more than $10. Money received and spent for lobbying is supposed to be reported quarterly to the House Clerk and the Senate Secretary, showing the identity of contributors of $500 or more and the identity of those to whom aggregate expenditures of more than $10 have been made.

A lobbyist is required to show in his reports the proposed legislation he was employed to influence and the names of publications in which he has caused articles or editorials to be published.

Violation of the law is punishable by a fine of up to $5,000 and imprisonment up to a year and prohibition from lobbying for 3 years.

The act does not apply to activities regulated by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, which deals with campaign contributions and expenditures, or to political party committees.

Senate and House committee reports accompanying the law when it was passed were identical. Both said the law applied mainly to three classes of lobbyists: (1) those who without visiting the Capitol initiated propaganda letters and telegrams from all over the country; (2) those who are employed to come to the Capitol * * * and spend their time in Washington presumably exerting some mysterious influence on legislation but carefully conceal from Congressmen the purpose of their presence; and (3) a third class of entirely honest and respectable representatives of business, professional, and

philanthropic organizations who come to Washington openly and frankly to express their views * * * many of whom serve a useful and perfectly legitimate purpose.

Both reports said the act did not apply to organizations formed for other purposes whose efforts to influence legislation are merely incidental to the purposes for which formed. This was probably the first monkey wrench that started confusing the works.

The words "principal purpose" have caused confusion ever since. Some organizations and individuals do not register, or register but do not file spending reports, on the ground that lobbying is not their principal purpose. Others in the same circumstances follow the principle of "if in doubt, do".

In upholding the constitutionality of the law in *United States* v. *Harris* in 1954, the Supreme Court severely limited coverage in a way that seemed counter to the congressional authors' intention.

The Court laid down these prerequisites to coverage:

1. The person must have solicited, collected, or received contributions;

2. One of the main purposes of such person, or one of the main purposes of such contributions, must have been to influence the passage or defeat of legislation by Congress, and

3. The intended method of accomplishing this purpose must have been through direct communication with Members of Congress.

Some groups which formerly filed reports claim the Harris decision made the law inapplicable to them because they do not engage in direct communication with Congressmen; some that lobbying is not their principal purpose; some that their function is not to influence legislation but to inform and educate their members and the public.

Among the national groups which did not file spending reports in 1961 were the American Bankers Association, Americans for Democratic Action, the American Public Power Association and the National Association of Manufacturers.

The NAM has not filed a spending report since 1950, claiming it is not subject to the reporting requirements, although its lobbyists do register.

Students of the lobby law point out that the Supreme Court's first prerequisite for coverage by the law exempts a corporation or group which might spend several million dollars to obtain passage of legislation solely to line its own pockets, as long as it spends only its own money. Some of the Nation's largest defense contractors, incidentally, have large Washington offices but no registered lobbyists.

Students of the law argue that the Supreme Court's second prerequisite—main purpose—is difficult to apply and leaves too much to a lobbyist's conscience. It is suggested that a dollars-and-cents standard on lobby spending would be more practical than the purpose test.

The direct communication prerequisite exempts from coverage of the law the area where the most lobbying money is spent.

However, investigation would show that, unpoliced, even those lobbyists registering and filing quarterly reports do not comply fully with the letter of the law.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat of Wisconsin, told the Senate last year he estimated that less than 25 percent of all lobbyists in Washington comply fully with the requirements. He based the statement on a study his staff made of oil and gas industry representatives during the 1960 session of Congress.

"Of the 41 lobbyists who did file reports," he said, "36 violated the law by failing to give their specific legislative interests, 21 failed to comply with the law by stating whether they had received contributions of more than $500, 20 illegally refused to list the parties they had paid money to, and 17 did not state the nature of their employers' businesses as the law requires."

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 5, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—EVERYBODY HAS A LOBBYIST

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—Just about everybody has a lobbyist or lobbyists these days, at least for part of his total interests—even if he's not paying for it.

Doctors have their American Medical Association lobbyists. Bankers have theirs. Workingmen have various labor union lobbyists; nonunion workers have certain business lobbyists who work indirectly for some of their aims.

Practically every kind of business has its own trade association that lobbies for it, and other groups try to further business' common aims.

If you are a veteran, there are organizations looking out for your particular interests in this field.

It requires a lot of thought to look at the list of organizations registered as lobbies or represented by individual lobbyists and think of somebody not represented directly or indirectly, at least in some way, by registered lobbyists.

Those registered under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act range from spokesmen for the Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, the AMA, the AFL–CIO, and the American Legion to the Council for Exceptional Children, the Christian Amendment Movement, the Sacramento (Calif.) Municipal Utility District, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

In between are lobbyists for numerous tribes of Indians.

The 312 pressure groups which filed spending reports totaling about $3,770,100 in 1961 were classified by Congressional Quarterly, the Washington research organization, in 6 categories. This breakdown showed that 171 business groups reported spending $1,598,091, 52 citizens groups $437,695, 40 employee and labor groups $857,788, 22 farm groups $365,887, 10 military and veterans groups $133,734, and 17 professional groups $376,911.

Five organizations reported spending more than $100,000 each on lobbying during 1961, and 14 other groups reported spending more than $50,000 each. (See accompanying table for a list of these groups and their reported spending.)

Eight organizations reported spending more than $50,000 each during the first half of 1962, while 11 other groups reported spending more than $25,000 apiece during that period. Compilations for the whole of 1962 are not yet available.

The 171 business lobby groups that reported spending in 1961 included the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, scores of trade and industry associations like the National Association of Chain Drug Stores and the American Petroleum Institute, and many individual businesses, like insurance and oil companies.

They included some notable omissions, like the National Association of Manufacturers, which claims the reporting requirements do not cover it.

The 52 citizens groups included such organizations as the American Cancer Society, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Reclamation Association, the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Committee To Support U.S. Congress Bill Creating a Commission on Obscene Matters and Materials, and the National Council on the Facts of Overpopulation.

Employee and labor organizations included a dozen organizations in the various transportation industries, 14 Federal employee organizations and a number of AFL–CIO affiliate groups.

Among farm groups represented by lobbyists were the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers Union, the National Grange, and organizations of cattlemen, citrus growers, vegetable growers, milk producers, soil conservation districts, wheat growers, turkey growers, wool producers, cotton growers, and tobacco growers.

Military and veterans lobbying groups, in addition to the American Legion, included the American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS), the Disabled American Veterans, the Disabled Officers Association, the Jewish War Veterans, the Reserve Officers Association, the Retired Officers Association, and the Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc.

The latter group, incidentally, known as the "Wonnies," was the biggest spender of all lobbies in 1960, according to the reports; it reported spending $200,623 then in behalf of a pension bill, mostly on bringing World War I vets to Washington.

The 17 professional groups reporting in 1961 included dental, nurse, optometric, surgeon, veterinary, professional women, engineer and social worker associations, in addition to the AMA.

The more powerful pressure groups have whole batteries of registered lobbyists. For example, during the third quarter of 1962, lobbying reports were filed by 10 persons for the American Farm Bureau Federation, by 7 for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, by 6 each for the AMA and the AFL–CIO national headquarters, and by 5 for the American Petroleum Institute.

Many lobbyists are integral units, such as executive vice presidents, of the organizations for which they lobby. Many are Washington business representatives of business firms elsewhere and spend only part time at legislation influencing. Some lobbyists, though, are full-time pros who do nothing but lobby, sometimes for several clients.

Of the 239 registrations in 1962 that represented individuals or organizations filing for the first time, 188 were individuals, 14 were public relations or law firms and 37 were organizations.

Thirty-five of the individuals or firms were registered lobbyists for more than one employee, representing a total of 88 employers. One Washington law firm registered for 13 clients, another for 8, another for 7.

Many of the better known lobbyists are former Members of Congress. Turning lobbyist is quite the accepted thing for a Congressman to do when defeated or looking for a better paying job. About 85 have registered as lobbyists after leaving office since the lobby law was passed in 1946, but some of these are dead and some others apparently are no longer active as lobbyists.

Probably the best known of those still active is former Senator Scott W. Lucas, Democrat, of Illinois, onetime Senate majority leader, who usually has several clients. Another well-known one is former Representative Andrew J. Biemiller, the AFL–CIO's chief lobbyist. Another is former Representative Frank Ikard, of Texas, who resigned from Congress last year to become the American Petroleum Institute's chief lobbyist and executive vice president, at a salary said to be $50,000 a year.

Quite a few former high officials in the executive branch of the Government also turn lobbyist, especially after changes in administration. The best known of these is probably Oscar L. Chapman, President Truman's Secretary of the Interior.

It has often been said that in Washington there are lobbyists for everybody except "the people." But this is an oversimplification not as accurate as it sounds.

In the first place, all lobbies represent people. Put them all together and you have quite a lot of people and different kinds. Secondly, Members of Congress are lobbyists themselves—for the people in their States and districts—and work to influence each other.

Finally, the largest paid lobby of all in Washington consists not of spokesmen for the AMA, the NAM, the AFL–CIO or any such group. It is made up of spokesmen for the various agencies of the Government—Cabinet members, "legislative liaison" staff members, experts in various fields—who, under the direction of Presidential assistants as expert as any business lobbyists, push legislation or oppose it, often as effectively as any "special interest" lobbyists.

This network is at the President's fingertips, and some Members of Congress have called this "White House lobby" the most powerful there is. The "White House lobby" has almost unlimited sources of information, unusual powers of persuasion in patronage, public works projects and other ways to pay off Congressmen for support, and the best forum in the world for presenting its views.

What it spends influencing Congressmen has never been added up. But if it were, this lobbying expense would be impressive.

Theoretically, the "White House lobby" is a lobby for the people, since they elect the President. Actually, of course, it may represent only those who think like the President. But if it does not represent the people, they have the chance to change that by choosing a different President, just as any special interest organization has the chance to change the course of its lobbying by selecting a different administration.

TOP SPENDERS

The following 19 organizations reported spending more than $50,000 on lobbying during 1961, the latest year for which complete figures are available:

American Medical Association	$163,405
AFL-CIO (national headquarters)	139,919
American Farm Bureau Federation	111,364
American Legion	103,566
U.S. Savings and Loan League	101,801
National Farmers Union	88,273
American Trucking Associations	84,986
National Committee for Insurance Taxation	73,012
District Lodge 44, International Association of Machinists	71,737
National Housing Conference, Inc.	68,675
International Brotherhood of Teamsters	68,012
National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc.	55,936
National Association of Electric Companies	55,205
American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies	54,028
National Association of Home Builders	53,712
Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy	53,101
National Education Association	51,910
National Retail Merchants	51,042
National Association of Letter Carriers	50,920

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—TEXANS ARE ACTIVE LOBBYISTS

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—Texans are prominent among the lobbyists in Washington, and quite a few Texas interests have representation of their own in the so-called Third House, in addition to the countless ones represented by lobbyists for various trade and industry associations.

One of the most successful lobbyists in the Capital, and by far the one most identified with the Lone Star State, is Dale Miller, a 53-year-old native of Corpus Christi.

Congressmen call him the dean of Texas lobbyists.

Holiday magazine once called Miller and his wife, whose friends call her Scooter, a "social lobbying team par excellence." It said that in 20 years in Washington they had "danced rings around other lobbyists on the party circuit and know just about everyone worthwhile to Miller's clients in the city."

Though Miller says he and Mrs. Miller don't do nearly as much entertaining as they get credit for, the birthday parties they gave for 18 years for the late Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn made them the talk of Washington. This annual event became a 440-person party with an all-star crowd.

Miller has long been close to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, as he was to Speaker Rayburn. His father, Roy Miller, a lobbyist too, was a friend of both Rayburn and JOHNSON. Roy Miller helped JOHNSON get the job that first brought him to Washington years ago as an administrative assistant to Congressman Richard Kleberg.

Dale Miller grew up in Corpus Christi and as a boy did cub reporting chores on the Corpus Christi Caller, which his father owned then. After college—New Mexico Military Institute, the University of Texas, the University of Missouri Journalism School—he taught journalism at the University of Texas, wrote for Texas Weekly magazine and handled publicity for the Texas centennial celebration of 1936.

In 1941 he moved to Washington to represent the Dallas Chamber of Commerce as an experiment, which proved so successful that the Dallas Chamber is still one of the clients for whom he lobbies.

His other clients are the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, of which he has been executive vice president since 1946; the Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., and the Port of Corpus Christi, which he represents only in navigation matters.

The canal association and Texas Gulf Sulphur, which have offices in Houston, are clients he inherited from his father, who represented them before his death in 1946. Dale had shared the same office, his present suite in the Mayflower Hotel here, with his father. He was familiar with the clients' affairs and naturally gravitated into representing them after his father's death.

Miller describes himself as "about the most unlobbying lobbyist you ever saw," saying he does very little persuading on legislation.

Actually, he said, in none of his jobs is the primary purpose influencing legislation. Most of his work involves visits to Government agencies, helping visitors to Washington and giving people in Washington information about Texas, he said.

He testifies every year before House and Senate Appropriation Committees, about every other year before Public Works Committees of both Houses, and occasionally before other congressional committees on general legislation in which the Dallas chamber is interested. He appears from time to time before the Civil Aeronautics Board and other executive or independent agencies in behalf of his clients.

Being here permanently and well known for his interests, Miller says he never has to ask a Congressman to vote for or against particular legislation. "They know my interests," he said.

Indeed, some say Miller is consulted more often by Congressmen than they are consulted by him because he is an expert on intracoastal waterway affairs, the Trinity River and other subjects.

He says he is more useful to his clients simply by finding out what is going to happen and alerting them than by influencing what happens.

Miller is proud of his profession and thinks it is essential and important and becoming more so as civilization becomes more complex and Congress must deal with more technical matters.

In frequent conflict with Miller's activities as lobbyist for water transportation interests are the activities of another Texas lobbyist, Tom Pickett. One of several former Congressmen from Texas who registered as lobbyists after leaving office, Pickett now represents the Association of American Railroads. He formerly represented the National Coal Association.

Former Congressman Fritz G. Lanham of Texas has been registered recently as a lobbyist for the National Patent Council, Inc., and Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc.

The chief lobbyist for the powerful American Petroleum Institute is former Congressman Frank N. Ikard of Wichita Falls, who resigned from Congress last year to become executive vice president of the API and is now its president.

Former Congressman J. T. Rutherford, of Odessa, who lost his bid for reelection last November, became a legislative consultant soon after his term expired and said he would be doing some lobbying. Some of it will be for the American Trucking Association, Inc.

Former Republican Congressman Ben H. Guill of Pampa, who served a short term by special election in 1950, is a lobbyist for the National Automobile Dealers Association and has in the past done lobbying for the American Smelting & Refining Co.

Another Texan, like Ikard, lobbies for a major oil industry organization. He is Joe T. Dickerson of Houston, who represents the Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association.

Two of the American Medical Association's six registered lobbyists are Texans—Dr. Roy T. Lester and Cecil B. Dickson. Dr. Lester, from Dallas, is the AMA's Washington office manager. He formerly was the chief medical officer for the Blue Cross-Blue Shield organization in Texas. Dickson, who was a close friend of the late Speaker Rayburn, is a former Texas newspaperman, Associated Press reporter and once coordinator of information for the House of Representatives.

The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, headquartered at League City, is represented here by Clair P. Guess, Jr., who recently moved to Washington from League City.

Joe G. Fender, of Houston, general attorney for the National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, is registered as a lobbyist for that organization.

C. Herschel Schooley, a former Abilene newspaperman and journalism teacher, who has spent 20 years in Government information positions, recently resigned his position as press assistant to Senator JOHN G. TOWER, Republican of Texas, to become Washington office manager and a lobbyist for the Independent Bankers Association.

Several Texas oil and gas companies have registered lobbyists.

One well-known one is James H. Pipkin, a Texan, who represents Texaco, Inc.

Harold S. Skinner of Houston is registered to represent the Continental Oil Co., which is headquartered in Houston.

The Humble Oil & Refining Co., headquartered in Houston, is represented by Paul H. Long of Houston and Charles C. Keeble and John M. Sprague, both of Washington.

Leonard F. Lee and the Washington law firm of Hedrick & Lane are registered as lobbyists for the Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. of Houston.

The Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. of Houston is represented by the Washington law firm of Chapman & Friedman, which is registered as a lobbyist. This is the law firm

of Oscar L. Chapman, President Truman's Secretary of the Interior.

Dick Tullis of Dallas is registered as a lobbyist for the Superior Oil Co. of Houston and Los Angeles, Calif.

William L. Shea of Washington is registered as a lobbyist for the Delhi-Taylor Oil Corp. of Dallas.

W. O. Reed of Dallas is registered as a lobbyist for Texas railroads.

Several persons have registered as lobbyists for Dresser Industries, Inc., of Dallas, and two have registered as lobbyists for the American Life Insurance Co. of Dallas.

Sydney C. Reagan of Dallas is registered as a lobbyist for the Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association of Durant, Okla.

The Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries of Dallas and the Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., of Lubbock are registered as lobbying organizations.

The North Texas Municipal Water District at Wylie, the Texas Aluminum Co., Inc., at Rockwall, and the Wherry Housing Association have Roland Boyd of McKinney as their registered lobbyist.

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 7, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—LOBBYISTS WINCE AT TITLE

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—A common caricature of a lobbyist pictures a fat, cigar-smoking, diamond-stickpin-wearing slob carrying a suitcase of bills to be doled out to lawmakers, whom he buttonholes in legislative halls, saturates with food and booze and butters up with blondes.

The picture had some basis in fact many years ago. But it is probably not accurate anywhere in the United States any more, though some elements of it still appear in State capitals.

Lobbying now lacks the color of the old days, and the picture is far from descriptive of the current Washington lobbyist. But the "new lobbyists," as Potomac persuaders like to think of themselves if they have to embrace the term "lobbyists" at all, are still having to overcome that picture implanted in the public mind.

In State capitals, lobbyists still call themselves lobbyists. But in Washington the term is unfashionable with lobbyists—it makes some of them wince—though they can't escape it because the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act's title hung it on them.

The "new lobbyist" calls himself a "Washington representative," "legislative counsel," "consultant," "legislative liaison man" or "information specialist."

His business is big business, and he is more businesslike than his professional ancestors—in fact, so businesslike he is often dull by comparison with flamboyant lobbyists of the past.

The names he gives himself actually describe him better than "lobbyist" in many cases.

He is trying, and succeeding slowly, to convince the world he is straight where some of his predecessors were crooked, a gentleman where they were boors, sophisticated where they were ignorant, honorable where some of them were bribers and cheats.

He may be a former newspaperman; many lobbyists are. He may be a former public relations man, or "press agent"; many lobbyists are. He may be a lawyer who spends only a little time lobbying, as many do. He may have become a lobbyist, as many do, via the route of petty civil servant to law student to Capitol Hill staff man to Washington lawyer to high-paid legislative persuader.

He may be a former Congressman or Senator, as many are, and have a distinct advantage over most lobbyists because he has the privilege for life of going on the floor of the legislative body he served in and talking with present Members at any time.

The Government has become so complex in the last 30-odd years that, if he is successful, the lobbyist likely has had years of familiarity with it.

The successful lobbyist may earn anywhere from $15,000 to $50,000 a year. If he is especially sharp and has a loaded client with sufficient interest at stake, he may draw down $100,000.

If he is successful, he is probably articulate, convivial, a hustler, and has an organizing knack. He will ooze confidence in whatever he is promoting and convince you be believes sincerely that what he advocates is in the national interest, whether he does or not.

He will probably be very persuasive, but not necessarily highly influential. Most lobbyists belittle the idea that they and most others are personally very influential with Congressmen, and they are probably telling the truth. Of course, when selling a client on themselves many probably tell a different story.

Most are much more successful at channeling toward Congressmen pressure from persons more influential than themselves than they are at influencing the lawmakers themselves.

A spokesman for one of the biggest lobbies in the country says a lot of money is wasted on lobbying in Washington because lobbyists don't have the personal influence the spenders think they do. The usual lobbyist does not have any personal influence with more than a few Congressmen, he said.

The lobbyist nowadays has a much bigger theater of operations than the persuader of the past. He works on at least five fronts.

First, in the only activity that by definition of the law is actually lobbying, he works directly with Members of Congress and their staff members, trying to influence legislation.

Then he represents his clients before various agencies of the executive branch of Government, roaming the halls and offices of places like the Pentagon, seeking information or contacts, trying to shape regulations and specifications in his client's interests in visits with Cabinet members and subordinates, testifying before quasi-judicial boards or arranging for others to testify, seeking administration support of his clients' legislative objectives.

None of these activities is subject to the lobbying regulation act, although some are subject to certain agency regulations on ex parte communications or other agency disclosure requirements.

The lobbyist acts as a public relations man for his clients, seeking to help their image in the press by issuing press releases or planting information with newsmen at the National Press Club.

He keeps his clients posted on what is happening in Washington that affects their interests. He may write regular reports or report regularly by telephone. Often he will try to stir them into lobbying or prodding others into it.

Much of his time is spent maintaining social rapport with various officials of value to both him and his client. He attends many parties and entertains a lot himself. One Congressman, who said he seldom accepts lobbyists' invitations, claims he would be going to parties 15 nights a week if he accepted all. New Congressmen accept plenty, but the older Members learn to be highly selective.

Naturally, Congressmen with seniority—particularly committee chairmen—are the lobbyist's preferred targets. But they are also the busiest and most difficult to see.

A chairman of two House committees, for example, said he would be talking to lobbyists 18 hours a day if he would see all who tried to see him, so he sees very few. But a Congressman with little seniority said not even one lobbyist a day tries to visit him.

In his lobbying activity as narrowly defined by the law, the lobbyist is a legislative engineer who concentrates most of his efforts on congressional committees handling legislation in which he is interested, particularly the chairmen and ranking members. The power of committees has grown with the expansion of Congress and, just in the past 2 years, with the weakening of congressional leadership in both Houses.

Just winning the favor of a committee chairman is doing half of the lobbyist's job, a prominent persuader says.

If the lobbyist wants to pass a bill, he often will write it himself or have it written, then find a Congressman—preferably a committee chairman and one for whom he has done favors—to introduce it.

He will find witnesses for the bill before the committee, perhaps write their testimony and coach them on how to answer questions, plant friendly questions with committeemen. He may testify himself. He may help the committee staff prepare a report on the bill that will get it off to a good start on the House or Senate floor. He may write the sponsor's floor speech.

Generally, he will try to make a case for his bill with facts, while buttering up the chairman and committee members to vote it out. But if mere facts won't do the trick, there are other ways he tries to win friends and influence Congressmen.

He may arrange for some legal business to come the way of the law firm in which a Congressman has not given up his interest. He may make a campaign donation or arrange for somebody else to. He may promise blocs of votes, or opposition. He may arrange a speaking engagement for which the Congressman will get an honorarium—$1,000 would not be unusual.

He may help a busy and expense-burdened Congressman in many other ways, such as taking him on fishing trips, finding tickets for sold out Broadway shows, making it possible for a daughter to have a nice social debut or be queen of the such-and-such festival. He may pick up an assortment of night club and hotel bills and dinner checks along the way to success.

Probably he will be more discreet than to say he's doing anything for the Congressman's vote. He had better be discreet, for opposition lobbyists will be looking for a chance to expose him and pour his work down the drain.

When the bill reaches the floor, he'll count votes, stiffen the backbone of waverers and direct pressure from home against opponents.

While doing everything else, he may have been arranging for influential contributors and constituents of various Congressmen to call them and urge support for his bill. And he has probably been working for a long time on indirect lobbying; that is, lobbying the people back in the Congressmen's districts so that they'll put on pressure with letters, telegrams and telephone calls.

If the lobbyist is opposed to a bill, he will also concentrate on the committee and try to bury it there, using many of the same tactics as in supporting one.

Friendship with a committee chairman, or bringing the right influence to bear upon him, may get committee vacancies filled with friendly Congressmen, get pesky legislation dropped, get an investigating committee deflected to a less bothersome pursuit, get a bill written in obscure ineffective language, or leave a tax loophole undisturbed.

How effective lobbyists are is a subject of much debate. It is easy to show that Lobby X spent so many thousands of dollars and bill Y in which it was interested was passed; but it is nigh impossible to show that the bill would not have been passed anyway and that Congressmen have not voted the way their constituents collectively probably would have voted.

Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, says some lobbies "are wholly

ineffective but take credit for what happens without, in fact, having in any way influenced events."

There are indications that the most effective lobbying consists of merely presenting true facts to Congressmen and then directing the propaganda at the people, to turn them into lobbyists.

Though lobbies are often accused of bringing ruthless pressure on Congress, lobbyists themselves and most Congressmen say the persuaders actually perform a very useful service by providing Congress expert information on legislation. To the claim that they often provide slanted information, they reply that a counter lobby on the other side of most questions will slant the information from the other side and Congress can get the truth somewhere in the middle.

Senator MCCARTHY has another argument: That expert lobbyists can help maintain a balance between Congress and the executive branch. The executive branch usually has a prepared case on legislation, sustained by expert witnesses, he said. Congress can offer in opposition the knowledge and experience of its Members, committee staffs or assistants, he said, but "often this is an unfair contest." The lobbyists can make it fairer, he said.

[From The Houston Post, Mar. 8, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—LOBBYISTS ENLISTING PUBLIC

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio, tells the story that more than a century ago Senator Thomas Hart Benton, of Missouri, quickly gave in to pressure from several lobbyists to help nail down a profitable ship subsidy.

The story goes that Benton threw in one condition: That "when the vessels are finished they will be used to take all such damned rascals as you out of the country."

YOUNG commented:

"Today Senator Benton's inspired remedy might be impossible. Thanks to the activities of the 'new lobby' such a solution would mean a big population loss."

He's right.

The reason is that today's lobbyist is not just going his solitary way trying to put the bite on Congressmen. He's trying to make lobbyists for his cause out of everybody else.

Indirectly, by interesting as much as possible of the general public in his cause, he is putting far more pressure on the lawmakers than he could possibly exert himself.

There is a growing trend toward this kind of lobbying, which already is pretty full-blown.

The spare-no-expense, no-holds-barred publicity and public relations campaigns are exciting the voters and turning the heat on lawmakers with pleasant or angry letters, telegrams and votes that are far more persuasive or frightening than mere lobbyists face to face.

Such campaigns sometimes express the will of the majority. But often they distort, exaggerate and oversimplify, and sometimes it is not clear who is behind them.

Said Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN'S special committee investigating lobbying in 1956–57:

"The ability of pressure groups to stir up such deluges (of inspired letters and telegrams) is well known to all Members of Congress. In the absence of adequate disclosure laws concerning pressure groups, Members of the Congress can only conjecture as to whether or not direct communications they receive are spontaneous expressions of constituents' views, or strands in a net held by the unseen hand of a pressure group attempting to scoop up a vote here, a vote there."

Senator YOUNG said the abuses in political pressure today are precisely in this area.

The way the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act has been interpreted—as applying only to direct communications with legislators by persons principally engaged in trying to influence legislation—Congress is barred from policing these indirect efforts of the new lobby.

Thus the expenditures reported under the lobbying act are a feeble gage of how much is really spent on lobbying these days. Only a fraction of the cost of these massive advertising and public relations campaigns, or none of it, shows up on spending reports.

This probably is much of the explanation of why the total of lobby spending reported has dropped and leveled off in the neighborhood of $4 million a year in spite of inflation, the expansion of lobbying that is obvious but difficult to prove, and the annual totals that were much higher in the early days of lobby registration.

Illustrative of the magnitude of such indirect lobbying campaigns is the program sponsored by the American Medical Association against President Truman's compulsory health insurance legislation for about 3 years, starting in 1949.

The AMA hired a California public relations firm, Whitaker & Baxter, for a grassroots campaign which, according to testimony before Senator MCCLELLAN'S committee, cost the doctors' association $4,678,157. Whitaker & Baxter registered and reported under the lobbying act, the committee said, although it allegedly made no contacts with Congress and confined its activities to public relations work at the grassroots level.

The McClellan committee developed information about an expensive campaign conducted in the mid-1950's by an organization called the Natural Gas and Oil Resources Committee (NGO), which supported the Harris-Fulbright natural gas bill.

NGO was organized by a cross-section of the oil and gas industry in October 1954, with the avowed purpose of carrying out a long-range educational program about the gas industry, including the harmful effects of Federal regulation and the benefits of an unregulated industry.

NGO raised $1,950,000 in contributions from more than 1,000 donors and between October 1954, and March 31, 1956, spent $1,753,513 in an advertising and publicity effort.

It did not consider this lobbying, since it made no direct contact with Congress to influence legislation, so it did not register under the lobbying act.

The donors, it developed, were counting on considering their contributions as operating expenses for tax purposes, until the McClellan committee brought this to the attention of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Bureau ruled they did not qualify as allowable tax deductions.

Afterward, the McClellan committee proposed that the Lobbying Act be amended to require reporting of expenditures on advertising and public relations campaigns containing implicit appeals to the public to contact Congress to influence legislation.

Pressure mail and telegrams from such campaigns often flood Congressmen's offices. Often the communications are obviously parts of inspired campaigns. Sometimes those who own the signed names don't even know the communications are sent.

In May 1961, Senator YOUNG received thousands of letters from Ohio, each asking that he oppose Senate bills 1089 and 1197 concerning the railroad industry. He concluded this was an inspired mail campaign, and a mighty sloppy one at that. Each was addressed STEPHEN A. YOUNG, whereas his middle initial is M. And the lobbyist made a telling mistake in having writers use bill numbers. Most Senators don't know bills by numbers themselves, let alone the people out in the sticks.

The McClellan committee conducted hearings on two spurious telegram campaigns. It showed that 1 Minnesota Senator in 1956 got about 900 telegrams in 2 days urging passage of the Harris-Fulbright bill and that many of the wires were sent without the knowledge or authorization of purported senders. An oil company had staged and financed the campaign.

Also in 1956, the two Senators from Massachusetts each received 80 telegrams opposing a social security bill which, though varying somewhat in content, often spelled amendment with a double m. Two insurance agents had charged the costs to their firm, the investigation showed, and some of the purported senders said they had not authorized the wires.

A campaign, fostered by the U.S. Savings and Loan League and others, last year demonstrated how a well-timed grassroots lobbying effort can bowl over Congress and the President without much of its expense being subject to reporting under the Lobbying Act.

It dropped a hailstorm of mail on Senators, urging that they oppose President Kennedy's proposal for withholding income taxes from dividend and interest payments, just as taxes have been withheld on wages for years.

Senator Paul DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, said he got about 75,000 letters against the plan, while Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said he got about 60,000.

The campaign resulted from sample letters sent out by the Savings and Loan League to its several thousand member institutions to help them prepare letters to their millions of savers.

The resulting flood of letters to Congressmen contained thousands indicating the writers thought Mr. Kennedy was proposing a brandnew tax on dividends and interest, instead of just a new way of collecting taxes already owed but often not paid.

So many misunderstood that Mr. Kennedy and the Treasury Department complained that the lobbyists had badly misrepresented his proposal. But it did not do any good to complain. The Senate killed his plan 66 to 20, although it had been passed by the House before the letterwriters went into action.

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 9, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—FOREIGN LOBBY TO COME UNDER SENATE COMMITTEE

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—Like domestic lobbying directed at the American public, lobbying by representatives of foreign interests has not received much attention from Congress in past years.

But some startling testimony about it may be developed this month by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which began both public and closed hearings on the subject last Monday after months of investigation.

Already, in the first 3 days of hearings, Committee Chairman J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, has charged that the Department of Justice has failed to enforce well the existing law for disclosing foreign lobbyists' activities. Already FULBRIGHT has accused the Department of State of being "rather casual" about the law's enforcement and failing to complain about lack of compliance with it.

Already, a State Department official testifying has suggested new legislation to require the licensing of foreign agents, subjecting them to review of their qualifications, and to outlaw foreign contributions to American political campaigns.

And already a Justice Department spokesman has testified that the criminal penalty in the present law is a heavy but unwieldy weapon and recommended that Congress give his Department a new tool. He suggested

authority to seek injunctions against foreign agents operating until they satisfy disclosure requirements.

Last year, when Congress dealt again with a bill establishing foreign sugar quotas, lobbyists for both domestic and foreign sugar interests were, in Senator FULBRIGHT's words, "thick as flies" around sugar on Capitol Hill.

FULBRIGHT started his committee's extensive investigation because of this.

Both FULBRIGHT and President Kennedy criticized the fact that fees of some of the foreign lobbyists depended on the size of the sugar quotas they could get from Congress for their clients.

If foreign governments found such success in lobbying for sugar quotas, FULBRIGHT said, they might try to increase their military and economic aid from the United States that way—or maybe already had.

The committee is trying to assess the extent to which foreign agents try to influence U.S. policies, through Congress, the executive branch, and the American public.

Unlike domestic lobbying, foreign lobbying of the public is subject to reporting.

Lobbying on the sugar bill, which sparked the current investigation, was one of the most intensive efforts in a long time, and many Congressmen thought it got out of hand.

Senator FULBRIGHT said only four lobbyists had spoken at public hearings when Congress revised the sugar quota bill in 1956, but last year no less than 22 were heard. He was disturbed not only by the proliferation of them, but also by the types of contracts they had and the size of their fees.

Shortly before he announced the investigation, the Senate Finance Committee released a document showing fees paid lobbyists who sought changes in the sugar bill. The information came from statements filed at the committee's request by 15 lobbyists for domestic interests and 25 for foreign interests.

Examples of what the document showed were:

That Oscar L. Chapman, who was Secretary of the Interior in the Truman administration, represented Mexican sugar interests and would receive a $200,000 retainer over 4 years beginning January 1, 1961, plus 25 cents a ton for any increase in Mexico's basic quota.

That I. Irving Davidson, representing Ecuadoran sugar producers, was to receive basic compensation of $500 but was to receive $1 a ton for all sugar shipped from Ecuador to the United States for 1 year after July 1, 1962, and 50 cents a ton for the following 3 years.

That James W. Riddell, representing the India Sugar Mills Association, was to receive a basic fee of $50,000 plus up to $5,000 in expenses; but if India received a quota for 3 years or more, he was to receive $99,000 plus up to $15,000 for expenses.

Riddell is a member of the law firm of Donald Dawson, one-time White House aid to President Truman.

Foreign sugar lobbyists included former assistants to Presidents Eisenhower, Truman, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, a former Congressman, a former congressional adviser and member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, a former Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, a former General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, and a former Assistant Secretary of Labor, in addition to former Interior Secretary Chapman.

Democratic industry lobbyists included a former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Nearly all, if not all, of the domestic and foreign sugar lobbyists had registered under the Federal Lobbying Act. The lobbyists for foreign interests were registered also with the Department of Justice, as required by the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938.

Administration of this act is the main concern of the Fulbright committee.

Although the term "foreign lobbyist" sometimes is applied to all who register under this act, this is very loose usage. By definition of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, such agents are not really lobbyists unless they work directly on Congress trying to influence legislation. That is when they should register with the House and the Senate.

Under the Foreign Agents Act, every agent doing business of a political nature in the United States for a foreign principal must register with the Justice Department, describe the nature of his work, list his offices and employees, list the principal's activities and report every 6 months all funds received and spent in the United States.

Distributed propaganda, printed matter sent through the mail and speeches on radio and television must be labeled foreign propaganda and copies furnished to the Library of Congress.

The Justice Department requires foreign agents to fill out registration and reporting forms much more extensive than those used for the lobby regulation act.

FULBRIGHT's committee staff, in a published preliminary study, said the four forms would satisfactorily fulfill the disclosure requirements if completed fully and accurately.

But the study said that so far the requirement of full and accurate completion of the forms has been enforced only sporadically by the Justice Department.

It said 29 indictments had been brought by the Justice Department for violations of the act between 1939 and mid-1962. But it said the Department had not brought a single action since 1945 for failure to list all activities, expenses, or principals, although a study of the registration statements disclosed a number of apparent omissions and evasions.

The study also said the Government had never brought a single case under the 1942 political propaganda labeling provisions of the act.

As of last June 30, 411 foreign agents were registered in active status. A breakdown of the 376 active agents at the end of 1960 showed 202 American citizens and domestic business firms and 174 aliens and foreign concerns.

Many large U.S. law, advertising and public relations firms and many prominent American individuals are or have been registered foreign agents.

They include Thomas E. Dewey, the former Governor of New York and 1948 Republican presidential candidate; former Congressman Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., of New York; former Secretary of State Dean Acheson; Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, and George W. Ball, now Under Secretary of State.

Foreign agents promote travel in countries they represent, seek U.S. loans, promote industrial development, buy embassies, draw up peace treaties, buy armaments and machinery, conduct propaganda campaigns, lobby bills through Congress and other things.

Their activities concerning legislation have been little explored heretofore.

[From the Houston Post, March 11, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—TAX DEDUCTION ACT WILL REDUCE LOBBYING EXPENSES

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—As if there were not already enough unidentified lobbying, Congress passed a law last year that will make lobbying cheaper and no doubt encourage a lot more.

It made expenses for direct lobbying of Congress by businesses tax deductible.

The deduction feature passed through the House of Representatives a sleeper—"a sleeping giant," Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, called it critically—without debate after the House Ways and Means Committee quietly slipped it into what had started out to be President Kennedy's tax reform bill. The committee held no public hearings on it.

President Kennedy had not proposed this windfall.

Not until the bill was being considered in the Senate did opposition come alive. A small group of Senators, mostly so-called liberals, then fought it stubbornly but lost the fight to kill it by a vote of 51 to 13.

The deduction provision has been labeled by some critics the Lobbyists Aid Act. It has also been called the Legislators Aid Act, since one highly disputable argument made for it was that it might bring legislators information lobbyists might not otherwise present.

Another critic suggested it be called the bill to authorize the purchase of State legislatures. The reasoning: Its biggest effect will be to increase lobbying in the State capitols tremendously.

Congress made the deduction apply to expenses for lobbying State and local legislative bodies as well as itself.

Here's what the provision, section 3 of Public Law 87–834, provides:

1. A business firm may deduct for income tax purposes all "ordinary and necessary" expenses for appearing before individual legislators, committees or legislative bodies of all levels of government concerning legislation or proposed legislation of direct interest to it or an organization of which it is a member. The deduction includes travel, preparation and submission of statements and the sending of communications. It does not apply to entertainment.

2. The business firm and an organization it belongs to may also deduct expenses of communicating with each other about legislation or proposed legislation of direct interest to them.

3. Dues paid by the business firm to such an organization are also deductible to the extent to which the organization uses them for lobbying.

The law specifies that no deductions will be allowed for spending in behalf of candidates in political campaigns or for advertising or other grass-roots methods to influence the general public on legislative matters, elections or referendums.

The latter specification was all the comfort Senate opponents of the deduction feature could find in the law. An effort to let business firms and their trade associations deduct lobbying expenditures for all purposes, including grass-roots campaigns, was made but failed.

The deduction provisions became effective for taxable years beginning after last Dec. 31.

Except for the few critical Senators, about the only voices raised in Washington against the deduction provision were those of the Treasury Department, the AFL–CIO and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon told the Senate Finance Committee the provision would be a "substantial change" in the law, which since 1919 had forbidden deductions for lobbying expenses. Dillon said the Treasury was opposed to all of several forms of the lobby deduction that were discussed. But the administration made no real fight against the change.

AFL–CIO spokesmen, who urged the Senate to kill the provision, said it would permit corporations to double their expenditures on lobbying and thereby increase substantially their lobbying activity.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, however, took another tack with its criticism: The deduction section was not

broad enough; it should grant tax relief for all forms of lobbying.

The House Ways and Means Committee's report on the tax bill made two arguments for the lobbying deduction:

1. Action was needed to put expenses for presentations to legislative bodies on the same tax-deductibility basis as expenses for presentations of a business firm's case in courts and before executive or administrative bodies.

2. It * * * is desirable that taxpayers who have information bearing on the impact of present laws, or proposed legislation, on their trades or businesses not be discouraged in making this information available to the Members of Congress or legislators at other levels of government.

Opponents, including Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, called the deduction provision unconscionable, discriminatory, shocking and outrageous. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, called the day the Senate passed it "one of the saddest days in the history of the Senate."

Critics said the change would cut the effective cost of lobbying for business about in half and, by shifting the burden of lost revenue to the general taxpayers, make them pay for the privilege of being lobbied, often against their own interests.

Until this change came along, the critics pointed out, the Federal tax laws had been neutral concerning expenses incurred by different groups lobbying.

The change discriminates against the ordinary citizens, who cannot deduct expenses for visiting his Congressman if he is not a businessman, they said.

PROXMIRE said the deduction gives "a thoroughly unjustified tax advantage to special business interests over the public interest." A corporation can deduct some of its dues to a lobbying trade association, but a member of the League of Women Voters or some other nonprofit organization could not deduct any of the dues to her organization for lobbying on the same legislation, he pointed out.

KEFAUVER said he could not believe "that there is such a shortage of lobbying activity that we need to encourage it by tax advantages." He added:

"It is already unfortunate that there is no lobby for consumers and the public at large to represent their interests in legislation, but it will only compound the one-sided picture we often get if we allow tax incentives to encourage more and better lobbying."

Opponents have dreamed up all sorts of inequities they say can result, such as:

A racetrack could deduct expenses of lobbying before a State legislature for on-track betting, but a minister could not deduct his expense for opposing the same legislation on moral grounds.

A manufacturer dumping waste into a stream could deduct expenses for lobbying against a State pollution law, but homeowners interested in purifying that stream by law would have to pay their legislative expenses with no deduction.

Some Senators have made predictions that the deduction will expand lobbying at all levels of Government and flood their offices with a lot more mail, telegrams, phone calls and visits.

How much it will cut Uncle Sam's revenue has not been estimated by anybody. Nobody can say how much the deductions may total.

The Internal Revenue Service expects to publish proposed regulations to carry out the new law in the spring and issue the regulations in final form this summer.

If the IRS ever adds up the lobbying deductions taken by businesses in 1963, the country should have a figure on total lobby spending in the United States that is much nearer the actual amount than has ever previously been available.

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 12, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—LOBBY LAW FAILINGS KNOWN

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act's weaknesses and shortcomings have been fairly well identified since it was included almost as an afterthought in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

As long ago as 1957, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN'S special committee to investigate lobbying political activities and campaign contributions offered the Senate a substitute law that would seem to be a considerable improvement.

But the proposals stemming from this committee's expensive investigation got no action.

Students of the present lobby law, who agree that lobbying should not be restricted but only properly identified, have pointed out these major shortcomings:

1. There is too much confusion about who should register and make contribution and spending reports, and too much is left to the discretion and conscience of the lobbyist about what he should report and need not report.

This has resulted mainly from the interpretation that the act applies only to those whose principal purpose is to influence laws—a standard hard to pin down. Some now register and report who probably do not need to, while others who probably should do not. Some report contributions and spending they probably do not need to, while others do not report such items when they probably should.

2. Nobody is administering and enforcing the law, because the law designated nobody to do it. And nobody is continually studying and suggesting improvements in the law, as is the case in most situations where an agency is charged with administering a law.

The House Clerk and the Senate Secretary, with whom reports are filed, merely act as depositories and compile the reports for listing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They do not advise persons to file or not to file, do not check on those who file once or more and then cease filing, do not check the information filed even for obvious omissions or contradictions, and do not recommend investigations of suspected violators.

For a while in 1947 and 1948, the Justice Department made an attempt at enforcing the law, getting copies of lobby reports and checking into some. But the act did not give it this responsibility, and finally the Department dropped it.

3. The law does not cover lobbying of the people in grassroots campaigns designed to bring pressure on Congress from the voters, by far the biggest effort in lobbying these days and growing all the time.

4. It does not cover lobbying in the executive branch, where lobbyists actually spend most of their time. They lobby there for two things: (1) For administration support of their legislative aims, and (2) for favorable actions on purely administrative matters. But the lobbying law does not cover either.

5. The law does not require groups or corporations which do not solicit or collect money for lobbying to register or report spending—a gaping hole through which a big business, such as a defense contractor, can pour wads of influence money of its own to make things go its way, all without bothersome disclosure.

6. Reporting requirements of the present law are so complicated they are a clerical nuisance, though they could easily be simplified.

There have been other suggestions for changes—that contingent fees for lobbying should be outlawed, a suggestion with which, however, there is strong disagreement; that Government lobbyists, such as White House and other agency legislative liaison people, should be required to register; that notices of termination of representation should be required of lobbyists or their employers; that there should be more publication of contribution and spending reports, including lists of contributors and recipients; and that a penalty should be established for sending spurious communications to lawmakers.

In 1957, after months of investigation, the eight members of McClellan's Senate committee—including then Senator John F. Kennedy—introduced a bill designed to cure many of these shortcomings. It would have done a complete overhauling.

Called the Legislative Activities Disclosure Act, it even had a name that was more to the point than the old law, which was not designed to "regulate" as its name implied and which did not even use in its body the word "lobbyist" that lobbyists so dislike.

It would have called one hired to influence legislation by direct communication a "legislative agent" and required him to register and report receipts and expenditures for lobbying.

It would also have required reports from the legislative agent's employers if they spent more than $300 a year for lobbying; from persons with legislative and nonlegislative duties if they received $300 or more a year for legislative activities, exclusive of personal traveling expenses; from persons who conduct campaigns specifically urging others to communicate with Congress in order to influence legislation; and from persons who conduct large (more than $50,000 a year) campaigns which implicitly urge others to communicate with Congress to influence legislation.

Thus the proposed law would have extended to most direct lobbying campaigns and removed some of the uncertainty about who was covered by the reporting and registration requirements by using a dollar standard instead of a hazy "purpose" standard.

The committee's bill proposed to make the Comptroller General of the United States, an agent of Congress, responsible for administering the law. He had said he thought his agency could do a good job of it.

He would have been directed to prescribe new forms and reporting procedures, compile and summarize information from the reports and report it to Congress, make investigations to determine whether all who should register and report did so and whether reports were accurate and complete, report violations to the appropriate law enforcement agencies and tell Congress what they did about them, make studies and recommendations to Congress that would further objectives of the law, and report annually to Congress on his administration—almost all duties or powers nobody has now.

The bill would have required notices of termination of representation.

It would have given radio and television the same exemptions newspapers have under the lobbying law.

It would have established a maximum fine of $10,000 (twice the present one) and the present 1-year maximum imprisonment for failure of a legislative agent to register and report. Falsification of reports would have been made punishable by a maximum of $10,000 fine and 5 years' imprisonment.

The bill would have given the attorney general power, at the request of the administrator, to seek mandatory civil injunctions to force compliance by persons or organizations other than legislative agents, such as those conducting grassroots campaigns.

Only three spending reports a year, instead of the present four, would have been required, and report-filing problems would have been simplified. Lastly, the bill would have made transmitting, uttering or publishing forged, false, countrefeit or fictitious communications to Congress punishable by up to $10,000 fine and 5 years in prison.

When MCCLELLAN introduced this bill in behalf of himself and his colleagues on May 31, 1957, the Senate referred it to its Govern-

ment Operations Committee, of which McCLELLAN was and still is chairman. And there it died.

What happened?

The Senator from Arkansas said no hearing was ever scheduled or any action taken on the bill. The bill would have required a hearing, but the committee had more time in session that year and all of the next year's session in which it could have held one.

"There was no real demand for the legislation then," McCLELLAN said, "and there was a lot of opposition."

He said he thought then and still thinks that the bill would have been a considerable improvement over the present law. But he has no plan to introduce the bill again.

The only legislation introduced so far this session that would do anything about overall revision of the present lobbying act is S. 177 by Senator CLIFFORD CASE, Republican of New Jersey. This bill, which CASE introduced in behalf of himself and Senators JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York, would establish a commission on congressional organization and direct it, among other things, to study the operation and effectiveness of existing lobbying laws. It would also direct the commission to study conflicts of interest of members of Congress.

Congress is never eager to crack down on lobbyists, and doesn't seem in the mood now. It could stir up so much trouble.

A lobbyist says it is almost impossible to get a major bill through Congress without a big lobbying campaign. He is probably right, and if he is, the prospects of better lobby disclosure legislation's being passed are pretty dim.

There's no lobbying for it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

THE GOSPEL OF FEAR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, 30 years ago this month, Franklin Roosevelt stood before a vast crowd, within a stone's throw of where we sit, and proclaimed, in the midst of a depression, that "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Thirty years later to the month, President Kennedy, before a vast crowd in Chicago, spoke of concern, of recession dangers, of growing troubles, of the jobless problem, of the turbulent sixties, of warnings, of chronic troubles. In pursuit of this fearful theme, he cited the retreat from the farm because of production efficiency, the maturing crop of war babies entering the labor market, the school dropouts, automation, the number of women in the labor force, longevity, and the availability of our senior citizens for useful work.

But in all candor, it must be pointed out that every one of these factors was operating years ago when the Republicans were in power, and at a time when Mr. Kennedy was charging them with timidity, retreat, lack of faith, lack of vision, lack of leadership. One might surmise from the general temper of the President's observations that these factors have taken on new force, new size, to plague him.

I believe a reminder is in order. It is now 2 years and 5 months since the election of 1960. The charges against Republicans made in that campaign are on the record for all to see, but so are the pledges and promises of what the New Frontier said it would do. Many things have been tried, but the number of jobless increases and Mr. Kennedy predicts that unemployment will increase some more.

But despite this concern, despite their fear complex, there is still no hint that the administration will draw back from the new ventures it proposes, such as the Domestic Peace Corps, the Youth Conservation Corps, Federal aid to education, and numerous other New Frontier proposals that will not create a single new job.

Despite all this, there is no hint of an effort to reduce the gigantic budget deficit, the swollen budget.

It is certainly not amiss to point out that:

First, the travel and entertainment regulations of the Internal Revenue Service have disemployed thousands and thousands. I have seen an estimate as high as 200,000.

Second, that the arbitrary treatment of the steel industry has built no confidence in the future.

Third, that the drive for more and more intense regulation by the regulatory agencies have not won friends and influenced future job-creating investments.

Fourth, that a planned deficit of $12 billion produces little faith and little confidence.

The lament of this tearful and fearful New Frontier over the future might better be supplanted by some words from the administration and some action which is calculated to inspire faith, not fear; confidence, not concern; hope, and not despair.

SECRET SERVICE PROTECTION FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week there appeared on the front pages of the newspapers considerable publicity concerning the so-called Secret Service people who give protection to the Vice President of the United States. In one account I read, it seemed to appear that this was something which was contrived by Vice President JOHNSON.

In all fairness, I think I must say that the bill to provide this protection was introduced by me, and was ordered reported and put on the calendar on the 16th of May 1960.

It came from the Eisenhower administration, and it had the endorsement of the Treasury Department, as indicated in a letter which they wrote on January 27, 1960. The letter was signed by Acting Secretary of the Treasury A. Gilmore Flues. It was not done at the request of the Vice President, either the incumbent or the previous Vice President. It was an administration request. It called for an amendment of title 18 of the United States Code so that the Vice President or other officer next in order of succession to the office of President of the United States or the Vice-President-elect should have this kind of protection. It provided for a criminal penalty for anyone who violated that act. It did not indicate how many people were to be assigned; nor is there an indication as to how much money Congress should appropriate for that purpose.

I wish to make it abundantly clear that this protective legislation for the Vice-President-elect and others was sponsored by the prior administration. It was introduced by me, was reported to the Senate on May 16, passed in the Senate on May 26, and was referred to the House Judiciary Committee on May 27, 1960.

A POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege. It was my distinct honor and opportunity to serve as one of the Senate delegates to the Costa Rica conference which was held last week under the very statesmanlike leadership of the President of the United States.

Last Tuesday morning the seven Presidents met in executive session at San José, Costa Rica. It was well understood that at the conclusion of that executive session the Presidents would reach an agreement on the principles to be encompassed in the final communique, but that some further time would be needed to reduce the understandings to a final draft, both in Spanish and in English. Those who have attended such international conferences, where there exists the language barrier, know that it is necessary to be particularly careful in seeing to it that the drafts in the two languages mean identically the same thing. It was understandable, therefore, that when we came out of the executive conference, the press would attempt to seek to find out what had transpired in executive session.

Each member of the U.S. delegation, including the senior Senator from Oregon, was set upon—which I believe is an appropriate descriptive phrase under these circumstances—by members of the press. They were determined to find out whatever they could as to our understandings, if any, of what transpired in the morning session.

We on the delegation took the position that it was a conference of the President and the Secretary of State, and that it would be presumptuous of us, as Members of Congress, to be holding press interviews or commenting on anything that had transpired in any conference attended by the President of the United States as the spokesman for our country.

As we walked from the National Theater, where the sessions were held, to the hotel across the street at least six or seven times various members of the press, sometimes singly, but very often by twos and threes and fours, and other numbers, sought to elicit some judgment or information about the morning session. I said the same thing to each group. As I was leaving the lobby of the hotel to go up to my room there was present Pierre Salinger, who is in charge of press relations at the White House, and who heard me when I said that I would not even comment on the weather. I said I

would make no statement. I said that in my judgment the two people who should speak for the American delegation were the President and the Secretary of State, who, I said, were doing a grand job. I said if I had anything to say about the conference I would say it when I got back to Washington, and that I had no intention of having any press interviews in San José.

In one of those instances the correspondent for the Newhouse papers—and the Portland Oregonian is the largest newspaper in my State—was quite understandably insistent upon getting some statement that he could send back to his home newspaper. I told him that my position went for him as well as the other correspondents, and that I was not even commenting on the weather in San José.

This correspondent of the Portland Oregonian sent a statement to that effect to his paper, indicating that I had declined to give the press any statement about what had transpired in that meeting. It appeared in the Oregonian of March 21.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

MORSE MUM ON MEETING

President Kennedy seems to have done what no one else has been able to do—muzzle the voluble Senator from Oregon, WAYNE MORSE.

MORSE talked freely at previous Latin American conferences attended only by Secretary of State Dean Rusk or lesser officials, even to the point of differing openly with the U.S. position.

Tuesday, MORSE emerged from an economic session to be met by reporters.

"I'm not talking until I get back to Washington," MORSE said. "This is a State Department matter."

Mr. MORSE. Well, Mr. President, it was surprising—and, in my judgment, shocking—to note the journalistic irresponsibility shown by the story written by Mr. Paul P. Kennedy of the New York Times, which resulted from my refusal to give any information in regard to what had transpired at the executive session of the seven Presidents.

I fully appreciate the job that the journalists have to do. I can understand how they would have welcomed someone in the delegation speaking out—in this instance such a person would have been speaking out of turn—and giving them some kind of story as to what had transpired in the executive session. I can understand their desire to get that kind of information. However, I cannot understand such a story as Mr. Kennedy wrote.

Mr. President, freedom of the press carries with it the responsibility of being responsible. I am shocked by the increasing frequency of irresponsible journalism in this country. In fact, we had some of this kind of experience at Punta del Este. Sometimes we get the impression that journalists are laboring under an illusion that they are a supergovernmental body in this democracy. That is not characteristic of a majority of journalists, but of too many.

As the record shows, I have never hesitated in my many years in the Senate in telling off journalists who I thought needed to be told off because of their irresponsibility.

I find none of them to be supermen; in fact, it is my considered judgment that they are very average men who, very often, write out of the depths of great ignorance, because too frequently they do not do their bookwork and are not well informed.

Any injustice that was done to the senior Senator from Oregon as a result of Mr. Paul Kennedy's article is inconsequential, for I am never concerned about injustices which are done to me by the press. Those injustices, for the most part, particularly strengthen me. The people in my State have long ago come to learn that they will never read the truth about their senior Senator from American newspapers—although I would be less than honest if I did not say that I should prefer to have the newspapers supporting my campaigns, for that would make campaigning a little easier. Nevertheless, I have learned that it is not necessary to have their support. I have been treated for many years to the overwhelming opposition of the press of my State. In the last campaign there were 3 dailies, out of all the dailies in the State, which endorsed me; and 3 weeklies out of some 60 weeklies. I have often said that the opposition of the press made me thousands and thousands of votes.

So the misrepresenting article by Mr. Paul Kennedy, published in the Western edition of the New York Times for Wednesday, March 20, 1963, will not harm the senior Senator from Oregon in Oregon. What I do resent is the injustice which it does to the Nation and the President of the United States. The article is a gross misrepresentation of the fact. It was a gross misrepresentation of fact to plant the seed of falsehood in the New York Times, Western edition, for Wednesday, March 20, 1963, seeking to give the American people the impression that the congressional delegation at San Jose was not solidly behind the President.

In my judgment, no President could possibly have had such unity of support as President Kennedy had at San Jose from the congressional delegation; he deserved it, for he displayed magnificent statesmanship at San José. As I have said since returning home, in my judgment the President never missed a cue, so to speak. He rose to every occasion in magnificent form. In fact, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion to my remarks the final communique which was signed by the seven Presidents. I think it should appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the inspiring speech delivered by the President of the United States at the dedication of a great housing project in San José. I only wish that Senators could have heard and seen the reaction of that crowd to the high ideals which the President of the United States set forth in his address, his challenge to the people of Central America to carry out the opportunities for cooperative action that the Alliance for Progress offers them and offers us. It was one of the President's great speeches.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the speech which was delivered by the President of the United States at the University of San José. It, too, was a strong challenge to the peoples of all Latin America, not merely Central America. It discussed the economic problems of Latin America, and it also discussed the Cuban problem. I ask unanimous consent for the printing of the speech by the President at the University of San Jose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MORSE. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two other statements by President Kennedy be printed at the conclusion of these remarks. One is the text of his remarks upon arrival at the San Jose airport; the second is the text of his remarks upon the convening of the President's Conference on March 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 4 and 5.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn to the article written by Mr. Paul P. Kennedy, which was published in the New York Times, western edition, on Wednesday, March 20, 1963. Incidentally, I do not know Mr. Paul Kennedy; I would not know him if he walked through the doorway. I feel that is no loss. However, this is a correspondent with whom, so far as I know, I have had no previous associations; and if this is the last one, the senior Senator from Oregon will be very happy. On the basis of this kind of subversive journalism, I do not wish to have interviews with newspaper reporters of that stripe; and this is subversive journalism because an article which misrepresents the position of the U.S. Government in a foreign land to the detriment of our country is a form of subversion. The headline reads: "Six Latin Nations and United States Sidestep Cuba Showdown."

Interesting, but untrue. If ever a subject was thoroughly discussed, it was the subject of Cuba. In fact, it was important that our Central American friends understand what our record has been with respect to Cuba. Speaking for myself on the floor of the Senate today, I can say that they were very agreeably surprised. They were not aware of the policies which the United States has followed since Punta del Este, based upon the Punta del Este Pact which all the nations signed. The headline continues: "Costa Rica Declaration Is Limited to General Pledges To Combat Communism."

The subheading reads: "Morse Dissatisfied—Kennedy Pledges Fund for Economic Study—Panama Moves Toward

Markets." And the byline is credited to Paul Kennedy, special to the New York Times.

Then the article begins. I shall read the first paragraph and then go to the gross misrepresentation in the article:

SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA, March 19.—President Kennedy and the six Presidents of the Central American States signed today a declaration covering the economic and political aspects of their 2 days of discussions here.

Down in the body of the article, the correspondent writes:

There were numerous indications this afternoon that some of the legislators in the U.S. delegation here were not happy over the Declaration of San José, as the final document is formally entitled. Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, and chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin America, was obviously nettled as he walked from the meeting of foreign ministers and the delegations this afternoon.

He declined to comment on the proceedings, saying: "I won't even comment on the weather here but when I get home I will make my views known."

Mr. President, I have already told the Senate what the senior Senator from Oregon said, as the press tried to get out of us information which would have been very improper for us to give; namely, information based upon our personal knowledge of what had happened at the executive session participated in by the seven Presidents. Mr. Kennedy simply drew a completely false and unfounded conclusion from what I said.

I told those reporters that any statement concerning the Conference should come from the President or the Secretary of State and that I would not even comment on the weather. I said:

If I have anything to say in regard to the Costa Rica Conference, I will comment on it on the floor of the Senate when I return to Washington.

Mr. President, that is what I am doing this afternoon.

Apparently, Mr. Paul Kennedy had to have a conflict. Apparently he felt impelled to write an article which would have controversy in it, without regard for the great injustice which this kind of misrepresentation does to the President of the United States. The article spreads across the continent and the hemisphere a false statement to the effect that the U.S. delegation was dissatisfied with the communique. Actually, to the contrary, we were highly pleased with the communique, as I feel certain every Member of the Senate will be when it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow, after having been placed in the RECORD today.

The next day, the editorial board of the New York Times, taking the misrepresenting article by Paul Kennedy, wrote an editorial, which was published in the western edition of the New York Times of Friday, March 22, 1963. The editorial, which is entitled "After San José," reads, in part, as follows:

Some of the delegates (Senator MORSE, of Oregon, is apparently one of them) seem to be dissatisfied with the results achieved at the Central American Conference at San José. Not enough Cuba. Not enough fire and brimstone about Castro. No threat of invasion or even an embargo on oil. Merely a call to the interior ministers of the six Central American republics to meet next month "to effect common measures to restrict the movement of their nationals to and from Cuba and the flow of material, propaganda and funds from that country."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire New York Times western edition editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AFTER SAN JOSÉ

Some of the Delegates (Senator MORSE, of Oregon, is apparently one of them) seem to be dissatisfied with the results achieved at the Central American Conference at San José. Not enough Cuba. Not enough fire and brimstone about Castro. No threat of invasion or even an embargo on oil. Merely a call to the interior ministers of the six Central American Republics to meet next month "to effect common measures to restrict the movement of their nationals to and from Cuba and the flow of material, propaganda and funds from that country."

Cuba, in fact, is scarcely mentioned in the new San José manifesto that bears the name of the Declaration of Central America. Practically this entire document is concerned with humdrum economic matters, such as fiscal policy and tariff rates. The six Republics agree to accelerate the establishment of a customs union for the benefit of the new Central American common market. They agree to cooperate in programs to improve the prices of primary commodities. They welcome the promise of the President of the United States to consider a long-term loan to the Central American Bank for Economic Integration. They agree—and this is perhaps the most important item in the catalog of their agreement—that economic and social conditions should be created to assure labor of an improved living standard through better distribution of national income.

Scarcely a mention of Cuba and Castro. Yet this declaration contains, as does the Alliance for Progress, the real nub and core of an effective anti-Castro program. The best defense against Castro—and the best offense, too—is to lift the Latin American Republics to a level of prosperity and economic democracy at which they will be impervious to Cuban propaganda and in fact a continuing incentive to the Cubans themselves to seek their own advancement by ridding themselves of Castro.

In a noteworthy speech to the Senate a few days ago, entitled "Our Castro Fixation Versus the Alliance for Progress," freshman Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN of South Dakota said:

"There can be no mistaking the fact that much of Castro's appeal to the oppressed rests on the knowledge that his presence has forced every government in the hemisphere to take a new and more searching look at the crying needs of the great masses of human beings.

"The real issue turns upon the question of whether or not the people can overturn an unjust social order through a peaceful democratic revolution, or whether they will do it by a violent Communist-led upheaval.

"The Alliance for Progress is a mutual effort to raise standards of living through the painstaking, often frustrating, method of democratic reform and economic development * * *.

"It is easier to make loud speeches against an irritable bearded dictator than to face the tough and sometimes painful tasks of making Alliance for Progress work. I suggest that we have had * * * not enough courageous and thoughtful men giving their attention to the real problems confronting the Alliance."

To the degree that it focused interest on these problems and pushed things ahead in this direction, the conference at San Jose can be considered a success.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the deans of all American schools of journalism that if they wish to see a good exhibit of irresponsible editorial writing to use in their classes on that subject, I refer them to this New York Times editorial, published in the western edition of Friday, March 22, because here again we find that an editor has engaged in the pastime of intellectual sophistry called "supposing," and, on the basis of his suppositions, has written an editorial which simply is factually untrue.

It is not pleasing to make these comments about any person or any institution, even a newspaper. But American foreign policy is so vital to the American people and is so important to the security of this country that the representatives of our free people in the U.S. Congress should not remain silent when such irresponsible journalism is spread on the pages of U.S. newspapers.

I close these remarks by saying—as the Secretary of State and the President and the members of the official executive branch delegation know—that at all times at the San José Conference the President had the support and cooperation of the congressional delegation. He was entitled to have it for many reasons, but the most important is that he was completely correct at every turn of events at the conference.

So a great disservice has been done by the New York Times, through its correspondent, Paul Kennedy, and through its board of editors, by giving the American people these two false representations concerning me and, by implication, the congressional delegation. The editors of the New York Times owe me nothing; but certainly, in my opinion, they owe an apology to the U.S. President.

I recognize that an apology never rights a wrong; but I think there is no excuse when a U.S. newspaper which claims to be responsible undermines the President of the United States by publishing an untrue article in regard to the position of the congressional delegation—or in regard to one of its members, and, by implication, the others—and which also does damage to the President of the United States, in connection with an international conference.

I have made these remarks today because in my judgment I owe them to the President, and I also have an obligation to the country to set the record straight.

Whenever I find myself in disagreement with the policy of this administration or any other administration, I shall never hesitate to say so. But I attribute the fact that I have the confidence of a great many officials in Latin America in no small measure to the fact that they know they can sit down with me and talk about United States-Latin American problems and the Alliance of Progress program, and that when I walk out of their offices I will not then proceed to hold a press interview in regard to the

matters we discussed, but will do my discussing after I return to my country.

So, Mr. President, I hope the New York Times will proceed without delay to correct the clear misstatements of fact which it has made in the editorial and in the article, which in my judgement do damage to the President of the United States. I do not care what they say about me, but I do care what they do in regard to damaging the President.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Department of State Press Release No. 145, Mar. 20, 1963]

DECLARATION OF CENTRAL AMERICA APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENTS OF CENTRAL AMERICA, PANAMA, AND THE UNITED STATES MARCH 19, 1963

The Presidents of the Republics of Central America and Panama are determined to improve the well-being of their peoples, and are aware that such a task demands a dynamic economic and social development program based on the carefully planned use of human, natural and financial resources. It also depends on important changes of the economic, social and administrative structure, within the framework of the principles that govern our democratic institutions. They have met with the President of the United States of America in San Jose, Costa Rica, to review the difficulties which impede the achievement of these objectives as well as the progress thus far made in the isthmus since the integration programs began and since the Alliance for Progress was jointly established by the Republics of the hemisphere in August 1961.

Following an analysis of the situation, the Presidents of the Republics of Central America, convinced that the best hope for the development of the region is through economic integration, and bearing in mind the extraordinary efforts made toward this end in the last decade and of the importance of accelerating overall economic growth, pledge to their peoples:

To accelerate establishment of a customs union to perfect the functioning of the Central American Common Market;

To formulate and implement national economic and social development plans, coordinating them at the Central American level, and progressively to carry out regional planning for the various sectors of the economy;

To establish a monetary union and common fiscal, monetary and social policies within the program of economic integration;

To cooperate in programs to improve the prices of primary export commodities;

To complete as soon as possible the reforms needed to achieve the objectives set forth in the act of Bogotá and the Charter of Punta del Este especially in the fields of agriculture, taxation, education, public administration, and social welfare;

To take the above measures with a view to achieving the creation of a Central American Economic Community which will establish relationships with other nations or regional groups having similar objectives.

The Central American Presidents affirm that the economic integration movement in itself constitutes an effort which is laying the groundwork for regional planning in which sectoral plans of common interest to the Isthmian Republics serve as a point of departure. Their governments have already taken measures to coordinate national plans so that their execution will aid rather than impede the achievement of the objectives of the economic integration program. It is intended that the first global plan for harmonious regional development be presented as soon as possible for evaluation in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este. Meanwhile, the Central American Presidents declare their resolve to proceed immediately with their sectoral plans and with projects of interest to the Isthmus. The President of the United States agrees to consider a long-term loan to enable the appropriate Central American regional organizations, principally the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to conduct economic feasibility surveys relative to this program of regional development.

The Presidents of Central America reaffirm their hope that the Republic of Panama will participate more closely in the economic integration movement, and the President of Panama declares that his Government fully reaffirms its support of the program of Central American economic integration. He further declares that his Government is prepared to initiate immediate negotiations with the Governments of the general treaty of economic integration as a whole with a view to concluding a special agreement to facilitate the association of his country with this program.

The President of the United States is impressed by the determination of the Presidents of the Central American Republics to move as rapidly as possible toward the integration of the economies of their countries, and of their intention to formulate a regional economic development plan within which national plans would be coordinated, and he believes that the coordination of their respective monetary, fiscal, economic and social policies is a great step forward in the achievement of this objective as well as toward the achievement of the goals set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este.

The President of the United States is prepared to offer the greatest cooperation in the preparation and implementation of the regional and national development projects of Central America and Panama and declares that his government will intensify its joint efforts with the governments and appropriate regional organizations in order to extend to them increased technical and financial assistance for this purpose within the framework of the broad regional program entitled joint exposition of the Presidents of Central America, and the development plan being prepared by Panama.

To this end he proposes a fund for Central American economic integration, to be made available through the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to which the United States would make an immediate substantial initial contribution, to assist in carrying out regional development projects in accordance with various sectoral plans now being developed by the regional organizations.

For the longer term, he also declares that as soon as the Central American Republics have formulated an overall regional development plan, and as soon as this plan has been evaluated favorably in accordance with the procedures established in the Charter of Punta del Este, the United States will enlarge and expand its participation in the fund and will work with the Central American countries in obtaining other free world resources so that the agreed plan can be effectively implemented.

The Presidents have discussed the fundamental importance to economic development of a vigorous and freely competitive private sector, and declare their intention of taking the necessary steps to encourage private investment which is prepared to accept the normal responsibilities compatible with the development of a modern economy. These measures include establishment of regional trade and promotion offices for the specific purpose of attracting private foreign investment. They also agree that development banks or corporations should be established in each country as soon as possible to provide credit on reasonable terms for the growth of private industry, the President of the United States offering financial assistance to their operation.

Concurrently they agree that economic and social conditions should be created to assure labor of an improved living standard through a better distribution of national income. Furthermore they agree to encourage and support free democratic labor organizations as a means of contributing toward greater worker participation in the common effort on behalf of the general welfare.

The Presidents also agree that opportunities should be given to the people of Central America to build and purchase their homes. There exist in Central America national savings and loan institutions which have been assisted under the Alliance for Progress, and others are about to be created. In order to give further support for these national efforts, the Presidents of Central America suggest that a regional home loan department, which would be a secondary source of home mortgage funds, should be created as a division within the Central American Bank for Economic Integration and the President of the United States agrees to offer technical and financial assistance to it.

The Isthmian Presidents indicate that Central American institutions should be strengthened as much as possible to enable them to play a major role in training the personnel who will be needed to put into effect the plans for integration of the Isthmus. A large part of the responsibility for training will devolve on the Superior Council of Central American Universities (CSUCA). Recognizing, moreover, that trained manpower at all levels is needed for economic development, they agree to the proposal of the President of the United States to establish a multimillion-dollar scholarship fund for vocational training in agriculture and in industry for young people of outstanding ability who cannot afford the normal expenses of such training, to which the United States will offer substantial financial assistance.

The Presidents note the primary role of coffee in the economies of Central America and the importance of the International Coffee Agreement for the achievement of stable and remunerative prices.

They reiterate the intention of their governments to fully support the agreement so that it will serve as an effective instrument to improve the earnings of exporting countries from coffee and to promote their economic development.

Other primary commodity problems exist and the Isthmian Presidents will hand to President Kennedy studies on these problems.

President Kennedy agrees he will have them reviewed immediately on his return to Washington.

The Presidents, notwithstanding the fact that present conditions are favorable to undertake a solution of the economic and social problems of the isthmus through joint action of the countries of the area, believe that all of them are faced with an externally provoked political problem, which by its very nature can imperil the exercise of representative democracy and the normal development of the plans in which their respective governments are engaged to attain as rapidly as possible the highest levels of economic and social justice and to bring to full realization the plans for Central American integration. Consequently, the Presidents declare that in order to carry out their programs for social and economic betterment, it is essential to reinforce the measures to meet subversive aggression originating in the focal points of Communist agitation which Soviet imperialism may maintain in Cuba or in any other place in America.

The Presidents note that the Council of the Organization of American States is actively engaged in maintaining vigilance over the

continued intervention of Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere as requested by the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers. They express special interest in early completion by the Council of the OAS of the studies on Castro-Communist subversion in the hemisphere, and particularly in early action by the Council on recommendations to the governments for counteracting those activities in these areas.

The Presidents agree that Ministers of Government of the seven countries should meet as soon as possible to develop and put into immediate effect common measures to restrict the movement of their nationals to and from Cuba, and the flow of materiel, propaganda and funds from that country.

This meeting will take action, among other things, to secure stricter travel and passport controls, including appropriate limitations in passports and other travel documents on travel to Cuba. Cooperative arrangements among not only the countries meeting here but also among all OAS members will have to be sought to restrict more effectively not only these movements of people for subversive purposes but also to prevent insofar as possible the introduction of money, propaganda, materials, and arms, arrangements for additional sea and air surveillance and interception within territorial waters will be worked out with special cooperation from the United States.

In addition to these measures, a more rapid and complete exchange of intelligence information on the movement of people, propaganda, money, and arms between Cuba and our countries is to be developed by the meeting of ministers.

The Presidents voice their deep sympathy for the people of Cuba, and reaffirm their conviction that Cuba soon will join the family of free nations. The Presidents recall how, in 1959, the Cuban people were fired with the hope of a purely Cuban revolution that was to bring them freedom and social justice; honest government and free elections; fair sharing of goods; opportunities for all; more schools and jobs, better health and housing, and constructive land reform; no collectivization of the land. In sum, a progressive republic which, in the words of Martí would be "con todos y para todos." The Presidents declare that they have no doubt that the genuine Cuban revolution will live again, and its betrayers will fall into the shadows of history, and the martyred people of the oppressed isle of the Caribbean will be free from foreign Communist domination, free to choose for themselves the kind of government they wish to have, and free to join their brothers of the hemisphere in the common undertaking to secure for each individual the liberty, dignity, and well-being which are the objectives of all free societies.

Finally the Presidents solemnly reaffirm their adherence to the principles established by the Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of Rio de Janeiro, the Charter of the OAS, in the Act of Bogotá and in the Charter of Punta del Este.

MARCH 19, 1963.

EXHIBIT 2

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT EL BOSQUE HOUSING PROJECT, EL BOSQUE, COSTA RICA

Mr. President, Mr. Minister, Ambassador, our friends from Costa Rica, we celebrate here today a great victory, and that is a victory for the human spirit, for these houses, these medical units, these books, are today freeing men and women from centuries of bondage and poverty which has imprisoned their capacity, their happiness and their future, and I am proud, as a citizen of the United States, to be here in Costa Rica taking part in this great effort.

As a citizen of a sister republic, as a strong believer in the democratic faith, we take pride in the democracy of this Republic and the other Republics of this hemisphere, but we know that our enjoyment of freedom is not so much a gift from the past as a challenge for the future, not so much a reward for old victories, but a goal for new struggles, not so much an inheritance from our forefathers as an obligation to those of us who follow, for democracy is never a final achievement. It is a call to effort, to sacrifice, and a willingness to live and to die in its defense.

Every generation of the Americas has shaped new goals for democracy to suit the demands of a new age. These goals for today's America are summed up in the words Alianza para el Progreso. They call for an end to social institutions which deny men and women the opportunity to live decent lives. They call for a better standard of living for all of our citizens in order that they may produce and live up to their capabilities. They call for an end to the remnants of dictatorship in this hemisphere, and they call for an unyielding defense against all those who seek to impose a new tyranny in this hemisphere. They call, in short, for a recognition that no man's job is done until every man in this hemisphere shares an equal opportunity to pursue his hopes as far as his capacities will carry him. That is the commitment of this country and my own, and the commitment of our sister Republics.

It is sometimes easy for us, living in our nations' capitals, to become disheartened about the nature of the struggle. but it is here with you in this project, sharing in your achievements, participating in your labors, that we renew our faith and determination to succeed, for in this project, hundreds of people will move into decent housing. By October 1st of this year, almost 8,000 people will have moved into homes financed under the Alliance for Progress, and built by the labor of the people of Costa Rica, and in every country in this hemisphere, similar housing programs must go forward. These medical units which we have seen are only a few of the 60 which will be in operation throughout Central America and Panama this year. They will provide 4 million medical examinations a year, reaching almost a third of the population of the isthmus. In them, doctors and nurses will bring modern medicine to our people who have had no protection against disability or disease, entering hundreds of villages where no doctor has been. Approximately 8,000 people in Costa Rica already have received treatment under these units.

These books we have distributed to these children are a token of a massive program which will bring more than 2 million new schoolbooks to the children of Central America and Panama. With these books, millions of children for the first time will have the tools to conquer life and make something of their future.

Education, homes, jobs, health, security—those are the things for which this country stands. Those are the things in which the people of the United States strongly believe. Those are the things which together we must achieve for our people, and I want to assure you through the Alliance for Progress we will stand and work shoulder to shoulder in making this hemisphere an example of what democracy can mean.

Viva Costa Rica. Arriba Costa Rica.

EXHIBIT 3

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF COSTA RICA, SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA

Mr. Rector, Mr. Minister, I would like first to present to you my colleagues from the U.S. Congress who have traveled with us on this voyage of the last 3 days, and I would like to have them meet you.

First, I would like to present the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the former president of the University of Arkansas, Senator FULBRIGHT.

I would like to present the leader of the opposition in the U.S. Senate, but we both agree that we love Costa Rica, Senator HICKENLOOPER.

The chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin America of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, formerly dean of the University of Oregon Law School, Senator WAYNE MORSE.

Congressman SELDEN, who is chairman of the House Committee on Latin America, Congressman SELDEN, of Alabama. And the Republican leader of that committee in the House of Representatives, Congressman WILLIAM MAILLIARD.

And the U.S. Ambassador.

It is a great pleasure to leave Washington, where I am lectured to by professors, to come to Costa Rica where I can speak to students.

I think it is appropriate that the first speech by any U.S. President to any student audience in Latin America should take place at this center of learning in a nation so dedicated to democracy, and I am honored that you have invited me here today.

For the past 3 days the Presidents of seven American nations have been grappling with the central question which faces this country, my own country, and my hemisphere, and that is whether, under a system of political liberty, we can solve the economic problems that press upon our people. We are embarked upon a great adventure together, and that is the task of demonstrating to a watching world that free men can conquer the ancient enemies of man, poverty, ignorance, and hunger; of protecting freedom against those who would destroy it; of bringing hope to those who search for hope; of extending liberty to those who lack it.

This is an immense task, filled with difficulty and hardship and danger, but you have been given an opportunity to shape the destiny of man which has been given to no other generation in the last 2,000 years. And as a fellow American, I know that you welcome that responsibility and that opportunity. What Franklin Roosevelt said to the American people in the 1930's I say to you now: This generation of Americans, your generation of Americans, has a rendezvous with destiny. I am confident that you will meet that rendezvous, for I can remember my own country when it was quite different from our country today. It was not so many years ago that I was a university student as you are now, and at that time, only 1 in every 10 American farms was electrified, half of the farmers in our Southland were tenant farmers and sharecroppers, thousands of families in the Tennessee Valley had cash incomes of less than $100 a year, and all this in addition to a great depression which threw 12 million men and women out of work and had 20 million Americans on relief—that in that time I was at the university.

Then, under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt, we carried through a great New Deal for the United States. One program after another brought an end to tenant farming in the United States, electrified nearly every farm in our country, transformed the poverty-ridden Tennessee Valley into one of the richest agricultural and industrial areas in the United States. It demonstrated in those great years the immense power of affirmative, free government, the power which adds the idea of social responsibility to individual liberty.

The history of your country in the last years has demonstrated that same quality. And if the task of progress with freedom is more complex, more subtle, and more difficult than the promise of progress without freedom, we are unafraid of that challenge. We are committed to four basic principles in this hemisphere in the Alliance for Progress. The first is the right of every nation to govern itself, to be free from outside dictation and coercion, to mold its own economy and society in any fashion consistent with the will of the people.

Second is the right of every individual citizen to political liberty, the right to speak his own views, to worship God in his own way, to select the government which rules him, and to reject it when it no longer serves the need of a nation.

And third is the right to social justice, the right of every citizen to participate in the progress of his nation. This means land for the landless, and education for those who are denied their education today in this hemisphere. It means that ancient institutions which perpetuate privilege must give way. It means that rich and poor alike must bear the burden and the opportunity of building a nation. It will not be easy to achieve social justice, but freedom cannot last without it.

And the fourth principle of the Alliance is the right of every nation to make economic progress with modern technological means. This is the job, it seems to me, of all of us in this hemisphere, in this decade, all of you who have the opportunity to study at this university, and that is, as I said at the beginning, to demonstrate that we can provide a better life for our people under a system of freedom, to demonstrate that it is our adversaries who must build walls to hold their people in, who must deny their people the right not only of freedom, but economic advancement as well. It is no accident that this year in Cuba agricultural production will be 25 percent below what it was 5 years ago. The great myth of the 1950's was that through a system of communism it was possible to produce a better life for our people; through a denial of political freedom we could provide more material advances, but the fifties showed us well, in China, the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, East Berlin, and Cuba, that when you deny political and social freedom, you also deny the right to advance economically.

Gracias. I want to express the thanks of all of us to you for having us here today. Occasionally, universities are regarded as dangerous places for Presidents, and we are grateful to you for your warm welcome to all of us on this occasion. We also want to express our thanks to the people of Costa Rica. Every one of us will go home with the most profound impression of what a strong, vital people can accomplish, and I think that this journey to Costa Rica has illuminated the minds of 180 million people of what a great opportunity and privilege we have to be associated together in our common cause. Viva Costa Rica. Arriba Costa Rica. Muchas gracias.

EXHIBIT 4

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY UPON ARRIVAL AT LA SABANA AIRPORT, SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA

Mr. President, I want to express my warm appreciation to you and the people of Costa Rica for your welcome to us today.

About 500 years ago, Christopher Columbus, after having discovered Costa Rica, turned from Panama and began his last journey home. He described this fourth voyage as the "high journey," the high voyage, and I feel in a very real sense that this is a high voyage for all of us who meet today in this free and democratic country. Our high voyage, Mr. President, is not to seek new lands to conquer, but to make sure that old lands remain free. We don't seek gold for a few in our voyage; we seek a better life for all of our people.

Mr. President, the purpose of our meeting is, as you have suggested, to see what our countries, working together, the United States and the countries of the isthmus. we working together, can do for our people to make sure that along with a system of political independence, hand in hand will go economic well being.

It is our responsibility in this hemisphere, in this isthmus, in my own country in the 1960's, to demonstrate that economic prosperity is the handmaiden of political liberty. That is the responsibility of all of us. If we meet that responsibility, then this country and all countries like it in this hemisphere will remain free. If we do not meet this responsibility, then their inevitable fate will be one of enslavement by those who already have indicated their desire to crush out independence in this hemisphere.

So this meeting is most vital, and I want you to know, Mr. President, that I come here today not only with the Members of the Congress and the Secretary of State and others, but I come here today with 180 million fellow Americans who want this hemisphere to be an example to a watching world in the crucial years of this century and this decade.

And, Mr. President, I want to express again our thanks to you. We could not feel more at home a thousand miles from the United States than here in Costa Rica.

EXHIBIT 5

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON CONVENING THE PRESIDENTS' CONFERENCE, TEATRO NACIONAL, SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA

Presidents of the Central American Republics, President of Panama, Your Excellencies the First Ladies of the Central American Republics, members of the diplomatic service, the Archbishop, ladies and gentlemen, I think the extraordinary statements which we have heard this afternoon will serve to illuminate for the people of this hemisphere, and particularly for the people of the United States, the harsh and striking challenges we face in these Republics and in the other Republics of this hemisphere in attempting to improve the life of our people. The statements that have been made today I think serve as a call to action by all of us, north and south, to move ahead in these days before time passes by.

In 1825, a son of El Salvador and a citizen of Central America, Antonio Jose Canas, the first minister accredited by the United Provinces of Central America to the United States, delivered an invitation to Secretary of State Henry Clay. He asked him to send representatives to the first Inter-American Congress at Panama, a meeting at which, he said, the struggling new nations of this hemisphere "might consider upon and adopt the best plan for defending the states of the New World from foreign aggression, and * * * raise them to that elevation of wealth and power, which, from their resources, they may attain."

Today, 138 years later, we are gathered in this theater in pursuit of those same goals—the preservation of our independence, the extension of freedom, and the elevation of the welfare of our citizens to a level as high as from our resources we can attain. And today I have come from the United States at the invitation of a Central America which with Panama, is rapidly attaining a unity of purpose, effort and achievement which has been unknown since the dissolution of that earliest federation.

That early conference did not achieve all its goals. But from it flowed the dream and creation of Bolivar, and Canas, and Jose Cecilio de Valle of Costa Rica—the dream which became the inter-American system and this system has been the most successful, the most fruitful and the most enduring of international order in the history of the world.

We can say this because every effort to reimpose the despotisms of the Old World on the people of the New has ultimately been beaten back—because within this system 20 Republicans have attained the full recognition of their dignity as sovereign nations, and because this system has maintained an unmatched record of peaceful relations among its members. There have been occasional conflicts to mar this record. But nowhere else have nations lived as neighbors with so little hostility and warfare. And today the principles of nonintervention and the peaceful resolution of disputes have been so firmly imbedded in our tradition that the heroic democracy in which we meet today can pursue its national goals without an armed force to guard its frontiers. In few other spots in the world would this be true.

We have not attained this strength by merely trying to protect what was already won, to preserve the gains of the past, to maintain the status quo. If these were our system's goals, it would inevitably have crumbled as old orders crumbled. Instead, it has survived, prospered and grown, despite wars and revolutions, despite changing ideologies and changing technologies, despite shifts in power and shifts in wealth—because it has itself been an instrument of change, profound revolutionary change which has molded the history of this hemisphere and shaped the thinking of men seeking freedom and dignity in all lands. As each powerful new wave of ideas and aspiration has swept across our shores, the inter-American system has been able to translate these ideas and aspirations into a working reality for our people. In this respect it has been unique among efforts at world collaboration. That is why it has endured in the past and must endure in the future.

In the first three centuries of our history, the seeds of Western civilization and culture were planted here.

In the next century, we established an inter-American system which helped to complete and maintain our freedom from foreign rule. This freedom has often been challenged—as today it is challenged in Cuba. But with the help of dedicated and brave men—men such as those who drove out Maximilian or men such as those who prevented the Spanish reconquest in 1866, men such as Costa Rica's Mora, who helped to drive out William Walker—with such help, we have destroyed all efforts at foreign conquest in the past, as we will ultimately triumph over the new conquerors of today.

In the 50 years following its creation, the inter-American system worked to establish the political equality and national dignity of all its members, to extend political democracy and strengthen the principle that no nation should forcibly impose its will upon another. Those goals have been largely met. The equality of sovereign states is accepted by all. Intervention and force have been renounced. Machinery of peaceful settlement has been strengthened. Democracy rules in most of our lands. It will ultimately prevail over the last vestiges of tyranny in every land in this hemisphere.

Now, in our own time, the inter-American system faces old foes and new challenges; and it is again demonstrating the capacity for change which has always given it strength. The foes are stronger and more determined than ever before and the challenges are more difficult, more complex and burdensome. For today we are faced not merely with the protection of new nations, but with the remolding of ancient societies—not only with the destruction of political enemies, but with the destrucion of poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease—not alone with the creation of national dignity but with the preservation of human dignity.

To meet this enormous challenge, the peoples of the Americas have fashioned an Alianza para el Progreso, an alliance in which all the American States have mobilized their resources and energies to secure land for the landless, education for those without schools, and a faster rate of economic growth within a society where all can share in the fruits of progress.

Here in Central America we have already begun to move towards the goals of the Alianza.

You have made enormous strides toward the creation of a Common Market of 13 million people. New regional institutions have been created; a central bank has been established; and centralized planning and direction are going ahead in education, finance, and many other fields. I congratulate you on your effort to reestablish an historic unity to meet new needs; and I pledge my Government's continued assistance to that great effort.

In addition, you have begun to formulate the long-range economic development plans essential to the success of the Alianza. The organization of the Central American Joint Planning Mission gives new impetus to planning on a regional development scale.

In nearly every country represented here, new land reform or tax reform programs have been adopted in an effort to meet the basic pledges of increased social justice contained in the Charter of Punta del Este and demanded by all of our people.

In the 2-year period beginning July 1961, under programs supported by the United States as part of its contribution to the Alliance, almost 3,000 new classrooms will have been built in the nations represented here today; almost a million new books have been distributed; and tomorrow we will begin to distribute more than 2 million more to children hungry for learning. Much more remains to be done.

Some 7,600 new homes will have been built during this 2-year period under Alianza programs in these nations—but much more remains to be done.

Three-quarters of a million children will have been fed, but many are still hungry.

Nearly 6,000 new teachers have been trained, as well as many thousands of agricultural workers, public health, and other public administrators. Still more are needed.

During the last 18 months, almost 3 million people in Central America—farmers, workers, children, and slumdwellers—have received some form of direct benefit under the Alianza; and almost $250 million of external resources have been committed in support of the Alliance in Central America and Panama, to help strengthen the basic structure of the economy and at the same time meet the basic needs of the people for improved health, education, housing, and institutions.

Finally, a revolutionary worldwide agreement to stabilize the price of coffee has been entered into which we in the United States are determined to make work—to protect your most vital source of export earnings. As every speaker here today has said, all of these countries sell their agricultural commodities in a sense at wholesale, and buy their manufactured goods at retail, and pay the freight both ways. And we are also willing to move ahead on agreements stabilizing the prices of other commodities, so that your future prosperity will not depend on the often destructive fluctuation of prices beyond your control.

Tomorrow, at El Bosque, we will see with our own eyes how the Alianza enters into the lives of citizens of Costa Rica—providing them with new homes in which they and their families can find decent shelter for the first time.

We shall continue under the Alliance to build economies more balanced and less dependent on one or two export commodities. To this end we must push forward plans for industrialization, greater crop diversification, stronger educational facilities, and better utilization of resources.

Yet we cannot be, and I know none of us are, satisfied with the progress we have made. Peoples who have waited centuries for opportunity and dignity cannot wait much longer. And unless those of us now making an effort are willing to redouble our efforts, unless the rich are willing to use some of their riches more wisely, unless the privileged are willing to yield up their privileges to the common good, unless the young and the educated are given opportunities to use their education, and unless governments are willing to dedicate themselves tirelessly to the tasks of governing efficiently and developing swiftly, then let us realize our Alianza will fail, and with it will fall the society of free nations which our forefathers labored to build.

Unfortunately, while this new endeavor goes forward, we are also confronted by one of the oldest of our enemies. For, at the very time that newly independent nations rise in the Caribbean—the people of Cuba have been forcibly compelled to submit to a new imperialism, more ruthless, more powerful, and more deadly in its pursuit of power than any this hemisphere has known. Just when it was hoped that Cuba was about to enter upon a new era of democracy and social justice, the Soviet Union, through its Cuban puppets, absorbed the Cuban nation into its empire—and it now seeks to extend its rule to the shores of the continent itself.

But other foreign powers have discovered that the American Hemisphere is not fertile ground for foreign tyranny, and that any effort to spread such rule will meet with fierce and unyielding resistance. For Americans will not easily yield up those freedoms which they shed so much blood to achieve.

At the OAS, at this meeting, and wherever Americans gather to consult about the future of their continent, we will continue to strengthen the structure of resistance to subversion. I am hopeful that at this meeting we will again increase our capacity to prevent the infiltration of Cuban agents, money, and propaganda. We will build a wall around Cuba—not a wall of mortar or brick or barbed wire, but a wall of dedicated men determined to protect their freedom and sovereignty. And in this effort, as in all the other necessary efforts, I can assure you the United States will play its full part and carry its full burden.

In 1822, Bolivar, the father of the inter-American system, said this: "United in heart, in spirit, and in aims, this continent * * * must raise its eyes * * * to peer into the centuries which lie ahead. It can then contemplate with pride those future generations of men, happy and free, enjoying to the full the blessings that heaven bestows on this earth, and recalling in their hearts the protectors and liberators of our day."

My friends and colleagues, today we meet, representing seven of the great Republics of America, united in spirit and in aims. We are confident of our ultimate success in protecting our freedom, in raising the living standards of our citizens, in beginning a new era of hope in American history. Secure in that confidence, we, too, can look forward to future centuries knowing that our descendants may also gratefully recall in their hearts the protectors and liberators of our day.

Thank you.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT BY ADDITIONAL STATES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to announce to the Senate that two additional States have ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which the 87th Congress submitted to the States last August. Those States are Tennessee and Connecticut.

This brings to 25 the number of States which have ratified this important Constitutional amendment which would eliminate the prerequisite that payment of a poll tax or any other tax be a requirement for voting for President, Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senators or Representatives in Congress.

Mr. President, I am particularly pleased by the favorable action of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee. The Senate of the Tennessee Legislature on last Wednesday, March 20, approved the amendment by a vote of 22 to 1; and on the following day, March 21, the Tennessee House approved the amendment by a vote of 55 to 20, thus completing ratification by that State—the first Southern State to ratify the amendment.

I wish to express my profound appreciation to my distinguished friends, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who cosponsored and vigorously supported passage of my resolution proposing the amendment in the 87th Congress, and his colleague [Mr. GORE], who likewise supported passage of the resolution. Each of them has worked valiantly in seeking its ratification by the legislature of their State.

I likewise express my deep appreciation to Governor Clement, of Tennessee, for his most effective leadership in this matter.

In the case of Connecticut, the senate of that State's legislature approved the anti-poll-tax amendment on last Wednesday, March 20, by a unanimous vote of 33 to 0, completing ratification by the State, the house having previously approved the amendment on March 6 by the overwhelming vote of 251 to 4.

Mr. President, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the two distinguished Senators from Connecticut—Senator DODD, who cosponsored, warmly supported, and directed his efforts toward ratification of the amendment by the Legislature of Connecticut; and Senator RIBICOFF, who likewise has vigorously supported ratification by the legislature of his State.

In addition to the good news from Tennessee and Connecticut, I have been informed that the House of Representatives of the Pennsylvania Legislature has voted favorably on ratification of the amendment, but I do not know the date on which the Pennsylvania House acted or the vote. I understand that the concurrent resolution is now pending before the Senate of the Pennsylvania Legislature, and that the indications are that it will be favorably acted upon at an early date.

Either the house or the senate of the legislatures of four other States have approved the amendment. Those States are Arizona, Kansas, Wisconsin, and Missouri.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend. First, I wish to say that in connection with this matter I am very greatly indebted to the senior Senator from Tennessee. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Judiciary Committee, he kindly allowed me to be heard on this matter on two or three different occasions, in different Congresses. Under his leadership, the subcommittee favorably reported the resolution proposing adoption of the amendment.

He supported us on the floor. He went further, and in the 86th Congress, when an amendment of his own was pending, he was gracious and generous enough to permit me to offer my amendment and to aid me in offering it as an amendment to his amendment. Then he followed with the superb work which he has done with the legislature of his own State. I wish publicly to express on the floor of the Senate and as a part of the permanent Senate RECORD my sense of very deep appreciation to the senior Senator from Tennessee, who has done a yeoman's work in this whole matter.

I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am most gratified for the kind remarks of my colleague from Florida. It has been easy to work with him for this important resolution for a constitutional amendment because of the consistent, progressive, and intelligent leadership that he has given the effort. The Senator from Florida is doing one of the finest services that has been done in the Senate during my tenure here in pointing out the importance of this amendment to the Constitution and in urging State legislatures to ratify it.

I am gratified that the Volunteer State, the State of Tennessee, has ratified the amendment by overwhelming votes—as has been stated, 22 to 1 in the senate, and 55 to 20 in the house of representatives—and that the ratification of the amendment by the State of Tennesseee represents the first ratification by a Southern State. I know that as the legislatures of other Southern States meet, the amendment will be approved by other States which realize the importance of doing away with the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

Mr. President, in all States where poll taxes have been in existence and where they have been eliminated there is a better grade of citizenship. We have more participation in elections. We have better expression of the will of the voter and a better formulation of public opinion. I did what I could to urge ratification of the amendment on the part of the senate and the house of representatives in Tennessee. My colleague [Mr. GORE] did likewise.

But without the leadership of the Governor of Tennessee, Frank Clement, this great record would not have been made. He has worked diligently on the problem. He has urged the legislature to ratify the amendment. While on some matters we have not always seen eye to eye, I have been very happy to join with him in this effort. While we in Tennessee think we have the most progressive State in the South, I feel that other Southern States will follow suit in this march toward greater democracy in the United States and greater rights to the voters of our country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate those cordial and very generous remarks of the Senator from Tennessee. We have here exemplified again the fact that people in public life who do not agree on many things have made common cause on this particular subject. We have seen it in the bipartisan pressing of this issue on the floor of the Senate, on the floor of the House, and in the followup with the State legislatures. We have seen it in almost every State. I think that the remarks of my distinguished friend from Tennessee have made it clear that, even within a party, leaders who are not of exactly the same philosophy have found it equally important to join in the furtherance of this effort. I have already expressed my appreciation of Governor Clement's leadership in this field. I say again that without the continued, devoted effort of the senior Senator from Tennessee, I doubt very seriously if the State of Tennessee would have acted as it has. Certainly we would have had greater difficulty in getting favorable action here in the Senate without his help. I again express my appreciation.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to know how many States have now ratified the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to say 25 States have now ratified the amendment, so far as I know. We have been informed that one more State may complete ratification of the amendment today or tomorrow. We know of five States altogether which have ratified by action of one house of the legislature. We know of several others which are considering the matter with apparent favorable prospects.

We are pushing as rapidly as we can. We do not have an organized campaign. We have not attempted anything of that kind. The good and kindly efforts of the Senators here on this floor, on both sides of the aisle—and I include in those who have worked hard the distinguished Senator from Idaho—those efforts have been more responsible for favorable action than any other one source. But in some States we have had, just as we have seen in Tennessee, aggressive action by the Governors of those States. I hope that we shall learn as we go along just who has been providing the aggressive leadership. I certainly want to be equally fair to all who have participated and will participate. The effort is not a personal one. We wish to eliminate something which I think has been harmful to good government and the citizens of our country.

Mr. CHURCH. I think the signal progress of so many States having ratified the amendment in so short a time testifies to the high merit of the amendment. I wish personally to extend my congratulations to the Senator from Florida for his effort. He has rendered very great service to his country.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. I, too, wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Florida for his ingenuity and foresight in bringing the amendment to the attention of the Senate and the people of America. He sponsored the resolution at the last session of the Congress. Maryland was, I believe, the fifth or sixth State to ratify the amendment.

It is very fitting that today, the 330th birthday of Maryland, the Senators should bring up this matter.

On behalf of Marylanders, I desire to say to him that we are very grateful to him for having brought to our attention the fact that the Tennessee Legislature ratified the amendment. It is very fitting that on our 330th birthday of Maryland we should pay tribute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. I have already stated in the RECORD previously that we are indebted to him and to his colleague for the bipartisan leadership which resulted in favorable action by his great State. I appreciate his kind remarks today.

I yield the floor.

PEACETIME VETERANS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a result of our country's farflung responsibilities, American servicemen stationed in many parts of the world are frequently exposed to dangers as great as those in active warfare. These brave men should be entitled to receive the same protection and benefits as our wartime veterans. I have joined in sponsoring legislation which would authorize benefits for such veterans and their dependents who have served in an area which the President may designate as an "area of hostilities."

A recent series of reports published by the Newhouse newspapers throughout the country graphically describes the kind of fighting that these so-called peacetime veterans are experiencing. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the three-part series by Jules Witcover, which appeared in the Syracuse Herald-Journal and other Newhouse newspapers on February 10, 11, and 12.

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

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Feb. 10, 1963]

UNITED STATES AT PEACE, BUT AMERICANS DYING IN HOT "COLD WAR"

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Though the United States has been officially at peace for nearly a decade, Americans have been serving and dying in foreign lands throughout that time. For these men and their survivors, there has been nothing cold about the cold war. This is the first of a three-part series about their sacrifices.)

(By Jules Witcover)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—On July 27, 1953, the day an armistice was signed in the Korean war, Soviet Mig fighters gunned down an American RB–50 reconnaissance plane over the Sea of Japan. Sixteen Americans lost their lives. Since then, more than 100 others have died in the cold war.

Many of them, like those who have perished in south Vietnam and Laos; have been soldiers and airmen in a kind of hot combat that mocks such expressions as cold war.

Many others, including several score in south Vietnam and four in Laos, have died in incidents the Pentagon calls "not the result of actions by hostile forces." The distinction is lost on the families of such men.

To the casual reader, the recent heavy casualties in southeast Asia may have

seemed to be a sharp, sudden break in a long period of unruffled peace. To hundreds of service families and their friends, they have constituted a particularly hard period in a decade of apprehension, uncertainty and sorrow.

On November 7, 1954, a B–29 was shot down by a Soviet plane over northern Japan. All 11 crewmen bailed out and were picked up. But one American was dead when they found him.

On August 17, 1955, a propeller-driven T–6 trainer was shot down by a North Korean plane in the Korean theater, killing the American observer.

On September 2, 1958, a C–130 transport was attacked by three Soviet jet fighters over Soviet Armenia and crashed. The bodies of six crewmen were returned by the Russians 3 weeks later. Eleven other crew members were never heard from and are presumed dead.

On July 1, 1960, an RB–47 reconnaissance plane was shot down over the Barents Sea off the Arctic coast of the Soviet Union. Four Americans lost their lives. Two others were released 7 months later.

Until the start of the major U.S. military commitment in southeast Asia, these were the most highly publicized cold war incidents in which Americans made the supreme sacrifice. But there were others—scores, even hundreds of them.

In the same periods, American military men died in what have come to be considered routine incidents—routine in terms of military experience: Planes crashing in training, on patrol or trying to land on the deck of a carrier in rough seas: auto and truck accidents, accidents in everyday drill.

But to the widows, parents, and children of the men who lost their lives, there was nothing routine about them. The incidents brought grief just as profound as did any death of an American soldier or sailor in World War II.

The Army alone lists 2,909 "accidental military fatalities" to its troops overseas in the period July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1962, of which 2,007 occurred in Europe and 902 in the Pacific. Comparable statistics are not kept by the Air Force and Navy.

Just how many lives have been lost in the cold war is a question neither the Pentagon nor the State Department is prepared to answer. To draw the line between a man who died in a hot incident along the Iron Curtain and one who perished in training made necessary by the cold war conflict, their officials say, would be an injustice to both.

Thus, in the recent Cuban crisis, the only clear-cut fatality listed by the Defense Department was Air Force Maj. Rudolf Anderson, Jr., of Greenville, S.C., pilot of the U–2 photo reconnaissance plane reported shot down over the island October 27.

However, in another incident directly related to the crisis, seven Air Force crew members of the C–135 stratolifter cargo transport perished when their plane crashed while making an approach to the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, October 22.

The Navy does not list this crash—nor any other that has occurred in the last decade—as a cold war casualty. The term is a diplomatic one, not a military one, service spokesmen insist. The loss of any service life in this twilight period of limited war and counterinsurgency, whether under fire overseas or in training in the States, is a cold war casualty, they say.

Even on the so-called quiet fronts of the cold war—like Korea, where an armistice has been in effect for nearly 10 years—Americans are dying. The latest was the death last November 20 of 18-year-old Army Sp4c. James Allen Johnson, of Paris, Ky.

Johnson, who was one of three cold war victims mentioned by President Kennedy in this year's state of the Union message, was ambushed by North Koreans while he stood guard in an observation post along the South Korean border. He had been in the Army 13 months and 16 days.

It is perhaps a measure of the casual American attitude toward the cold war that the Army, asked how many other James Allen Johnsons there have been in Korea since the armistice, cannot provide the answer.

In World War I, in World War II, even in what is still euphemistically called the Korean conflict, a compilation of the number of Americans killed in any theater of action was readily available after notification of next of kin.

So it is now concerning Americans who die in Vietnam. The Pentagon prints up a weekly list of deaths there, dating back to January 1, 1961, from actions by hostile forces. The situation has become hot enough to warrant hot-war treatment in this regard.

But in Korea and in West Germany the Americans who have died as a result of hostile action or otherwise are not toted up on any list by the services. War's grimmest statistics, like the cold war itself, become blurred and hard to lay your hands on in the era of limited war and limited concern.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Feb. 11, 1963]

THREE DEATHS POINT UP U.S. COLD WAR LOSSES

(By Jules Witcover)

WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 11.—President Kennedy, concluding his state of the Union message to Congress on January 14, singled out three men who died in the cold war in recent months as a reminder of the commitment the United States continues to make in the fight against communism.

The name of one of the three, Air Force Maj. Rudolf Anderson, Jr., of Greenville, S.C., was recognizable to millions of Americans as the U–2 pilot killed on a photo-reconnaissance flight over Cuba in the heat of the October crisis.

The names of the other two—Marine Sgt. Gerald Pendall, of Macomb, Ill., and Sp.4 James A. Johnson, of Paris, Ky.—were not. Pendell was one of five Americans killed last October 6 when their helicopter crashed into a mountainside in south Vietnam. Johnson was killed last November 20 when North Koreans ambushed his observation post on the border between North and South Korea.

Of the two, the marine sergeant is the more typical of the men who are on the firing line of the cold war—a career serviceman, married and the father of four small children, a specialist in marine aviation enroute to an outlying fuel station established to meet the heavy demands of U.S. helicopters.

The Army specialist 4, the equivalent of a World War II corporal, was single, 18 years old, just out of high school, an enlistee only 13 months earlier. He was standing his post peacefully with two other young soldiers who survived the ambush.

Sergeant Pendell's wife, Donna, back at Macomb with the children—ages 8, 5, 4, and 2—is a service wife who has lived with the risks of the cold war for a long time and has been exposed to the military environment. She knows why her husband was sent to Vietnam, and why he had to die there.

"My husband was a very dedicated Marine and he was satisfied he was doing his work," she says calmly. "His letters told me some things, but I didn't think it was so bad over there until it happened.

"I've always been around military bases and have been more aware of the cold war than the people in a small town in Illinois. I know it's necessary."

Specialist Johnson's mother, Mrs. James Johnson, at home with her husband and three other sons, knows only that going into the Army was what her son wanted to do. To her, the cold war is an indefinite thing that suddenly entered her home.

"He joined the Army to serve his country, and they put him in Korea," she says. "He never complained. He was doing what he wanted. I appreciate the President taking time out to mention him."

Though brief conversation quickly reveals the difference between the two women in terms of their comprehension of cold war politics, there is little basic difference in their attitudes in this first difficult period of adjustment.

They are proud of their men in an unspoken way; somewhat surprisingly perhaps, they voice no bitterness that their men have been taken from them while the rest of America goes blissfully about its peaceful pursuits.

"A lot of people here woke up when the news came about my husband," Mrs. Pendell says. "But people in a small town can't be expected to really comprehend. They need something like the Cuban crisis close to home to reach them."

Says Mr. Johnson: "Most people listen to the news, but if it doesn't hit their own families they don't know. You can't blame them."

Others who have lost men in the cold war reflect in different words the same mood of understanding.

Mrs. Archie T. Bourg, of Baton Rouge, La., mother of Airman 2–C Archie Bourg, Jr., one of 11 Americans never recovered in the crash of a C–130 transport over Soviet Armenia in 1958, says: "The American people are always ready to take up arms to defend their country. But this is just something they read about."

There is, of course, some bitterness among some of the widows and mothers. But it is mostly bitterness against bureaucratic callousness in handling personal matters, or in the Government's inability to project to the public the depth of American sacrifices. They do not question the need for committing troops to cold-war fronts.

Mrs. Julia Oshinskie, of Shamokin, Pa., mother of Airman 1–C Robert J. Oshinskie, another of the never recovered in the 1958 crash over Soviet Armenia, says she never has received a satisfactory answer on what happened to the plane, and adds:

"Hardly anyone remembers how that plane was shot down 4 years ago. We throw out a lot of propaganda on our gains, but why didn't they keep reminding the public of the toll we have paid?"

Mrs. Edgar W. Weitkamp, of Arlington, Va., wife of an Army warrant officer whose body never was recovered from a transport crash in Laos in March 1961, says, "We've got to stop communism someplace." But she does not understand why the Government did not press at the Geneva talks later that year for the return of her husband's body.

And of the public's apparent apathy toward the cold war, she adds: "Only in this thing with Cuba did people suddenly realize something is going on in this world. For the first time they felt fearful. They don't even read the papers. It won't be a personal thing until they're personally involved, the way I am."

And there are those, like Mrs. Pauline Tencza, of Fairfax, Va., wife of Army Lt. Col. Anthony J. Tencza, who died in Vietnam in a helicopter crash last July, who have lived through "hot" conflicts like World War II and Korea and feel somehow singled out by the cost of a "limited" war.

Her husband had 21 years in the Army and had received two Purple Hearts in Korea before he was sent to Vietnam.

"In total war you expect it to happen, and every family is in the same boat," she says. "But it's hard for the families that are hit when it's less than a total war."

According to a man who has dealt with numerous survivors of men lost in the cold war, Chief of Air Force Chaplains Gen. Robert P. Taylor, those who express bitterness or

any doubts about the need for cold-war losses are in a distinct minority.

"Most widows react as courageously as those of World War II did," he says. "They may not comprehend the full meaning of the cold war, but they respond with the same patriotism that has buoyed up American women in all wars."

As for the public's reaction, General Taylor says:

"I'm not so sure the people at large are to blame for their lackadaisical attitude. Maybe the military hasn't kept them abreast of the importance of the cold war. When the people are truly informed about what it really means, they will rally."

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Feb. 12, 1963]

U.S. FIGHTERS IN VIETNAM GO BENEFITLESS AND UNSUNG

(By Jules Witcover)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—Though hardly a week goes by now without the death of another American serviceman in Vietnam, the U.S. troops there are still considered by their Government to be serving peacetime duty.

Among the official distinctions drawn by Uncle Sam concerning these and other cold-war combatants are:

1. They are not eligible for the major combat decorations for heroism—the Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, the Air Force Cross, the Silver Star.

2. They are not eligible, after discharge, for the same pension given World War I, World War II, and Korean war veterans totally and permanently disabled by a non-service-connected cause.

3. They are not eligible for the so-called GI bill of rights providing educational, housing loan, and other readjustment benefits available to men who served in the last three hot wars.

4. They are not eligible, if they lose a limb, for a special automobile made available for men who suffered such losses in World War II or Korea.

5. They are judged by much more stringent presumptions of preservice fitness than are applied to bonafide "wartime" servicemen in determining eligibility for service-connected disability compensation.

6. They cannot buy the cheap $10,000 national service life insurance policy available to men who served in the last three hot wars.

The first-mentioned distinction—their ineligibility for major combat decorations—soon may be removed. The Kennedy administration has asked Congress for legislation permitting the award of these medals, now restricted to distinguished service in active conflict with an armed enemy of the United States in time of hot war.

Until last April, men killed or wounded by hostile action on cold-war fronts were not even eligible for the Purple Heart. An executive order by President Kennedy changed that ruling, but Congress must act on the remaining decorations.

As far as other benefits are concerned, there is no distinction made between those servicemen who are on active duty on the front lines of the cold war places like Vietnam, Laos, Korea, and Berlin, and those who are carrying out normal military peacetime pursuits in the States.

If a man is permanently disabled or killed in a cold war front, he or his next of kin may be eligible for a somewhat higher disability compensation or death benefit payment based on "extra hazardous" service. But this is one of the few instances in which a special consideration is given.

The Government's distinction between hot and cold war apparently is not drawn by a number of insurance companies. Widows and parents complain that life insurance policies they hold on their deceased men are not paid because death occurred overseas and on a hazardous mission of war.

Mrs. Julia Oshinskie of Shamokin, Pa., mother of A1c Robert J. Oshinskie, one of 11 Americans never recovered in the 1958 crash of a C-130 transport over Soviet Armenia, says:

"We had two personal policies on Bob, and when he was lost they refused to pay the full benefits because he was overseas and was on this type of mission."

Mrs. Edgar W. Weitkamp, of Arlington, Va., wife of an Army warrant officer lost in a transport crash in Laos in 1961, says:

"This wasn't supposed to be a war, but the insurance company won't pay double indemnity for an accidental death. How can it be both ways?"

Other survivors wonder at the distinctions drawn. Mr. and Mrs. Edward S. Connard, Sr., of Milton, Del., parents of Capt. Edward S. Connard Jr., navigator of the Air Force transport that crashed attempting to land at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base at the outset of the Cuban crisis, are among them.

They frankly question why the Pentagon singled out Air Force Maj. Rudolf Anderson, the U–2 pilot who lost his life on a photo reconnaissance mission over Cuba, for full military honors and did not list their son and the other six crew members of the Guantanamo crash as Cuban crisis casualties.

"We don't think they received proper recognition," Captain Connard's father says. "They were there to bring out the women and children. They were doing their part as much as anyone."

Another parent, one more closely associated with the military's attitude toward the problem of casualties, gets down to the nub of things—more important than how a casualty is categorized is public understanding of the necessity for it.

Maj. Gen. William F. Train, commandant of the U.S. Army War College at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., is the father of Lt. William F. Train III, killed in south Vietnam in June, 1962, while traveling with a Vietnamese army convoy. He says:

"The desirable thing would be to have everyone fully understand the term cold war. Insofar as the Vietnamese are concerned, their nation is a battleground and the shooting makes it a 'hot' war for them.

"Lives are frequently lost in the periphery of the Nation's interest.

"I think my son's loss of life in the service of his country is similar to the loss of life in any operation providing the freedom we know—in war or peace."

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is the intention of the leadership to proceed to consider Calendar No. 69, S. 6, which is known as the mass transit bill, and to have general debate on Friday of this week. I expect the debate to continue for some time. The Senate surely will be considering the bill until at least Monday of the following week.

I thought I should give notice now, so that Senators who are interested in discussing the proposed legislation can be prepared to initiate debate on Friday of this week.

ELECTION OF KARL ROLVAAG AS GOVERNOR OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Minnesota has been in the news lately. At long last there has been settled the question as to who is Governor of the State of Minnesota. I am happy to note, for the edification of my colleagues, that as of this day Mr. Karl Rolvaag, Democrat-Farmer-Labor candidate for Governor, the man we thought and knew had been elected Governor, has now been certified as the Governor of the State of Minnesota and will take his oath of office today. He will deliver a message to a joint session of the legislature this week.

Then, on April 16, it is our plan to have a sort of replay of Andrew Jackson's inaugural, Minnesota style, for a genuine community and statewide celebration. I hope that all my colleagues who know Minnesota and Minnesotans, and who know the distinguished Governor-elect and now Governor, Karl Rolvaag, will keep this date in mind.

I note that my friend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] who is so well known in Minnesota that he "bowls over" everybody whenever he contests with anyone in Minnesota, is in the Chamber. I hope that he will see fit to arrange his travel plans so that he can be with us. That would be a wonderful occasion for all of us.

The distinguished present Presiding Officer (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair) is beloved in the State of Minnesota, as well as respected and admired. We should like to have him there.

I see my good friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] the former Governor of that State, is in the Chamber. He should be at the celebration.

Senators will have to pay their own transportation costs, but we would like to have them come. They may be able to get a free lunch or two.

I include everyone in the invitation. I would even like to see my good friend the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] there, if he could find the time to come.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think I ought to make one suggestion to our distinguished friend. Since the candidate won by only 73 votes——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh no; it was a landslide victory, with a margin of 91 votes. It was a major victory.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Whoever may be in the entourage who go, full garrisoned and full panoplied, to the inaugural, the majority delegation should not exceed the minority delegation by more than one, to keep the ratio straight.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. Actually, it ought not to exceed it by more than 14/1000ths of 1 percent, because that was the margin of victory. We will try to keep the arithmetical proportion in mind.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is very kind of the Senator from Minnesota to invite us all to his State. We all enjoy visiting in Minnesota.

The only successes I have had in Minnesota have always been in the wintertime. I do not know how I would fare at this season. I am sure it will be a most enjoyable occasion, especially if it is to be along the line of the inauguration of Andrew Jackson.

I know Karl Rolvaag. He has been through a very tortuous route. He is a capable man, with great experience in government, who has had many years of enlightened politics.

In my opinion, Karl Rolvaag will become one of the great chief executives of a wonderful State. If I cannot be present, I hope the Senator from Minnesota will extend to him my very best wishes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be happy to do so.

We would be honored if the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] could also find her way out to Minnesota for one of these occasions.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That would make it more interesting for all of us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would be more interesting for all of us. Of course, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], has been to Minnesota before. We would love to have him return. We should like to see him as soon as possible.

To the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] I extend a cordial invitation.

I extend the invitation to all Senators. As I said, we are frugal people. In the light of the fact that there has been a rather extensive campaign, I imagine we shall not be able to provide too much of what are called "representation allowances."

In Minnesota we have a new slogan. Instead of "Travel now, pay later" we say, "Run now, pay later".

We have proved the value of a vote. We vote in November and count all winter.

This has been a wonderful experience. I am delighted that the Senator from Tennessee has paid such a well deserved tribute to my personal good friend and political associate and colleague for his many years of politics in Minnesota, Hon. Karl Rolvaag. He is a remarkable man, and a truly outstanding public servant.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am curious to know one thing about Minnesota politics. After such a long winter, is there any place left for the governor to appoint a good Democrat to office, or have all the places been filled?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I fear the pickings will be rather slim. Most of the appointments have already been made.

I should like to make another comment about Minnesota politics. It has been a long, cold winter, and there was not much else to do but to recount the votes, anyway. Now that spring is here—with work to be done, fields to be plowed, and wheat to be planted, to prepare for the future—we have put a Democrat in as Governor of Minnesota. During the winter months we just let the Republicans hang on. [Laughter.]

THE LAKES OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as long as I am dealing with my beloved, great State of Minnesota, I would like to talk about prospects for summer and the subject of the lakes of Minnesota.

Mr. President, Minnesota has long been known as the "Land of Ten Thousand Lakes."

What may not be as well known is Minnesota's proclivity for understatement. We are, indeed, a modest people.

I do not know whether this Senator should be making that statement or not, but, at least, this is the statement I have prepared. [Laughter.]

Having never subjected Minnesota's myriad lakes to actual count, we were content to claim a mere 10,000. For residents of other States this probably sounded like blatant extravagance; for Minnesotans it only represented another example of our great modesty.

Minnesota is currently engaged in the first statewide lake census.

You see, Mr. President, not only are we going to count votes, we are going to count lakes.

Although the results are not yet fully known, it is already evident that the record must be corrected.

Mr. President, it takes a long time for the results to be known in some of these hotly contested elections in our State.

Latest returns disclose 12,211 sparkling lakes dotting the Minnesota countryside and 2 of our 87 counties remain uncounted. Moreover, these two counties—Cook and Lake Counties—are among the most heavily dotted with those sparkling gems of sky-blue water.

Clearly, the final total will run well in excess of 13,000 lakes. And, my colleagues, these are genuine lakes, not swamps, bogs, mudholes, or pools of stagnant water that are often identified as lakes by other sections of this country less restrained and circumspect in their claims.

Mr. President, for those Members of the Senate who still harbor vestiges of doubt regarding the extent or beauty of Minnesota lakes, the Senator from Minnesota extends a cordial invitation to make an on-site inspection.

The matter of on-site inspections has received a great deal of international comment, but I believe I can say, without fear of successful contradiction, that in Minnesota we will welcome any number of on-site inspections by Members of the Senate at our lakes.

Come this summer; bring your family and friends. Explore the cool clear waters of Minnetonka, Winnibigoshish, Mille Lacs, or Ottertail Lakes, or the 13,000 other lakes. Mr. President, try your luck fishing on Kabetogoma, Burntside, Itasca, or Leech. We guarantee a Minnesota welcome. If you do not like one lake, we have another waiting around the corner for you.

I am grateful to my colleagues for their attention on the matter of statecraft and public policy.

I yield the floor to Senators who want to talk about the lakes in their States.

THE STRUGGLE FOR LATIN AMERICA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, with the President's return from Costa Rica, there will be renewed interest in the course he has chosen for dealing with the problem of Castroism in Latin America.

Stewart Alsop's timely article in the Saturday Evening Post entitled "The Fruits of Castro's Plotting," develops the thesis that the struggle for Latin America, which President Kennedy has described as "the most critical area in the world today," may be won for freedom and democracy in part because of the lessons the hemisphere is learning from the Marxist revolution in Cuba. He says that Castro has dramatized the importance to us of Latin America, shown the Latin American "intellectuals" the reality of communism, thrown a badly needed scare into the Latin American ruling classes, and given the United States an opportunity to demonstrate that the real center of power in this hemisphere is in the United States.

The article reports some interesting first-hand observations by Mr. Alsop, and acknowledges that he is "now convinced" that the key decision made by President Kennedy last October was the right one. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE FRUITS OF CASTRO'S PLOTTING

(By Stewart Alsop)

President Kennedy flies to Costa Rica in a few days for a summit conference with the leaders of Central America. Two questions, which have been on his mind before, will surely be on his mind still.

Is it enough that the Soviet missiles and other offensive weapons have been removed from Cuba? Or must Fidel Castro himself be removed, and with him the Soviet military base in the Western Hemisphere?

The final responsibility for answering these questions belongs to the President. But a reporter can at least try to put the questions in a meaningful context. To that end, this reporter recently traveled some 10,000 miles through the Caribbean and Central America.

Toward the beginning of the trip, an American Ambassador in one of the countries most dangerously threatened by Castroism made an oddly optimistic remark. "You remember the old saying about the Lord protecting drunks and the United States," he said. "Maybe Fidel Castro is one of the best things the Lord has ever done for us."

When I heard the remark, it seemed to me a rather feeble attempt at originality. But by the time I had got home again, the Ambassador's remark had begun to make a surprising amount of sense to me.

No one but a fool would deny for a moment the seriousness of the threat Castro represents to this hemisphere. The threat is visible to anyone with eyes to see and a mind to understand.

It is visible, for example, in the left hand of Rómulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela. Since he became President in 1959,

there have been five attempts to assassinate Betancourt. The attempt that most nearly succeeded was unquestionably inspired and directed by Fidel Castro. When his car was bombed by Castro's henchmen, Betancourt put his left hand down on the pavement, which was covered with burning gasoline. The hand is still a raw, puffy, scabrous red.

Betancourt's hand is an ugly symbol of the means the Communists use to achieve what Castro calls the liberation of Latin America. Because Betancourt's reform-minded government represents a real alternative to Castroism, Venezuela is Castro's chief target for liberation among Cuba's neighbors, and the Communists have resorted to what they call direct action. The Communists and their allies regularly explode "Cuban dinamitas"—plastic bombs—in stores, warehouses, factories and, on one occasion, in the American Embassy.

Elsewhere conditions are not judged ripe for direct action, and other means are used. A Soviet-financed campaign is underway to achieve what Lenin called the alienation of the intellectual. Latin Americas who go to a university—1 or 2 percent of the population in most countries—are the main object of this campaign, for the university students of today are the ruling class of tomorrow.

Universities are flooded with Marxist books subsidized by the Russians and on sale for a few pennies. The Communists make every effort to seize political control of the universities. When I was in Panama, the university's student body in a free vote had recently elected a slate of pro-Castro student leaders. In Guatemala several hundred students have illegally made the round trip through Mexico and Cuba to Prague or Moscow and back home again to form the hard core of the Communist underground.

Communism's drive to conquer Latin America is, in short, carefully planned, well financed, and deadly serious. Many countries in Latin America are, moreover, in what the Marxists call a prerevolutionary situation. Because I wanted to sense the immediate impact of Castroism, I confined my trip to Castro's closest neighbors—Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Venezuela, Panama, Guatemala, Mexico, with a last stop in Guantanamo, the great American naval base in Cuba itself.

The countries I visited are all very different in various ways. But they all have certain characteristics in common, which are also shared by almost all countries in Latin America. All have a long history of despotism, violence, and political corruption. All have a near-cancerous rate of population growth, higher in some cases than in Asia. All are raw-material producers, perilously dependent on the world price of oil, coffee, bananas.

In all these countries there is a dark and massive underlayer of illiterate or semiliterate Negroes or Indians, ruled by a thin upper layer of intellectuals with white or near-white (or, in Haiti, mulatto) skins. And in all these countries there is a constantly visible contrast between the gleaming skyscrapers and expensive cars of the world of the rich, and the slums and mud-walled villages of the poor.

These characteristics suggest what President Kennedy meant when he recently said, "I think the big dangers to Latin America are the * * * desperate conditions in the countries themselves, unrelated to Cuba." But the threat of Castro and communism to this hemisphere is also visible in Cuba itself. It is visible in the Czech helmets and Soviet arms of the Cuban militiamen who stand guard sullenly around the fenced periphery of the Guantánamo base.

"We used to exchange cigarettes and chow and call each other amigo, even after Castro took over," a marine private told me. "Not anymore, not since the Russians came."

Since the Russians came, Cuba has been transformed into a Soviet satellite and a military base 90 miles from Florida. That ugly fact remains true, even since the withdrawal of the offensive weapons and the reduction in Soviet troop strength. As one result, Guantánamo is today locally indefensible—the corporal's guard of marines on the base could not possibly hold out against Castro's big Soviet-equipped army, let alone the remaining Russian troops.

As another result, communism is now so firmly established in Cuba that, according to current Pentagon estimates, it would require a Korea-scale war to dislodge it. Even minus the missiles, the Communist establishment in Cuba thus represents the most serious military threat to this hemisphere since the Monroe Doctrine was promulgated.

For all these reasons, it is easy to see why President Kennedy has said, "I regard Latin America as the most critical area in the world today." It is much more difficult to see how any sensible man could maintain that Castro may be "one of the best things the Lord has ever done for us."

But the Ambassador's remark was a sensible remark all the same. There are four distinct ways in which Fidel Castro has served the vital interests of the United States. Let me list them:

First, he has reminded us North Americans of the existence—and the importance to our Nation—of Latin America.

Second, he has shown the Latin American intellectuals the reality, not the dream, of communism. In so doing, he has acted as a sort of inoculation against the Communist smallpox in this hemisphere.

Third, Castro has thrown a badly needed scare into the Latin American ruling class. Without such a scare, the Kennedy administration's Alliance for Progress would not stand a ghost of a chance of succeeding.

Fourth, Castro and Khrushchev have given the United States an opportunity to demonstrate for all the world to see, where the real center of power in this hemisphere lies. It lies in the United States. Since Khrushchev's October backdown, all Latin Americans know that this is so.

Castro's harsh reminder of the existence of Latin America was by no means the least useful of his services to the United States. For historical and geographic reasons, we North Americans have long suffered from a sort of mental block about Latin America. Except for a minority of specialists, we have simply refused to read about, or think about, Latin America. This national complacency about Latin America has been reflected in American policy.

In the pre-Castro era Latin Americans could—and did—accurately complain that the United States sent more dollar aid to Communist Yugoslavia than to all the 20 Latin American states with their more than 200 million people. If Castroism is not to be the wave of the future in Latin America, one reason is that last October's great Cuban crisis made Americans belatedly realize that Latin America is indeed the most critical area in the world today.

Castro's second useful service to the United States—the inoculating effect of his visible demonstration of the reality of communism—is admited even by the Communists themselves. One of the most interesting persons I interviewed on my travels was Señor Gustavo Machado, secretary general of the Venezuelan Communist Party.

Because his party is in semirevolt, Senor Machado was in semihiding. When I finally tracked him to his lair, in the comfortable, California-style Caracas house of a brother-in-law (Machado's family, like Castro's, is rich) he turned out to be a mild-mannered man in his midsixties, with gold cuff links and the air of a Spanish don.

Senor Machado was remarkably candid. There is no doubt, he said, that 80 percent of the people of Latin America were for Castro 2 years ago. Now 80 percent are against him. Why? He shrugged. Fidel should not have admitted he was a Communist. (As this suggests, communism as such is not admired among Latin America's heavily Catholic people.) Khrushchev "saved civilization" by withdrawing his missiles from Cuba, Senor Machado said, but Khrushchev "should have asked Fidel first instead of treating him like a puppet." But, he concluded, "our party is very militant, and we shall win in the end, all over this continent."

Maybe so, but old Senor Machado sounded oddly dispirited. He has reason to be. Castro's immense popularity in Latin America a year or so ago is an undisputed fact. But the precipitous decline in Castro's following, sadly acknowledged by Machado, is also a fact—it is confirmed, as President Kennedy has said, by all American intelligence surveys. Yet it is important to understand what the decline means, and what it does not mean.

It does not mean that the United States is universally loved in Latin America. In Guatemala City I gave a dinner party for five university student leaders. A sample of the way those five boys talked is worth recording, for it reflects both the nature of the decline in Castro's popularity, and the dangers of being too complacent about it. All five boys agreed that a year or so ago Castro had been their hero. He was a hero still to one—a sallow-faced youth who looked remarkedly like a beardless Castro and talked only in the glum Marxist dialectic. Castro was no longer a hero to the four other boys. But there were very audible Marxist overtones in their talk too, especially on the subject of the United States. Here is a sample:

"You Americans are not Greek people. You are Phoenician people—traders, materialists, no things of the spirit."

"You need our raw materials, our markets, so you do not send money to us because you want to help us but because you must. The Alliance for Progress is just some sort of business. Now Fidel is a monkey on your back, so that is another reason why you must send us money."

"The United States owned Cuba, and there would be no Castro if there had been no Batista. You Americans forced Castro to turn to the Russians."

SPREADING MARXIST GOSPEL

In most Latin-American universities the science of Marxism-Leninism is taught as gospel, and the students' mental image of the United States—with an assist from some local business interests—is twisted to fit the gospel. Anti-Americanism, like anticommunism in the United States, is part of the air Latin-American students breathe. Marxist simplifications were also reflected in their talk about Castro:

"Castro put in social justice in Cuba," said one. "He built houses, he sent poor children to schools. But we do not like his totalitarian state."

"Castro has done good things," said another. "But in Cuba, under communism, speak the wrong thing, and al paredón." "Al paredón" means "to the wall"—the wall against which Castro's critics are shot.

"Here is false democracy," said another boy. "Big show, but vote is directed. Yet there is some sort of democracy here, because I can speak what I want to speak. Not in Cuba."

In most of Latin America the freedom to "speak what I want to speak" is a new thing. Take the area I visited. Only in Cuba has one old-style dictator, Fulgencio Batista, been replaced by the new-style dictator, Fidel Castro. In Haiti, hated Francois Duvalier, surrounded by the bully boys of the Tonton Macoute, maintaining his torture chamber in the cellar of the presidential palace, still clings precariously to power.

Other old-style dictators have gone down like ninepins. Guatemala's Jorge Ubico was one of the first to be thrown out, back in 1944. Venezuela's corrupt and greedy Marcos Pérez Jiménez took to his heels in 1958, and the Dominican Republic's little Hitler, bloody Rafael Trujillo, was assassinated in 1961. The old-style dictators are a dying breed.

What is to replace the breed? A lot depends on the students and intellectuals like those Guatemalan boys, for they—not the dark-skinned, illiterate people of the underlayer—are the ruling class of the future. The minds of those boys, like the minds of the other Latin-American students, are being pulled in two directions.

One pull is the instinctive distrust of the Yankee colossus, the lure of the neat Marxist explanation for everything, the need for change. The other pull is the urge to speak what I want to speak—and Castro's wall. The wall in Cuba, in short, is as vivid a symbol of communism as Khrushchev's wall in Berlin.

But wall or no wall, Latin America is ripe for change. The only question is whether it will be Castro's kind of change. The Alliance for Progress is a carrot-and-stick device for promoting another kind of social justice. The great roadblock in front of the Alliance for Progress is the established ruling class in most Latin-American countries. This is understandable, since, from the point of view of the ruling class, everything is dandy already, and any change would be for the worse.

Consider one rather typical member of the ruling class, whom we shall call Rafael Castillo. Rafael is an amusing, American-educated Panamanian in his midthirties. His family is immensely rich. In the last election Rafael was the chief coiner of slogans. "My best poster was a picture of a slum and another picture of a rich man's horse in an air-conditioned stall. Below was the slogan: 'Are you for the people or the horse?'

"Did your side win?" I asked.

"Of course," said Rafael. "That was all arranged."

"And are the people still in the slums and the horse in the air-conditioned stall?"

"Of course," said Rafael, and laughed hugely.

Rafael is an oligarch, a member of the handful of families who run, and largely own, such countries as Panama. Many oligarchs, like Rafael, are agreeable people, but they usually invest their money abroad, pay few taxes and feel no responsibility for their own people. Rafael, in short, represents the old way of doing things in Latin America.

The old way of doing things in Latin America has deep roots. Among the Presidents I interviewed, Roberto F. Chiari, of Panama, and Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes, of Guatemala, are fairly representative of the old way. Both are agreeable old gentlemen—Ydigoras especially: a gutty, shrewd old man of great physical courage. Both are personally very rich—Chiari has a near monopoly of milk in Panama, and Ydigoras' income from government and other sources is estimated at around a million dollars a year. And although both have introduced minimal reforms in a bow to the Alliance for Progress, both are essentially conservative—they are themselves members of the oligarchy and represent its interests.

There is a pro-Castro underground in both countries. In Panama the incestuous, blandly luxurious life of the "Zonians"—the privileged Americans in the Canal Zone—provides a constant irritant which is the Communists' greatest asset. Guatemala had the first overtly pro-Communist government in this hemisphere—fellow-traveling President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman was thrown out with an assist from the CIA in 1954—and the Communists are waiting to make a comeback. They may make it.

But Castro and communism no longer represent the only alternative to old-style oligarchical governments in Latin America. One reason is that Castro's wall frightens the Latin-American ruling class as much as the intellectuals. Another reason is that a new breed of modern-minded businessman is challenging the power of the established oligarchies. Rómulo Betancourt's progressive Venezuelan Government, which has redistributed land, increased taxes on the rich and undertaken a massive educational program, has survived in part because it has the support of the more sensible portion of the Venezuelan business community. Dr. Pedro Tinoco, Jr., of Caracas, who is the spokesman for these business interests, told me that economic and social reform are both essential in Latin America, since "they represent the only real alternative to Castroism." A few years ago such views were anathema among the Latin-American ruling class. Thanks to Castro, that is no longer so.

Thanks again to Castro, a new kind of politician is beginning to emerge in Latin America. Betancourt is an example. So is Juan Bosch, new president of the Dominican Republic, a white-haired, very handsome man in his mid-50's, with a lined, thoughtful face. Betancourt and Bosch are members of what is sometimes known as the club—other members are men like Governor Luis Muñoz Marin of Puerto Rico, and ex-President José (Pepe) Figueres of Costa Rica. The members of the club know each other well, often correspond. In sharp contrast to traditional Latin-American politicians, they are not in politics for money. The members of the club are idealists within reason, and prophets of peaceful, non-Communist social and economic change.

They are left-leaning—Betancourt is an ex-Communist, Bosch had a pro-Castro period. They are not necessarily pro-American, not in the sense some dictators of the past have been. (Franklin Roosevelt said of Trujillo: "He is an s.o.b., but he is our s.o.b.") Yet in the opinion of the ablest American observers on the scene, men like these represent the best bet we can make. In fact, the Kennedy administration has already bet heavily on Betancourt and Bosch.

Overt American support is another reason Betancourt has survived so far. And although Bosch is no American stooge, American power, including plain old gunboat diplomacy, which was used to prevent the reestablishment of the Trujillo gang's dictatorship, made his presidency possible.

And here we come to the last of Castro's four great services to the United States. The successful American blockade of Cuba in October was a public demonstration of a simple fact. In the Caribbean and Central America the power of the United States is unchallengeably predominant.

We have become oddly shamefaced about American power—like female legs a century ago, it is not mentioned in polite liberal society. Yet our power exists, and we need only be ashamed of it when it is used badly or for wrong ends, or when it is not used when it ought to be used.

American power takes many forms—propaganda, economic pressure, economic and military aid, and the quiet persuasion of diplomacy. But simple military power is the essential ingredient. And the essential ingredient of military power is the willingness to use it. That is why Castro has not attacked Guantanamo. If he attacked Guantanamo or a neighboring Latin-American state, he would be in a war he would quickly lose, and he knows it. In short, Castro's big, expensive army isn't going anywhere. Neither are the Russian troops in Cuba, not unless Khrushchev wants a war.

WHAT STEPS SHOULD WE TAKE?

Even so, Castro's Cuba still represents an important Communist military base in America's backyard. That brings us back to the question with which this report began: Should American power, even at the risk of general war, be used to pull communism out of Cuba by the roots?

President Kennedy decided against that course during the crisis of October, when he overruled the "hawks," who wanted to strike directly at Cuba and thus remove not only the missiles but Castro himself. He has since reaffirmed that decision. I am now convinced that it was on balance the right one.

Mind you, it is extremely unlikely, in the opinion of the best observers on the scene, that the Cubans themselves will get rid of Castro. Castro's secret-police system, let alone the backstop of Soviet troops, all but rules out that happy ending. Nor will half measures suffice, as we learned at the Bay of Pigs. In short, bar an American invasion in force, Castro for the foreseeable future is here to stay.

But President Kennedy has ruled out an unprovoked invasion, for what now seem to me three good reasons. One reason is suggested by Woodrow Wilson's smug remark when he ordered the American landing at Vera Cruz in 1914. His purpose, he said, was to "teach the Latin Americans to elect good men." We have since learned that heavy-handed military intervention only teaches the Latin Americans to hate the United States.

Thus military intervention is a desperate last resort. Even so, we must be willing to use that last resort if necessary. President Kennedy has already made it clear that aggression by Castro against Guantanamo or a neighboring state will mean war. We must also make it clear that we will, if necessary, use our power to prevent the Communist smallpox from infecting Castro's neighbors—that we will intervene with force to prevent a Communist takeover anywhere in the Caribbean or Central America.

If we make this clear in advance, we are far less likely to have to use our power in this way. Latin Americans (like everybody else) are bandwagon jumpers. Much of Castro's former popularity in Latin America derived from the notion that his bandwagon was going places. Khrushchev's big backdown in October helped to dispel that notion. But it is still important to make it abundantly obvious that Castro's bandwagon is going nowhere. The fact that we have the military power to prevent Castro's bandwagon from going anywhere is a second good reason for ruling out an invasion of Cuba under present circumstances.

A third good reason is that the example of Castro's own regime makes it more practical than ever before for American power to be used in order to promote the kind of Latin American governments described by Simón Bolívar. Bolívar's rule was, "Do not adopt the best system of government, but the one most likely to succeed."

A carbon copy of our own system of government is not at all likely to succeed. In countries where assassination is considered a standard political instrument, where the mass of the people cannot read or write, where the opposition regards incitement to rebellion as its proper function, a certain executive ruthlessness is essential.

The Mexican Government, for example, is a peculiar, bland dictatorship in which individual freedom is permitted, but the mass of the people have no real voice. Betancourt's government in Venezuela is building a powerful internal police system and practices press censorship—necessarily so, where the opposition expresses its displeasure with "Cuban dinamitas." The "system of government most likely to succeed" in such countries stops short of full libertarian democracy. But it also stops short of both Duvalier's torture chamber and Castro's wall. Except in Cuba and Haiti, the young men in the countries I visited can "speak what I want to speak." They cherish that new-found right.

It may seem corny to say so, but the freedom to "speak what I want to speak" remains our greatest asset in the struggle with communism. The Latin American students of today are the rulers of tomorrow and nothing has so successfully "alienated the intellectual" as Castro's wall—but not in the sense Lenin meant. That is why it may indeed turn out that "Fidel Castro is one of the best things the Lord has ever done for us."

ANNIVERSARY OF MARYLAND STATEHOOD

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, today is the birthday of the most beguiling member of the sisterhood of States, the great Free State of Maryland.

Since 1634, this ever youthful charmer has won the hearts of all who have been fortunate enough to enter her company, captivating them with an alluring mixture of her southern coquetry and her Yankee ingenuity.

Perhaps, Mr. President, the secret of Maryland's attraction lies in that combination of factors which was the inspiration for her sobriquet, "America in Miniature." And this she truly is, Mr. President.

Temperamentally, for instance, she represents the heritage of our industrious North, the zest for gracious living of our romantic South, and the enormous promise of our expansive West, all assimilated into one unique and unforgettable personality.

Physically, too, Mr. President, she is truly "America in Miniature," and like one of Nature's true beauties, she takes justifiable pride in flirtatiously displaying her lustrous seashores, her verdant farmlands, and her softly rolling mountains.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that these remarks betray my longtime love affair with fair Maryland, and if this is true, I can only admit that I am one of the multitude of suitors who have fallen under her spell.

May her birthday anniversary be a pleasant one, and may all the Members of this body join me in wishing her many more centuries of happiness and prosperity.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to join with the Senator from Maryland in celebrating Maryland's birthday. I have a special interest in Maryland, because she was one of the first States to adopt an antibillboard law. I recommend to my colleagues a drive to Frederick, which they will find absolutely free from signboards. I commend Maryland for having taken that forward step.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator for those remarks. I may say, with some modesty, that 33 years ago I was one of the original sponsors of the elimination of signboards at roadsides, when I was a member of the State senate.

AN END TO DETERGENT POLLUTION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the American housewife is deeply in debt to modern industrial technology for eliminating one after another of the backbreaking chores that long plagued her daily life. Yet, while new products have most often proved a blessing, they have from time to time also proved costly in unexpected and even grotesque ways. And nowhere has this been more dramatically illustrated than in the case of the modern synthetic detergent.

For the housewife depressed by soap rings and by stubborn particles clinging to dishes, and by the unpleasant knowledge that hard water makes for hard washes, the synthetic detergent promised an efficient economical solution—with no apparent defect.

Today, however, the housewife has begun to wonder if her detergent is not more bane than blessing. She has now discovered that it is impossible to buy a container of detergent in a standard size and shape with its contents clearly marked. She is met at the supermarket counter with a cockeyed array of squeezeable, narrow-waisted, slant-shouldered detergent packages in odd and mystical measurements. The selection of a suitable detergent at an economical price has become a dismal, new, and unrewarding chore.

But one dispenser of detergents that the housewife had not bargained for was her own tap faucet. Yet just last summer the inhabitants of Lindenhurst, Long Island, discovered that they could draw from the taps in their kitchen sinks long draughts of white sudsy water. Unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, the suds were not strong enough to wash any dishes. Neither was the water potable. Ironically, the Lindenhurst housewife found that, while detergents came out of her tap, she was forced to buy her drinking water in containers. This is scarcely my idea of progress.

The experience of Lindenhurst was not unique. Synthetic detergents have infiltrated water supplies in both this country and in Europe, clogging water and sewage systems, and polluting rivers and streams. Many an idyllic city on the banks of a river has been punctuated by the sight of an enormous floating raft of suds.

There is some evidence that drinking water containing substantial quantities of detergents may be harmful to human health. There is additional evidence that not uncommon levels of detergent pollution are harmful to fish.

The reason for the emergence of the synthetic detergent as a prime source of pollution is quite simple. The detergents presently being marketed simply do not decompose as soap through the natural action of bacteria decomposes. Detergents, once finding their way into the water supply, are removed neither by the natural action of bacteria nor the artificial action of water purification plants. And as greater and greater quantities of detergents are discharged into our sewage systems, they remain in the water supply building up at an alarming rate.

Is this the price we must pay if we are to have the convenience of detergents? The answer, fortunately, is "no." Representative REUSS of Wisconsin who has long been a leader in the fight to rid our environment of artificial contaminants has made an exhaustive review of the detergent problem and has suggested what I consider to be a sound and feasible approach to the detergent problem. Congressman REUSS discovered that Germany—which ironically produced the first synthetic detergent—has enacted legislation banning nondecomposable detergents from German markets after December 31, 1964. Synthetic detergents capable of satisfying the standards set by the German Government have already been developed at Huells, at Gelsenkrichen, and at Hamburg. These new detergents are fully as efficient as their predecessors but they decompose as quickly and harmlessly as soap made from animal and vegetable fats. And they do so without leaving great traces of foam. They are only slightly more expensive than detergents now on the market.

Representative REUSS introduced legislation in the House embodying the essential elements of the successful German legislation. The Reuss bill would require that detergents manufactured or imported into the United States after June 30, 1965, comply with standards of decomposability set by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

My colleagues, the junior Senators from New Hampshire and Wisconsin, and I share Representatives REUSS' concern over the detergent problem. Working together, and utilizing the Reuss bill as a basis, we have prepared legislation which I believe will insure the removal of the incriminated agents from all detergents.

For myself and on behalf of Senators MCINTYRE and NELSON I introduce at this time a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic detergents manufactured for use in the United States or imported for use in the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be included at the close of my remarks and that the bill lay over for 3 legislative days for cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 1183) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic detergents manufactured for use in the United States or imported for use in the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MCINTYRE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who is a coworker in this field and a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. MCINTYRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for yielding to me at this time so that I may add my views on this worthwhile cause.

New England's preeminence in higher education, research, per capita income,

and advanced manufacturing indicates an excellent potential for future growth. But its distance from national markets and the exhaustion of some natural resources means that extra effort is needed to achieve results that are sometimes taken for granted elsewhere. And the early lead of the New England States in the industrial revolution has saddled the present generation with such inherited obstacles to progress as an illogical transportation system, high population density in unplanned urban centers, overcrowded stands of poor second-growth timber, and polluted waters.

Thus, New England's public problems are apt to be persistent, stubborn, and intractable. This is why the citizens and governments of our region must usually combine conservative methods of solution with the most imaginative long-range planning. Our complex inherited problems rarely yield to quick or easy solutions, so our determination to overcome them must be all the greater. And water pollution is such a problem.

Water pollution is a bar to our long-term development. It is a menace to public health. It imposes immense responsibilities on cities, far beyond the financial resources available to them for treatment facilities. As mayor of the city of Laconia, N.H., I helped to build a new treatment plant and am well aware of the difficulties faced by cities all across the Nation. The needs of recreation and modern industry for clean water constantly increases. Today 40 percent of Americans drink water that has already been used once. This national need for reusing both ground and surface water is the basis upon which I join the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] in introducing the detergent control bill to correct an increasingly critical element of our national pollution problem. In my opinion, the proper division of responsibility between the States and the Federal Government in controlling water pollution deserves further study. But the control of detergents seems a proper subject for Federal action.

In the United States we use 4 billion pounds of synthetic detergents every year, virtually all of which eventually enters the ground-water system of our navigable waters. By devising chemical substances which clean effectively and leave no sludge in hard waters, the manufacturers of detergents have earned the approval of consumers in an immense market. But with the widespread use of modern detergents has arisen a serious national problem which commands the attention of Congress.

The principal ingredient of modern detergents is a type of chemical which cleans effectively but contains a refractory kernel which resists decomposition by the bacterial action of waste treatment systems and natural waters.

The surface-active agents in detergents, of which the principal variety is known as ABS, very rarely decompose more than 50 percent in waste treatment. The chemical has a half-life of about 15 days in most water and may travel for a week over 100 miles in a river and still be less than one-third decomposed. By that time, the river water may have been taken for use by a downstream user. ABS persists for years in ground water as well. This gives rise to interstate problems upon which I urge Congress to act.

The national average of ABS in navigable waters is now about one-fiftieth of 1 part per million. In waste treatment even this concentration may impede coagulation and floc formation, adding to the expense and difficulty of operating municipal treatment works.

The national average in drinking water is now one-twentieth of a part per million, one-tenth of the minimum level recommended by the Public Health Service, but there are areas in which even that concentration of one-half part per million has been reached. In existing concentrations, ABS promotes the growth of undesirable oxygen-demanding algae in streams and of slime obstructions in treatment systems. A film may form over streams, delaying gas exchange with the atmosphere, reducing river water's capacity for reoxygenation by a very sizable percentage. These are the chronic problems, but in areas of greater concentration there are acute problems.

As concentration increase with reuse, the problems become even more serious. In the Ohio River, where water is reused 4 times, the concentration is already 10 times the national average for streams. The city of Cleveland, Ohio, has installed high pressure water jets in its sewage plant to beat back the foam, and a similar problem at Chanute, Kans., several years ago attracted international attention. In many places in the country billows of foam blow from streams and clog municipal treatment plants. In large apartment houses detergent suds clog drains, backing up water to create very serious health hazards. Other acute problems, which indicate concentrations greater than the national average, include the drowning of ducks whose feathers are permeated by detergent chemicals, refusal of water by livestock, side-effects on irrigated crops, and injury to fish.

I do not advocate increased assistance for local treatment plants. For one thing, it is unfair to expect our cities or the Federal Government to bear costs which should be assumed by the manufacturers of detergents. Also, such a subsidy could deal only with surface waters and would not reach the pollution of ground waters. In Suffolk County, N.Y., for example, the Federal Housing Administration has been refusing to insure mortgages because the quality of well water has been adversely affected by the very long-term effects of detergents from septic tank effluent. Congress has the power to protect the interstate ground water table, which is bound up with navigable waters in many ways. For this reason, the detergent control bill reaches beyond local treatment to control the process of manufacture.

The detergent control bill requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set standards to be met by all detergents which may enter the navigable waters of the United States after June 30, 1965, to assure that they no longer contain biologically "hard" surface-active agents that resist decomposition in natural waters and treatment plants. This bill does not contemplate a national tolerance level for detergent materials, but is directed at the elimination of a specific class of ingredients and their replacement with materials that will decompose.

I am happy to be able to say that this direct, effective approach to the problem has been made possible by advances in chemical technology and the experience of one of our European allies.

The West German Bundestag has passed an act requiring that all detergents meet minimum standards of decomposability. The very able Congressman from Wisconsin, Mr. REUSS, studied that act in operation and concluded that the United States could and should profit from West German experience.

The chemical companies which supply detergent manufacturers with ABS and other ingredients are contemplating a shift to the production of more readily decomposable chemicals. It is my confident hope that the manufacturers will greet legislation which recognizes their technical achievement and the sizable market that I am sure awaits the introduction of a better product. The detergent control bill will require the replacement of present chemical structures, not up to some uncertain national tolerance standard, but to the limit of technical feasibility consistent with commercial reasonableness. No company need fear that some kind of artificial bar will impede rapid technological development in devising new materials.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent discussion of this subject in the Chemical & Engineering News of March 18, 1963, appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, as well as the West German Act, a competent technical report by an expert of the Public Health Service, and a telegram describing the city of Cleveland's foam abatement works.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McINTYRE. It is because very satisfactory alternatives exist within the range of commercial reasonableness that we today move to eliminate biologically hard surface-active chemicals from detergents. Their replacement with more advanced substances will improve what is obviously too threatening a type of contamination to be permitted to continue. Without this legislation, users of ground and surface waters will face unnecessary increases in concentrations of detergent chemicals whose chronic effects are economically injurious and whose effects in acute concentrations are a menace to the public health and safety.

Mr. President, the advanced industrial societies of the West have benefited greatly from quickening technology, which has carried us to the threshold of interplanetary travel and brought us the fruits of abundance and leisure. But at the same time our standard of living may decline in other ways. I have spoken today in hopes of helping to maintain our traditionally high standard of natural resources. America has been uniquely blessed by nature in a world largely denied the beauty and natural abundance that has always been ours.

We must not accept a declining standard of water that threatens health, industrial development, the resources of local governments, and the very outdoors which are a source of spiritual strength to us all.

EXHIBIT 1

BIODEGRADABILITY OF DETERGENTS—A STORY ABOUT SURFACTANTS

Detergents—a boon to mankind—have come in for a fair share of criticism these days. The reason: pollution. Although ABS accounts for only a minor share of water pollution, a spate of pending legislation would restrict the use of alkylbenzene sulfonate (ABS) based detergents. Notwithstanding the fact that the role of ABS in pollution is probably overemphasized, industry spends more than $5 million annually on research aimed at reducing the problem of undegraded detergents in our water supply. This research takes many forms. At the one extreme, it is aimed at developing more degradable surfactants. At the other extreme, it attempts to prove—quite successfully, it might be said—that ABS is only a very minor contributor to overall water pollution.

Roughly 75 percent of all household detergents contain some ABS. In 1962, some 4 billion pounds of household detergents were sold—meaning about 560 million pounds of ABS. ABS-based detergents get most of the blame for pollution stemming from detergents, but other types—alkylphenol nonionics—are also at fault.

With pressure mounting to ban ABS detergents, raw material suppliers are scurrying around to come up with suitable materials. Alpha olefins are often mentioned as starting materials that would make a more degradable product. Five companies are building plants to make these olefins. It is generally agreed that they are more degradable than present materials; but, at present, their cost is in question.

Price may not be a factor though, if legislation forces a switch to new materials. Two Federal bills have been proposed by Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, which would do just that; and States are also pondering such legislation. Meanwhile in West Germany, where the problem is more critical than in the United States, legislation has been enacted. German detergent makers must switch over to products which are at least 80 percent degradable by October 1, 1964.

U.S. makers, although not now saddled with a deadline, appear to be shooting for new products by about 1964–65. Right now there is a 50–50 chance that Federal legislation will be enacted, but with the large stakes involved, detergent makers would surely like better odds.

In the final analysis, many experts say, pollution in general will prevail, whether detergents are improved or not. The call is out to improve our basic sewage treatment facilities and replace archaic cesspool type disposal systems with sewers.

Alkylbenzene sulfonate is the largest single surface active agent in household heavy-duty detergents. It is produced today almost entirely by alkylating benzene with propylene tetramer, followed by sulfonation of the benzene ring. The propylene tetramer is predominantly C_{12} but it may also contain varying amounts of C_9 to C_{15} molecules. It consists of a multitude of branched isomers that have never really been specifically characterized. Commonly referred to as ABS, it might be more descriptively called TPBS to distinguish it from proposed substitutes where the alkyl radical is some type of "straight" chain.

The opinion most widely held is that the highly branched isomers of the alkyl chain cause the problem—these just don't degrade rapidly enough under treatment conditions.

Dr. R. D. Swisher, research group leader in Monsanto's inorganic chemicals research department and the one most referred to in discussions on biodegradability and branched chains, says there are 3,057 isomers for the $C_{12}H_{25}$ group and about 80,000 different structures possible from C_{10} through C_{15}. "Thus, when we read in the newspapers that ABS is not biodegradable, we are reading a very broad statement. And furthermore, it is a statement that is not true."

Dr. Swisher's work shows that the present-day mixture of TPBS does, indeed, degrade. In river-water tests (a few parts per million of surfactant are dissolved in river water, and the solution is analyzed every few days, the methylene blue method being used to determine the amount of degradation), a typical household TPBS will drop from 7 parts per million at the beginning to 2 parts per million after about 3 weeks. While not all of the isomers present degrade equally fast, even the more resistant components degrade if given enough exposure to microorganisms, Dr. Swisher points out.

Much of the research effort in finding a more degradable detergent has been to develop a straight-chain hydrocarbon to make alkylbenzene. If these materials degrade readily in sewage treatment plants in a matter of hours, the detergent part of the overall pollution problem will be solved.

Most soapers will agree privately to a maximum of 10 percent of the total organic residue from a sewage treatment plant as TPBS (public health officials are more apt to say 5 to 10 percent). Assuming the soapers' most damning figure of 10 percent, then, a readily degradable detergent will leave about 90 percent of the pollution problem unsolved for surface water.

Sewage treatment plant effluent, however, is only part of the water pollution problem. The 1960 census showed that about 34 percent of all housing units may lack public sewage facilities. Many of these households obtain water from their own wells. Here, detergents must be degraded mainly in the ground rather than in a sewage treatment plant. Most significant is the fact that there are many questions yet unanswered about the rate of degradation even of improved detergents under such conditions.

The ground water problem has become most acute in New York's Suffolk County. Close proximity of septic tanks to drinking water supplies has led to foaming in fresh water from private wells, is seriously affecting this area. It has led to a concerted effort on the part of industry and State, local, and Federal authorities to pinpoint the degradation of detergents in soils and ground water. During this past fall, tests began in Long Island to gather basic knowledge on the problem.

The Soap and Detergent Association got from its members composite samples of more degradable detergents. SDA hasn't said what they are specifically, but likely candidates are a straight-chain ABS material, an alcohol sulfate, and a normal TPBS detergent for control purposes. These products are being used individually for 8-week periods in an Oakdale (Long Island) home. About 30 test wells have been drilled in the area to check the flow from the cesspool. Weekly samples from each well are analyzed in order to get an idea of the amount of degradation taking place. The concentration level of other sewage constituents is also being checked. Just 2 weeks ago, tests were begun at a second home and within the next 2 months the goal is to have four test sites in operation.

The tests, partially sponsored by New York State's Temporary State Commission on Water Resources Planning, will be completed possibly in another year. At that time the authorities involved hope to have the answer to many questions. Probably the most important: What type of detergent, if any, is most easily degraded under these conditions?

TWO PROBLEMS

Actually there are two problems in the United States. One involves ground waters, the other surface waters. Surface waters receive waste from sewage plants where aerobic degradation is used to clear the effluent of contaminants. Without sewage systems, septic tanks or cesspools are used to degrade wastes. In these systems, some anaerobic degradation may take place within the tank. (Some experts question whether septic tanks are completely anaerobic systems or a combination of anaerobic and aerobic.) From there the waste seeps into the soil. Should the soil be saturated, there is little chance for proper degradation since an abundance of oxygen is lacking. Many feel that the more serious of these problems is in ground waters.

This attitude is shared by Dr. R. L. Woodward, chief of the engineering section at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center. He says surface water is not so great a problem as are ground water problems in the United States. His colleague, M. B. Ettinger, chief of chemistry and physics (engineering section), pointing to the surface water problem, says from 5 to 10 percent of total organic matter in a sewage plant effluent is TPBS. But removing this will not nearly solve the whole pollution problem.

Toxicity is also mentioned frequently in discussion of ABS. A report to the Soap and Detergent Association in January states "In a statistically controlled experiment, beagle dogs consumed for a 2-year period 1,300 grams of food per week, containing up to 1,000 parts per million of ABS, with no discernible differences apparent in the health of any of the animals as determined by outward appearance or medical examination of the vital internal organs." This confirms previous 2-year tests that were carried out on rats.

Bad odor and taste are also at times attributed to ABS. Yet in Public Health Service Drinking Water Standards, revised 1962, it is stated, "ABS itself is essentially odorless * * * odor and taste characteristics are likely to rise from degradation of products of other wastes rather than from ABS."

Major organic chemicals used in detergents—over-all consumption, 1962

[In millions of pounds]

	Alkylbenzene sulfonate	*Alkylbenzene*
Procter & Gamble	235	165–170
Colgate-Palmolive	95	70
Lever Bros.	90	65
Others	140	95
Total	560	395–400
		Alkylphenol adducts
Procter & Gamble		None
Colgate-Palmolive		15– 20
Lever Bros.		55– 60
Others		30– 35
Total		100–115
		Alkanolamines
Procter & Gamble		10 –12
Colgate-Palmolive		0. 5– 1
Lever Bros.		5 – 6
Others		1 – 2
Total		16. 5–21
	Fatty alcohol adducts [1]	*Fatty alcohol* [2]
Procter & Gamble	190–200	95–105
Colgate-Palmolive	None	-------
Lever Bros.	None	-------
		Alkanolamides
Procter & Gamble		50–55
Colgate-Palmolive		3– 4
Lever Bros.		22–25
Others		6– 8
Total		81–92

[1] Roughly 95,000,000 to 100,000,000 lbs. lauryl alcohol sulfate; 95,000,000 to 100,000,000 lbs. tallow alcohol sulfate.
[2] Roughly 45,000,000 to 50,000,000 lbs. lauryl alcohol; 50,000,000 to 55,000,000 lbs. tallow alcohol.

Source: C. & E.N. estimates.

The revised PHS standards do recommend a 0.5 part per million maximum ABS content in drinking water, although tests by PHS show most surface waters are below this limit. ABS does not foam until concentrations reach about 0.5 part per million, and odor and taste cannot be attributed to ABS where concentration is below 0.5 part per million. This revision is apparently directed to improving the esthetic qualities and economic utility of drinking water rather than as a protective limit.

It has been stated that one favorable result of ABS's occurrence in drinking water is that it is an indication of other pollutants. The revised standards bear this out by saying, "concentrations of ABS above 0.5 milligram per liter are also indicative of questionably undesirable levels of other sewage pollution."

SUBSTITUTE

The scramble for a TPBS substitute has led to much discussion about straight-chain materials—and alpha olefins take up a good share of this. The list of companies known active in alpha olefins stands at eight and probably hasn't stopped growing. Most significant, apart from the implications of a new volume organic chemical, is the potential reshuffling among major alkylbenzene producers. This market today is under the predominance of California Chemical, Continental Oil, Atlantic Refining, and Monsanto. Eyeing the hassle over degradability as a chance to carve out their share are a number of newcomers, including Gulf, Enjay, Union Carbide Olefins, and Phillips.

Continental Oil is well on the road to becoming an alpha olefin producer. It soon will have a semicommercial plant with about 10 million pounds' capacity at Lake Charles, La. Conoco's alpha olefins, already available in small quantities, range from C_6 to C_{20}. The company uses a Ziegler-type ploymarization route.

Atlantic Refining put an alpha olefin unit on stream late last year. The company uses its own process, based on cracking paraffin, and can supply tank car quantities. Capacity of the unit is probably in the 10 to 15 million pound-per-year range, and the process turns out C_6 to C_{15} alpha olefins.

California Chemical, another of the more recent public entries in the large scaled plants derby, is building a commercial unit at Richmond, Calif., which will use a paraffin-cracking route. Completion is set for this spring, and the capacity for 1963 will probably be about 20 million pounds. Prices of its alpha olefins range from 7 to 15 cents per pound and should hold at this level when the plants are on stream.

Monsanto, fourth of today's Big Four AB producers, doesn't say much about what direction its efforts will take, but does indicate that it feels alpha olefins are not the solution. Henry Moss, director of product quality in Monsanto's inorganic chemicals division, says the best approach, considering all the factors, is tailoring AB. Length of the chain, position of the aromatic ring on the chain, and the position of the sulfonate group on the ring in relation to the alkyl group all must be considered.

According to Mr. Moss, Monsanto is now at the point where it has two approaches that offer commercial feasibility. What these are, Monsanto isn't saying at this time.

Enjay is the latest official entry into alpha olefins. The company says it will build a plant at Baton Rouge, La.; and the process, developed by Enjay, will involve cracking petroleum wax. Completion is set for the second quarter of 1964. Trade sources have speculated that Enjay (via its parent, Jersey Standard) has been working closely with Monsanto. These sources add that Monsanto is a likely customer for Enjay's output. Neither firm will comment.

Gulf Oil, a purveyor of development quantities of various alpha olefins for some time, is one of the most recent entrants into the larger scale plant field. Its Port Arthur, Tex., refinery is the site of a unit to make alpha olefins via ethylene polymerization. The unit will make either blends of from C_6 to C_{20} or specific olefins with purities as high as 98 percent. Gulf says the unit, slated to start up next month, will make tank car quantities. Trade observers say the company will have a capacity to produce 8 million pounds of alpha olefins this year.

Union Carbide Olefins has also been mentioned in the trade as a possible producer of alpha olefins. Industry sources say Carbide has contracted for the paraffin output of South Hampton Oil (Silsbee, Tex.), estimated at 500 barrels a day. Carbide has no comment on this report, but does admit it is studying the olefins as a business possibility. Carbide could get to alpha olefins through molecular sieve separation of paraffins or by ethylene polymerization.

Sinclair, also linked with alpha olefins, apparently had a small pilot plant size polymerization unit going about 4 years ago. It decided at that time not to go ahead, although various sources mention the company as a possible producer.

Sohio, also listed as a possible among trade observers, says it has looked at the alpha olefins market, but no decision has been reached.

Phillips, mentioned in most discussions on alpha olefins, will not comment on details, says only that it "has been active for some time in the research, development, and sampling of biodegradable detergent intermediates produced from several different routes. At this time, however, no decision has been reached regarding manufacturing plans."

One trade source feels Phillips is close to making this decision and that the route would be a molecular sieve extraction of kerosene to get a straight-chain paraffin. Then it would use the chlorination-alkylation route to a straight-chain AB.

Dow is another name mentioned as a possible producer of a new type of detergent alkylate. Dow admits to following developments in this field, but declines to give any specifics as to what directions its own work might pursue.

A new, or what some people might consider a variation of an old, approach has come from Stepan Chemical. Stepan has revealed a group of alpha-sulfo fatty acid esters, which it has trade-named Bio-Terge. These compounds include a variety of materials, but Stepan is mainly promoting Bio-Terge TMS (alpha-sulfo-tallow methyl ester) and Bio-Terge MMS (alpha-sulfo-myristic methyl ester). Stepan says that in its river die-away tests Bio-Terge TMS has completely degraded in about a week compared to either semicommercial straight-chain ABS or standard ABS, neither of which was completely degraded at the end of 30 days.

Alfred C. Stepan, Jr., president, said before the Chemical and Drug Analysts Group in January that Bio-Terge detergents "make it possible for the major soap companies to shift over to a biologically soft detergent which will eliminate the problem in the water supply and at the same time have no loss in cleaning efficiency and no increase in costs." He added that it appeared likely that Stepan "will build a large plant to make substantial quantities of Bio-Terge, probably late in 1963."

Another source of alpha olefins, around for a long time, is natural fats. Archer Daniels Midland is one of the oldest producers from this source. Economics do not allow them to be competitive with petroleum derivatives, however.

While alpha olefins generate the most talk and appear to be the replacement leader for propylene tetramer, not all agree. California Chemical, well along with its alpha olefin plant, says it is basing its plans on a spectrum of markets, including specialty surface-active agents, plastics, fibers, and lubricant additives. The company adds that the potential outlet for alkylating benzene to make a more degradable detergent alkylate does not enter into its plans because of cost. Atlantic also seems to be heading for markets other than detergent alkylate for its alpha olefins.

OVERSEAS ACTIVITY

West Germany has also come in for its fair share of activity in this area. With the deadline on its detergent legislation little more than 18 months off, producers of nondegradable detergents are readying substitutes to meet legal requirements.

Chemische Werke Huels (West Germany's largest syndet manufacturer) has decided to work with straight-chain (99.2 percent) paraffins in the C_{12} to C_{14} range as a raw material. It will buy this material from Gelsenberg Benzin, which has licensed UOP's Molex process to produce the straight-chain paraffins. Then, through a Friedel-Crafts reaction the paraffin is used to alkylate benzene. Final step is then sulfonation.

Huels will guarantee at least 80-percent biodegradability according to the government test, but says the product will do considerably better. Cost is slightly higher than that of TPBS. Huels has completed all of its testing and has a pilot plant working. It expects it to go into production in about a year, Dr. Franz Broich, vice chairman of the board of directors of Huels, says.

Huels started work back in 1956 on this problem and, before deciding on its present route, had considered other methods. It looked at alpha olefins based on petroleum wax and on Ziegler chemistry. But Huels feels alpha olefins are too expensive. It also points out that only about 30 to 50 percent of the olefins are C_{12}'s. For the process to be economical, there must be a substantial credit for the non-C_{12} olefins, Dr. Broich says.

The firm also considered fatty alcohol sulfates, which are 100 percent biodegradable, but it feels fatty alcohols are too costly at present.

A question concerning the toxicity of the new unbranched-chain ABS detergents has been raised. Huels says that the new material, considered by itself, is no more toxic than TPBS. But it emphasizes that, with the higher degradability, the final product in treatment plant effluent is less toxic than TPBS.

Other companies are also at work in West Germany. Rheinpreussen says it has been making a biodegradable material in quantity, which it calls Korenyl. This is probably an unbranched dodecylbenzene sulfonate similar to Huels' product, but derived from a different starting material. The company won't comment.

Conoco and Deutsche Erdöl have joined hands in a new 65 million pound-per-year fatty alcohol sulfonate plant being built near Hamburg. The plant will probably start up late this year or early next year. It will make Ziegler-type Alfol alcohols, as starting materials for various sulfates and will be similar to Conoco's Lake Charles, La., operation.

As the deadline nears, other firms will probably come up with candidate syndets. H. J. Zimmer, A.G., made news last month with its sugar esters of fatty acids. Although Zimmer seems confident, other firms tend to downgrade the sugar esters as serious contenders for any large share of the detergent market. They feel that the products are too expensive and will probably find use in higher value products, such as cosmetic detergents.

One of the earliest entries in the biodegradable market is Dobane JN, Dutch Shell's product. Dobane, a straight-chain AB produced from wax cracking, has been made and marketed on a limited basis—mainly in England. At present Shell is building a urea wax

plant at its Pernis chemical complex near Rotterdam in the Netherlands. The plant, slated for completion in mid-1964, will make commercial quantities of Dobane JN.

LARGE PIE

Why all this activity in the United States and abroad? Contenders are vying for a piece of a multimillion-pound pie. Total sales (active plus inert ingredients) of solid and liquid household detergents were about 4 billion pounds (containing about 560 million pounds of ABS) in 1962. Growth is roughly 4 percent per year. These figures exclude floor and wall cleaners as well as scouring cleansers. The Soap and Detergent Association reported sales at 3.75 billion pounds in 1962, but their reporting does not account for the entire industry. The big three of the industry—Procter & Gamble, Lever, and Colgate—have between 80 and 85 percent of the business, C. & E.N. estimates.

In the industry's parlance, last year's sales amounted to about 140 million cases. Solid detergents average 32 pounds a case (varying from 30 to 36 pounds), while the liquid detergents average about 20 pounds a case. The various light- and heavy-duty liquids comprised about 22 percent of last year's sales, compared to 11.5 percent in 1957.

Detergent composition can vary widely among producers. The solid products generally use TPBS as the key surface-active agent. But some producers, such as P. & G. use fatty alcohol sulfates in combination with TPBS, or as the sole active ingredient. These products also contain other ingredients, such as phosphates, dyes, optical bleaches, sodium carboxymethyl cellulose, and fatty acid amides (Colgate does not use amides in its solid detergents).

Variations continue in the liquid area. Procter & Gamble avoids ABS in its liquids, while Colgate and Lever use these sulfonates. Otherwise, the major organic components are generally an ethoxylated fatty alcohol sulfate or an ethoxylated alkylphenol adduct. Too, the liquids have various other materials, such as phosphates and hydrotropes (sodium xylene sulfonate or sodium toluene sulfonates), and they usually average 4 to 6 percent amides, compared to 2 percent for solid detergents. Moreover, some new liquids in early stages contain lauryl ether sulfate and an amine oxide, such as lauryl dimethyl amine oxide. The amine oxide could displace amides in household detergents.

Biodegradability problems seem destined to affect the outlook for present-day alkylphenols as well as alkylbenzenes. Although most of the concern as to biodegradability of synthetic detergents is for TPBS, where it rightly belongs, the biodegradability of alkylphenol is in question. Alkylphenol nonionics are generally quite markedly resistant to biodegradation. Alkylphenol adducts comprised 105 to 115 million pounds of household detergent formulations in 1962, with nearly half being accounted for by Lever. P. & G. does not use alkylphenols, primarily because its interest over the years has centered more on fatty acid derivatives.

These adducts require about 40 to 46 million pounds of alkylphenol, some 33 percent of the total alkylphenol market. Colgate does not purchase the alkylphenol, but rather buys the sulfated adduct for use in its formulations. Lever, although it does buy some alkylphenol for its own sulfonation, also buys sulfated adducts.

All told, household detergents account for about 40 percent of all nonionic detergent consumption. The trade feels that alkylphenol-based nonionics will decline because of the biodegradability fracas, although they could possibly be made more degradable with a straight side chain, while alcohol-based nonionics will rise rapidly. The decline phase for alkylphenols should become evident by 1965; and it is probable that, once it starts, alkylphenol adducts will be completely out of the household detergent market within a year.

The TPBS market faces the biggest turmoil because of the biodegradability problem. Last year, the detergent industry consumed about 560 million pounds of these sulfonates. The use of TPBS has virtually leveled off, since it has just about completely penetrated the high-sudsing, heavy-duty, solid detergent market.

The sulfonate production in 1962 meant a domestic demand for about 395 million pounds of alkylbenzene, chiefly as dodecylbenzene. Alkylbenzene production in 1962 was 527 million pounds, and exports ran about 102 million pounds. Procter & Gamble is the big consumer, taking about 170 million pounds last year. Colgate used 65 million pounds and Lever, 70 million. Miscellaneous detergent makers had consumed the balance.

With the biodegradability problem weighing heavily on detergent makers, it seems likely that a switch to straight-chain alkylbenzene could come quite strongly by 1964–65. This move, then, would not affect the benzene part of the demand, but it would cause serious repercussions in the propylene tetramer market. Whether a shift is the final solution to biodgradability or not is hard to say at this time.

Meanwhile, the use of fatty alcohols to make detergents should continue its upward trend. Procter & Gamble uses between 45 and 50 million pounds of lauryl alcohol and 50 to 55 million pounds of tallow alcohol annually in its detergent manufacture, with practically all going to household products.

HIGH STAKES

The stakes are just as high in West Germany. Total production in 1961 (latest available figures) of detergent raw materials was about 282 million pounds (active material). This includes some 56 million pounds that were processed into finished detergent material by the raw material producers themselves. Net production sold in 1961 to final processors was thus about 224 million pounds, valued at about $30 million. This includes some 31 million pounds of exports. The net amount sold in Germany was thus about 19 million pounds. Imports were minor, amounting to about 550,000 pounds. Exports were mostly to ECM countries, with smaller amounts going to EFTA countries, South America, and Asia. The bulk of imports came from the Netherlands, with a small amount coming from the United States. In the first half of last year, total production was 16 million pounds.

Estimates vary, but of total production, about 60 to 80 percent is ABS type, and about 20 to 40 percent is fatty alcohol sulfates and nonionic types, such as fatty alcohols, polyglycol ethers, and alkyl polyoxyethylene ethanol. Probably nonionics had the larger share of the 40 percent non-ABS type.

Huels produced about 9 million pounds of tetrapropylene ABS last year. Smaller producers, such as Sunlicht (owned by Unilever) and Elektrochemische Fabrik Kempden (owned by Rheinpreussen), accounted for an estimated 4.5 million pounds of ABS raw materials used in synthetic detergents.

In the United States, where the situation is a step or two behind West Germany, detergent makers either have not settled on what raw materials will do the trick, or they aren't saying. But something should break soon.

EXTENSIVE RESEARCH

All sizable detergent makers have extensive research programs going on for new products. Also, raw material suppliers are almost constantly furnishing new samples for testing by detergent makers. Dr. Richard B. Wearn, director of research at Colgate-Palmolive, says that in his labs at present there are about 70 samples of straight-chain material which are in some stage of processing. He feels the straight chains are feasible as substitutes for TPBS, but the economics are in question. Dr. Wearn adds that he believes alpha olefins could be used as intermediates to make alcohols or sulfates and possibly replace lauryl alcohol, if their price were in the 6- to 7-cent range.

Proctor & Gamble says either Ziegler or wax cracked alpha olefins may do the trick, depending on price. P. J. Weaver, head of P. & G.'s sanitary engineering research services, and Frank Coughlin, associate director, product development division, state that the company is receiving tank car quantities of straight-chain materials for evaluation.

P. & G., as well as other detergent makers, would apparently like to get a degradable product out before any Federal legislation, and for two apparent reasons. As the Federal bill appears now, it may follow the lead of the West Germans, meaning a minimum of 80 percent degradation in a product under a particular type of test. If this should go through, some detergent makers might feel they have no incentive to come up with a product any better than to pass the test. Without legislation, P. & G. states—and other detergent makers appear to agree—the industry will come up with the most degradable product it possibly can under a wider range of field conditions.

The second reason involves price. Although the Reuss bill would not take effect until June 30, 1965, there would probably not be enough time for cost of the new raw material to come down to that of tetrapropylene. Therefore, detergent makers would end up paying a premium which would have to be passed on.

YEARS 1964–65

As to when we can expect to see some new products from P. & G., Lever, Colgate, and other detergent makers, 1964–65 seems to be the date most heard. P. & G. and Colgate have reached the tank car test stage with some products, and it is likely that other detergent makers have also.

Detergent makers seem most interested in three qualities in any product to replace TPBS. First, it must be more biodegradable. As to how much more, the only answer detergent makers give is, "as much as possible." Second, performance must equal present ABS-based products. Third, the price must be in line. At present there are these prices to consider: Propylene tetramer at 4 cents per pound, alkylbenzene at 10 cents per pound. Since most detergent makers do their own sulfonation, the price to shoot for is a 10-cent-per-pound detergent alkylate.

Industry observers expect that initial offerings of straight-chain detergent alkylates will be about 15 cents per pound. These will be from commercial plants of 50 million pounds or more. These sources also qualify this further by saying that the materials will be obtained by cracking paraffin or by extracting straight-chain paraffins from kerosene or heavy naphtha. By 1963–64, this price will drop to 12 cents; by 1964–65, to 11 cents; beyond 1965, to 10 cents; and eventually down to 8 cents per pound.

On the other hand, alpha olefins from ethylene polymerization can also be expected to go at 15 cents per pound as an initial offering from commercial plants. By 1965 this could come near the 10-cent mark, depending to a great degree on the ethylene situation of any particular maker.

Among the many questions in this area is the one as to which route to take to alpha olefins—Ziegler or paraffin cracking. Paraffin cracking gives a product mix that contains a broad range of olefins of different chain lengths, and this mix must be fractionated to provide a specific fraction. The Ziegler route does not give a wide product range, although fractionation is also needed.

The Ziegler chemistry route starts with ethylene at less than 5 cents per pound. No one has said in so many words what the cracking routes start with, but a slack (high

oil content) wax is the likely candidate. With the wide variation in refinery economics, it is hard to pin down the price of slack wax. Some experts put it at 1.8 cents per pound, but it depends heavily on a particular refinery's situation—long or short on slack wax.

Whichever the route, raw material suppliers are gearing for the change. Whatever the change is, and whenever it takes place, pressure is building. State and Federal legislators got off to an eager start this year, throwing "ban the detergent" bills into the hopper in quick succession.

The legislative action was topped off late in January, with Representative REUSS introducing a bill which would prohibit use of degradation-resistant detergents. H.R. 2105 would take effect June 30, 1965. Before then, standards of decomposability would be set up by the U.S. Surgeon General.

EVEN ODDS

The bill is now before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. No hearing date has been set. When such a date is set, the U.S. Public Health Service will probably put forth its opinion on the bill, which could easily affect its outcome. Should the technical people in Public Health Service back the bill, its chances for passing would increase. On the other hand, should they take a stand against the bill, its chances of passing would be lessened. At last check, the bill was given a 50–50 chance of passing this year.

Latest word from Washington: Congressman REUSS has followed H.R. 2105 with a second bill. H.R. 4571, introduced about a week ago, plugs a loophole in the previous bill. Although H.R. 2105 would ban detergents that don't meet decomposability standards from interstate commerce, it would have no control on intrastate manufacture. So detergents made in a State could be sold within that State. But some of these products would presumably end up in interstate waterways, and here's where the second bill plugs the hole. It bans detergents completely which could possibly end up in interstate waters.

Also the new bill would empower the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out its provisions. H.R. 2105 gave authority to the Surgeon General.

Five State legislatures have seen some type of detergent bill introduced this year. These vary from calling for study committees to all-out bans on nondegradable detergents.

Maryland's bill (No. A464) would make it unlawful to sell detergents containing alkylbenzene sulfonate. Also in Maryland, a joint resolution requests the Governor to appoint a committee "to review the need for a standard of degradability in waste treatment systems for detergent materials and to recommend a standard of and method for determining such degradability."

The third bit of legal action taken against detergents in Maryland would forbid the discharge of untreated detergents into streams and septic tanks from coin-operated laundries and car-washing operations. Effective date is January 1, 1964. A new bill proposed in Maryland would defer this matter until the committee reports on degradable matters.

Wisconsin, also bothered by water pollution, has set up a study committee to examine the detergent problem. In addition, a bill has been introduced which would ban any nondegradable detergent.

Another bill will soon be introduced in Wisconsin to outlaw the use of nondegradable detergents and also set up authority for the State board of health to formulate rules and regulations for detergents.

Nebraska is also in the act, with two bills. One would place a 10-cent-per-pound tax on hard detergents, and the other would set up standards of biodegradability and ban detergents not meeting these standards after January 30, 1965.

Behind these bills is the Nebraska Department of Agriculture's plan for a degradable detergent based on corn. Midwest Research Institute, working under a grant from the Nebraska Department of Agriculture and Inspection, has developed a process which would start with cornstarch to make what MRI says is a detergent showing promising biodegradability.

On the surface, Nebraska's proposed legislation looks like a serious attempt at solving a problem. But the remarks of Dr. E. A. Rogers, State health director, cast some serious doubt on the need for such legislation. Dr. Rogers has told the State health board that foam on rivers and streams created by nondegradable detergents is not a health hazard, merely a nuisance. He adds that if the bill is an attempt to raise tax funds, then why not present it on an economic basis and leave out the health problem propaganda? Despite the possible lack of need for or motives behind the proposed legislation, some observers feel the bill may pass this year.

The remainder of proposed State legislation comes from California and Connecticut. California would ban nondegradable syndets. The Connecticut bill would also ban these products, although biodegradability is not specifically mentioned in the bill.

The Soap and Detergent Association, acting as spokesman for the industry, says legislation will not help the situation and therefore is unnecessary. In general, detergent makers believe no legislation is required, neither State nor Federal, because they feel no health emergency is involved. Producers agree that eventually they must shift their raw materials to a more degradable material, and they feel they will do this as fast as possible. But because test methods for degradability do not yet correlate with actual field experience, there is no sound basis for regulation now, SDA says.

The West Germans echo this feeling. As Dr. Broich of Huels puts it, "The chemical industry must do whatever it can do."

As in the United States, however, German detergent producers feel the problem has been exaggerated as a result of constant pressure by the press and politicians. The producers don't deny that there is a growing problem and that detergents—especially TPBS, which is only about 25 percent degradable in West German treatment procedure—contribute significantly to it. But they emphasize that syndets are only part of the problem, and perhaps a smaller part at that.

FOAM, A NUISANCE

Foam is mainly a nuisance, the Germans say, although it may possibly lower the efficiency of sewage treatment plants by its effect on the surface tension of water. Further, they point out, syndets alone don't cause foaming in rivers, where their concentration is about 1 part per million. It's TPBS in the presence of protein material in sewage that makes the foam. Thus, surface-active agents are a visible indicator of a polluted stream. But the general public tends to place full blame on detergents. Far more serious a problem, it is felt, is the unseen pollution.

What of the future? Apparently, nobody is completely convinced that the new unbranched-chain ABS material is the ultimate solution. One highly placed West German executive of an ABS producer feels that, if fatty alcohol prices come down, then fatty alcohol sulfonates, with their 100 percent biodegradability, might be the big detergent of the future. But this doesn't seem likely.

Even in West Germany, where the situation appears nice and tidy on the surface, things aren't completely nailed down. For instance, there is talk of raising the 80 percent requirement to 100 percent and adding a nontoxicity requirement. Neither action seems likely in the near future. But some in the industry feel that the law will become progressively more severe.

Some feel that the Government test, based as it is on a miniature treatment plant, is unrealistic for Germany, which has few treatment plants. They feel that the Warburg test, which measures oxygen uptake, and hence gives a measure of true degradation to CO_2, water sulfates, etc., is more realistic. It more closely matches degradation in a river, they say. The Government test, on the other hand, is a measure of loss of surface activity. This doesn't necessarily mean complete degradation of the molecule. Supporters of the Government test say that it is imperative that more treatment plants be built (only about 20 percent of German communities have such plants) and that as time passes, tests will become more representative of actual conditions.

The United States has its uncertainties, too. Biodegradability and new raw materials, in the end, will cause major changes in the detergent industry. The multi-million-dollar industry will solve its share of the pollution problem as well as it possibly can, but it has been shown that a very substantial water pollution problem will still exist. Added to this, the reuse of water will increase. At present, some industries recycle waste waters or use municipal sewage effluent to conserve water and reduce stream pollution. Water reclamation has also been practiced to a certain extent in municipalities.

Already, reuse of water is widespread in the United States. A summary report put out by Taft Sanitary Engineering Center clearly points this out. "One fact is clear, we are already reusing our water; 40 percent of the United States' population is using water that has been used at least once for domestic or industrial purposes. This natural reuse will increase."

There seems to be general agreement that increased and improved water and waste treatment facilities can remove greater amounts of detergent pollutants, and, equally important, greater amounts of other organic and inorganic contaminants. The Taft engineering group says that work at the Center—lab scale—has shown that, under proper conditions, percolation through unsaturated soils reduces ABS content by 90 percent. Total organics will be reduced similarly. Facilities to treat secondary effluent for further removal of organics and inorganic materials, including ABS, could include adsorption techniques, foam fractionation, ion exchange methods, and electrodialysis.

Adsorptive techniques have centered mainly on the use of activated carbon. The Taft group believes that, of the methods studied to date, the carbon technique offers the most promise for removal of organic wastes, with cost for carbon adsorption to achieve 90 percent ABS removal and 70 percent overall organic removal being estimated at 6 to 8 cents per 1,000 gallons of effluent processed. Foam fractionation cost is estimated to be in the neighborhood of 5 cents per 1,000 gallons to remove 90 percent ABS and 30 percent overall organic content.

At the annual meeting of the Soap and Detergent Association in January, three research men from California Research Corp. told of their success in removing 95 percent of the ABS in a sewage plant. This was done by foaming and recycling the foam to the activated sludge reactor in the plant. Taft's advanced research treatment section is considering a pilot-size foam operation to investigate overall organic removal, including use of the recycle system.

Ion exchange has proved effective in removing contaminants, although the cost depends to a high degree on success in regenerating the resin. The Taft research group points out that ion exchange is most successful in removing inorganics, since organic

materials may foul the resin. But ion exchange resins also hold promise for removing organics. Dr. Irving R. Abrams of Diamond Alkali's research labs has stated that in his labs products have been developed which are now being used commercially for removing organics similar to those encountered in sewage and industrial waste water.

Electrodialysis has also shown some worth in lab-scale setups. The Taft team says that, although organics are reduced in concentration in the purification cell of an electrodialysis setup, the organic particles tend to lodge in the membrane. But, they add, electrodialysis has been able to reduce inorganic content from a range of 500 to 600 parts per million to one of 100 to 200 parts per million in sewage waste. All of these, and other methods, are being studied. The more successful, if applied on a large scale, would remove not only detergent contaminants if they are still around at that time, but also all pollutants from sewage effluents.

ACT CONCERNING DETERGENTS IN WASHING AND CLEANSING MEDIA (ACT ON DETERGENTS) OF SEPTEMBER 5, 1961

(Bundesgetzblatt, pt. I, 1962)

The following act has been enacted by the Bundestag:

ARTICLE 1

(1) It is the purpose of this act to achieve maximum decomposability of surface-active and cleansing agents (detergents) contained in washing and cleansing media.

(2) Washing and cleansing media containing detergents shall not be put on the market by the manufacturer or importer, unless the decomposability of the detergents meets the requirements of the statutory ordinance to be issued under article 2.

(3) Paragraph 2 shall not apply where washing and cleansing media are supplied to third persons as samples for testing and experimental purposes.

(4) Nor shall paragraph 2 apply to the export or transit of washing and cleansing media.

(5) Any other conveyance of washing and cleansing media into or out of the area to which this act applies shall be deemed to be import or export.

ARTICLE 2

(1) The Federal Government shall be authorized to establish, by a statutory ordinance requiring the consent of the Bundesrat, the requirements of decomposability with regard to detergents in washing and cleansing media, as well as the necessary methods of testing. Such requirements must be in keeping with the level of scientific knowledge and technology attained in the field of detergent manufacture and sewage plant efficiency.

(2) The Federal Government shall issue the first statutory ordinance under paragraph 1 not later than June 30, 1962.

ARTICLE 3

(1) The authority competent under land legislation may take samples of washing and cleansing mediums needed for inspection at the importers' or manufacturers' premises. Part of the sample, officially packed and sealed, shall be left behind, if so demanded.

(2) The persons commissioned by the competent authority shall be permitted to enter rooms and premises insofar as their duty so requires. The fundamental right of inviolability of the home as defined by article 13 of the basic law shall be restricted to that extent.

(3) The officials of the authority competent under land legislation or their authorized agents shall not, without authority, disclose or make use of any business or technical secrets which have become known to them in the course of their duties, even if they are no longer in the service or if their employment has come to an end. This shall also apply to other persons who, by reason of official reporting, have obtained knowledge of the facts stated in the first sentence.

ARTICLE 4

(1) Any person violating the obligation imposed on him by virtue of paragraph 3 of article 3 shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year and a fine, or to either of these penalties.

(2) If the offender acts for remuneration or with the intent to secure pecuniary benefit for himself or for a third person, or to cause damage to a third person, he shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 2 years. In addition, a fine may be imposed.

(3) Prosecution shall only take place upon petition of the injured person.

ARTICLE 5

(1) Any person who, in his capacity as a manufacturer or importer, deliberately puts washing or cleansing media on the market which do not meet the provisions of article 1, shall be guilty of a statutory offense.

(2) A statutory offense may render the offender liable to (1) a fine not exceeding DM10,000, where such offense has been committed intentionally; (2) a fine not exceeding DM5,000, where such offense has been committed negligently.

ARTICLE 6

(1) The provision in respect of fines contained in article 5 shall also apply to any person acting as an executive organ on behalf of, and authorized to represent, a body corporate, or as a member of any such organ, or as the legal representative of a third person. This shall also apply if the legal act establishing the representative authority is void.

(2) Any person charged with the management or supervision of the enterprise or of part of the enterprise of a third person, or who is expressly entrusted by such third person to fulfill, on his own responsibility, any duties imposed by this act shall be accorded the same legal treatment as persons specified in paragraph 1.

ARTICLE 7

If, in an enterprise, any person commits an act subject to a fine under paragraph 1 of article 5, the owner or manager of the enterprise or the owner's legal representative or a member of the executive organ in charge of the legal representation of a body corporate or a partner authorized to represent a partnership (Personengescellschaft) under German commercial law may be liable to a fine, provided that they have failed in their duty of supervision either intentionally or negligently and the offense is attributable thereto. The amount of the fine shall be determined in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 5.

ARTICLE 8

(1) If any person, in his capacity as a member of the executive organ in charge of the legal representation or as a "Prokurist"[1] of a body corporate or as a partner authorized to represent a partnership under German commercial law or as a "Prokurist" of a partnership, commits a statutory offense under the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 5, a fine to be determined in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 5 may also be imposed on the body corporate or the partnership.

(2) Article 6 of the law on statutory offenses shall also apply in respect of any remuneration or profit which the body corporate or the partnership under German commercial law has received in consideration of the statutory offense or derived therefrom.

[1] Translator's note: "Prokurist"—proxy authorized by virtue of article 49 of the German Commercial Code to perform all judicial and extrajudicial legal acts arising from the management of a commercial enterprise.

ARTICLE 9

Objects may be confiscated which are connected with an offense punishable under paragraph 1 of article 5. Paragraph 4 of article 18 and articles 19 to 26 of the law on statutory offenses shall apply correspondingly.

ARTICLE 10

In accordance with paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Third Transition Act of January 4, 1952 (BGBI[2] I, p. 1), this act shall also be valid in the land Berlin. Statutory ordinances made under this act shall apply to the land Berlin in accordance with article 14 of the Third Transition Act.

ARTICLE 11

This act shall come into force on the day following its promulgation.

The constitutional rights of the Bundesrat have been observed.

The foregoing act is hereby promulgated.

Bonn, September 5, 1961.

LÜBKE,
The Federal President.
LUDWIG ERHARD,
The Deputy for the Federal Chancellor.
LUDWIG ERHARD,
The Federal Minister for Economic Affairs.
BALKE,
The Federal Minister of Nuclear Energy and Water Economy.

ASPECTS OF SYNTHETIC DETERGENTS IN WATER

(By Jesse M. Cohen, Engineering Section, Water Supply and Water Pollution Branch, Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Cincinnati, Ohio, at the July 1959 meeting of the American Society of Sanitary Engineering, Washington, D.C.)

INTRODUCTION

During the past 20 years, the development of petrochemicals for household and industrial uses has undergone tremendous expansion and diversification. Leading this burgeoning market are the synthetic detergents. Derived from crude oil, they emerged about 20–25 years ago as a poor competitor for soaps, which are produced from vegetable and animal fats and oils. The challenge of synthetic detergents to soap supremacy as a cleansing agent began on a very modest scale. In 1939, sales of soaps totaled 3.3 billion pounds, compared to a sales total of synthetic detergents of only 18 million pounds, as illustrated, in figure 1 (not printed in RECORD).[1][2] This beachhead was to advance steadily into a full-scale invasion of the detergent market. Ten years later, in 1949, soap sales totaled about 3 billion (2.96) pounds while total synthetic detergent sales, although still far behind, had expanded to 815 million pounds. In 1953, for the first time, total sales of synthetic detergents surpassed those of soap products, until today they comprise 75 percent of all detergent sales with a total of 3.8 billion pounds. Eighty-five to ninety percent of this impressive total is sold to the household market.

Synthetic household detergents are mixtures of at least 3 and sometimes as many as 10 individual components, each of which plays a specific part in the washing process. The one essential ingredient common to all is the surface-active agent, often referred to as the "surfactant" portion. Supplementary compounds, generally termed "builders," include polyphosphates, sodium silicates, so-

[2] Translator's note: "BGBI" is an abbreviation for "Bundesgesetzblatt," which has been the official legal gazette since 1949.

[1] Macon, J. R., "Detergent Market Trends," Soap and Chemical Specialties, 31, 41 (March 1955).

[2] Anon. "Specialties Ignore Recession," Chemical and Engineering News, 36, 113 (September 1958).

dium sulfate, and sodium carboxymethylcellulose. Other constituents, such as foam stabilizers, perfumes, and optical bleaches are usually added in minor amounts. Some typical formulations are shown in figure 2.

FIGURE 2.—*Examples of household synthetic detergent formulations*

Component	Amount (percent)			
	A	B	C	D
Alkyl aryl sulfonate	9	18	8	31
Alkyl sulfate	9	------	22	------
Sodium polyphosphates	50	47	------	------
Sodium silicate	7	7	------	------
Sodium sulfate	18	23	63	62
Moisture	5	3	5	5
Other compounds	2	2	2	2

Although soaps perform well in warm, soft water, they all form insoluble calcium and magnesium salts which lack cleansing properties and cause deposits on plumbing fixtures and appliances. Soaps also lose cleansing activity in acid waters. To overcome these difficulties, chemists have created entirely new substances whose molecules are enough like those of soap to have essentially the same cleansing properties, but differ enough to be immune to the effects of acids or hard water.

Synthetic detergents are divided into three groups: anionic, cationic, and nonionic compounds. When soaps and most of the synthetic detergents are dissolved in water, their molecules split into two electrically charged parts, or ions. These ions consist of a large organic group which is hydrophobic, that is, relatively insoluble in water, and a smaller inorganic group which is hydrophilic, or soluble in water. This hydrophobic-hydrophilic structure is characteristic of all synthetic detergents. The various classes of synthetic detergents, including soap, are illustrated in figure 3 (not printed in RECORD). Of the hundreds of different commercial surfactants available, the one compound in greatest use is an anionic surfactant, the sodium salt of dodecylbenzene sulfonate, which is frequently referred to as alkyl benzene sulfonate or ABS for short.

Synthetic detergents have caused concern among waste and water treatment people for the past few years for two important reasons. One is that almost the entire industrial production of 3.8 billion pounds is eventually discharged to surface or ground water; second that some of the surfactants are endowed with remarkable abilities to resist the treatment processes available to the sanitary engineer. A portion of the detergent materials consistently resists absorption and sedimentation in the primary treatment of sewage. Even sewage plants possessing secondary treatment processes are able to reduce only partially the surfactant content. Hence, practically all sewage effluents contain some surfactant, which, because it has survived the rigors of sewage treatment, is inherently prepared for an even longer survival against the purification agencies in surface and ground waters. In many instances the stream water containing the persistent surfactant is used for municipal drinking water supply.

During the past few years an extensive technical literature has appeared covering many aspects of synthetic detergents in sewage and water. I will confine my discussion to synthetic detergents in water and water treatment plants.

EFFECTS ON RIVER WATER

Streamflow is commonly relied upon to dilute and further degrade treatment plant effluent by natural stream purification processes. It becomes pertinent therefore, to consider the persistence of synthetic detergents in river waters.

The surfactants that reach the rivers in sewage plant effluents are those residual materials that have resisted the intense biological activity of sewage and, hence, are not likely to be easily oxidized in river water. In fact, it has been shown that the surfactant in greatest use today will resist natural stream purification processes. In figure 4 (not printed in RECORD) are shown the data of Hammerton[3] which illustrate the rates at which various types of surfactants are destroyed in river water. It is apparent from these curves that a portion of surfactants C and D will persist for longer than 20 days, long enough for this contaminated water to arrive at a water treatment plant as part of the water supply.

Along with the surfactant, one of the "builders," polyphosphate compounds are discharged into streams in quantities 2–2½ times the amount of surfactant. Phosphates are an essential nutrient for biological life and the constant discharge of synthetic detergents into a river provides additional material for growths of algae. Algae may cause difficulties with water plant operation and frequently are responsible for unpleasant tastes and odors in water. The polyphosphates also become important in water treatment, as I will show later.

DETERGENTS IN WATER TREATMENT

During the years 1950–54, when synthetic detergent sales were mounting rapidly (fig. 1) a number of instances were reported throughout the country of difficulty with the coagulation process in water treatment plants. These difficulties were generally ascribed to the presence of surfactant in the raw water supply. At about this time, in response to requests from various State agencies, the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center initiated research on the effects of synthetic detergents on the coagulation process.[4 5] Other research laboratories have since published results which have substantially confirmed our work.[6]

At the center we studied the individual components commonly included in household synthetic detergents to determine which of the major ingredients was responsible for the coagulation difficulties with alum and with iron salts. They were discovered to be two chemical compounds, the organic surfactants which generally is an alkyl benzene sulfonate, or ABS, and sodium polyphosphate which invariably is sodium tripolyphosphate.

Extensive investigation was done on the concentration of surfactant material which interferes with chemical coagulation. The data showed that damage to this process does not occur until relatively high concentrations of organic material are present. These interference concentrations are much higher than ever recorded as present in any drinking water supply. It is clear, then, that difficulties with chemical coagulation cannot be assigned to only the presence of surfactants.

Experiments with various concentrations of polyphosphates demonstrated that very small amounts of these phosphate compounds can interfere with coagulation. With a slight increase in phosphate concentration, the process of coagulation can be disrupted completely. Figure 5 (not printed in RECORD) illustrates the damage that small amounts of sodium tripolyphosphate can cause to a coagulation with ferric sulfate.[5] As little as 0.025 parts per million, or 0.2 of a pound in a million gallons of water, can decrease the quality of chemical coagulation in a water treatment plant. While many water supplies now contain interference concentrations of polyphosphates, fortunately no serious damage to water quality has occurred, for several reasons. First their interference may be overcome by increased coagulant dosage. Second, hardness which is present in varying degrees in practically all waters tends to reduce or eliminate their interference. Third, polyphosphates are rapidly converted in sewage to relatively innocuous forms of phosphates.

REMOVAL OF SURFACTANTS FROM WATER

I have already indicated that all sewage contains surfactant material in concentrations varying from a few parts per million to 20 parts or more per million. Sewage treatment processes at best remove up to 50–60 percent of the original surfactants and sewage effluents contain resistant forms which do not readily decompose. Dilution by river water further reduces the concentration so that municipal raw water supplies now contain surfactant concentrations ranging from a few parts per billion up to perhaps a few parts per million. This water will also contain varying amounts of phosphate compounds, but now in a form which will not interfere with chemical coagulation.

Water treatment processes have been shown to be ineffective in achieving significant removal of surfactant material.[5 7] Chlorination, which is common to all water treatment plants in this country, has no effect in reducing the concentration. Chemical coagulation has been shown by several investigators[5 7 8] to be incapable of removing more than minor amounts, from 5–10 percent. Chemical coagulation is, however, very effective in reducing the phosphate compounds to very low concentrations. No research has been reported on the effect of rapid sand filtration which is a step in the water treatment process, on removal of surfactant. This unit process is used in all plants which chemically coagulate water, and indirect evidence indicates that no removals of dissolved materials such as surfactants would be obtained. It has been reported[7] that slow sand filtration, which is more common abroad than in this country, has shown removals up to 40 percent.

When synthetic detergents first became a problem to sanitary engineers, it was stated that turbidity present in most surface waters would adsorb surfactants and remove them by sedimentation. This has since been shown to be wishful thinking, since such predicted removals have not occurred in practice.

To date only one water treatment process will remove substantial amounts of surfactants, but at such great cost, unfortunately, that it is unlikely any plant will undertake the treatment. This process consists of the addition of activated carbon, which is commonly used in many water plants for the control of tastes and odors. The activated carbon is generally applied in amounts up to 10 p.p.m., with some exceptional plants using more during short periods of difficulty. Activated carbon will remove surfactant compounds at rates which can be predicted, as shown in figure 6 (not printed in RECORD).

[3] Hammerton, C., "Observations on the Decay of Synthetic Anionic Detergents in Natural Waters," J. Appl. Chem., 5, 517 (1955).

[4] Smith, R. S., Cohen, J. M., and Walton, G., "Effects of Synthetic Detergents on Water Coagulation," Journal American Water Works Association, 48, 55 (1956).

[5] Cohen, J. M., Rourke, G. A., and Woodward, R. L., "Ferric Sulfate Coagulation in the Presence of Synthetic Detergent Components," accepted for publication in the Journal, American Water Works Association, (1959).

[6] Howells, D. H., and Sawyer, C. N., "Effects of Synthetic Detergents on Chemical Coagulation of Water," Water and Sewage Works, 103, 71 (1956).

[7] Hammerton, C., "Synthetic Detergents and Water Supplies," Proc. Soc. for Wat. Treat. and Exam., 5, 145 (1956).

[8] Vaughn, J. C., Falkenthal, R. F., and Schmidt, R. W., "Effects of Synthetic Detergents on Water," Journal American Water Works Association, 48, 30 (1956).

For example, if 1.6 p.p.m. of surfactant are present in a water supply, removal to a residual of .01 p.p.m. will require treatment with 120 p.p.m. of carbon; if residuals of 0.1 p.p.m. of surfactant are desired, then 60 p.p.m. of carbon would have to be added.

In both cases, the required doses of carbon are prohibitive economically. Up to the present time, there is no economical way of removing surfactant material from drinking water. Present research activities are more logically directed toward removal at the sewage treatment plant.

GROUND WATER CONTAMINATION

Growth of suburban areas has increased the use of individual household water supplies from ground water and of sewage disposal to septic tanks or cesspools. Use of small lots for both waste disposal and water source has resulted in increasing incidents of contamination of the ground water with sewage.[9 10 11] One of the first evidences of detergent pollution of drinking water is foaming at the tap. This qualitative test for surfactant is surprisingly sensitive and will indicate concentrations as low as 0.8 ppm. Pollution with greater concentrations produces, in addition to increased foaming, unpleasant tastes and odors. The polyphosphates which almost always accompany the surfactants apparently do not travel too far through the ground, but are precipitated and immobilized. While the surfactant material may not in itself be hazardous to health, its mere presence serves to warn that sewage has contaminated the ground water. Pollution of ground water is far more serious than similar pollution of a surface water. Underground waters move slowly; it may take months or even years before contamination appears, but once it has occurred it may require as much or more time before the water is free again from contamination.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

The tremendous expansion in the use of synthetic detergents has posed problems for the sanitary engineers that were not present when soap was the common cleansing agent. Those difficulties have appeared for the very reasons that make synthetic detergents more desirable as a cleanser than soap. Soaps are precipitated by hardness, synthetic detergents are not. Soaps are easily decomposed both by acid conditions and biological activity; synthetic detergents are immune to acids and, more important, will resist biological decomposition and hence will survive, at least in part, sewage treatment, river self-purification processes, ground water travel and will appear in varying reduced amounts in drinking water. At the present time and under normal conditions of rainfall, the concentrations of surfactant in drinking water are low, probably in the parts per billion range, but under conditions of abnormally low rainfall or increased pollution of the raw water supply with sewage effluents, concentrations have reached a few parts per million. These concentrations are easily detected both by foaming and by off-tastes and odors. The deteriorated quality of the drinking water and apprehension about the possible chronic effects of continued ingestion of small amounts of synthetic detergents have spurred research on the problem. Most of the effort at present is directed toward removing the surfactants at the sewage treatment plant. Some consideration has also been given by the major producers of synthetic detergents to the development of other suitable compounds equal to the present surfactants in cleansing properties but different in the important characteristics of being decomposable by biological life. A step in this direction has been the development of a synthetic detergent based, not on petroleum as most of them are, but on sugar.[12] The compound is still largely in the development stage.

I have no doubts that continued active research will discover means for increasing the efficiency of removal of surfactants by sewage treatment processes.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *March 22, 1963.*

Hon JOHN J. MCINTYRE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Regarding foam control measures, Cleveland Easterly Sewage Treatment Plant: Recent investment to the extent of one-quarter of a million dollars for process equipment to control foam has been expediency rather than a cure for the situation. Briefly a water spray system provides the energy to depress or break up the foam, driving the foam back into the liquid system. This method largely prevents the contamination by foam of any surface within the wind carrying distance.

The basic problem of removal of foaming constituents from the treatment process has not been changed. We are well aware that existing process equipment only partially removes refractory materials.

The new chemical molecules used by man are reasons for investigation. Molecular complexes are in the foam which we see. To a lesser extent they are unseen in the waters which we use. For this reason we search to find answers for complex relationships with which you are concerned.

JOHN J. WIRTS,
Chemical Engineer.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire upon his freshman speech in the Senate and upon taking an active interest in a problem which is of concern to the Federal Government. The Senator from New Hampshire brings to the Senate experience in local government. He is aware of the difficulties which descend upon us as we become more and more an urban community.

The housewives of New Hampshire will welcome his participation in this action, as will city fathers and others interested in the health of the State.

I am also glad to have heard the comments of the Senator from New Hampshire with respect to the field of conservation, the need for which we in the West are aware, but for which we are always in need of the support of easterners. I am pleased to join forces today with the junior Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join as a cosponsor of the bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], who has a long and distinguished record in the field of the preservation of America's natural resources. She represents one of the great natural recreation States of the Nation.

I am also pleased to join with the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], who has had a long and abiding interest in the broad aspects of the preservation of America's natural resources, and a wide knowledge of the specific aspects involved in the bill introduced a few minutes ago by the junior Senator from Oregon.

The bill seeks to end the growing problem of detergent chemicals in our water supplies. It is gratifying to note that a number of distinguished Senators and Representatives, including Representative REUSS, of the Fifth Congressional District of Wisconsin, understand this serious problem and are willing to provide the leadership to meet it. It is likewise gratifying to note the interest shown by leaders in the field of conservation and in other fields in the serious problem raised by the pollution of our waters in a number of different ways, especially pollution by detergents.

As Governor of Wisconsin, I spent much time in the past year or two working on this rapidly increasing menace to public health and recreational enjoyment. At my request, the Wisconsin State Board of Health, the State committee on water pollution and the natural resource committee of State agencies, made an exhaustive study of the triple threat which detergent chemicals now constitute: The pollution of our drinking water and the fresh water in rivers, lakes, and streams; the serious disruption of our sewage treatment plants, and the blighting of the landscape with detergent foam which scientists warn may contain dangerous bacteria.

These Wisconsin studies produced a wealth of valuable information. They revealed that the problem was far worse than we realized. They showed that detergent chemicals already had polluted some of the underground water supplies in 64 of Wisconsin's 72 counties. They found mountains of detergent foam piling up on some of our most scenic rivers.

But most important of all, they proved that it is almost impossible to deal with this problem at the State level.

First of all, it is extremely difficult for a single State to do the research and testing necessary to set standards and impose adequate controls on detergents. Second, it is a principle of physics that water—and the dangerous pollution which stalks our water—does not respect State boundaries. Wisconsin is almost an island, surrounded by rivers and lakes which lead to every part of the Nation. Its underground water supplies follow mysterious underground routes which lead for hundreds of miles.

A determined effort still is being made to enact legislation immediately in Wisconsin to deal with this problem, but even if successful, such legislation cannot guarantee the people of my State that their water will be free of detergent chemical pollution. This can be done only by the U.S. Congress, with a bill such as the one introduced today.

Should anyone have any doubts, as to the urgency of this problem, I want to emphasize this basic fact:

The control of detergent pollution is just one part of what I consider the most urgent domestic crisis facing our Nation today—the preservation of our priceless

[9] Flynn, J. M., Andreoli, A., and Guerrera, A. A., "Study of Synthetic Detergents in Ground Water," Journal American Water Works Association, 50, 1551 (1958).

[10] Neel, J. K., and Hopkins, G. J., "Experimental Lagooning of Raw Sewage," Sewage and Industrial Wastes, 28, 1326 (1956).

[11] Metzler, D. F., "Recommended Action Against Effects of Severe Droughts in Kansas," Journal American Water Works Association, 48, 999 (1956).

[12] McCarty, P. L., "Effects of Syndets on Some Sewage Treatment Processes," research report on project DSA–7554, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (September 1957).

natural resources and the defense of the environment in which we live against the most powerful assault in the history of our Nation. Unless this Nation girds for battle immediately, its people are not going to have clean water to drink, clean air to breathe decent soil in which to grow their food, and a green outdoors in which to live a few decades from now. This is a battle to preserve the simplest, basic elements necessary to human survival.

I am familiar, of course, with the tremendous threats our country faces around the world. We are all deeply concerned about Cuba and atomic bombs, with Communist subversion, crime, and human suffering. I support the programs our Nation has developed to meet those great problems.

But while we mobilize all the powers of our National Government to meet those perplexing problems, we cannot be blind to the growing crisis of our own immediate environment. Our soil, our water, and our air are becoming more polluted every day. Our most priceless natural resources—trees, lakes, rivers, fish spawning grounds, wildlife habitat, scenic landscapes—are being rapidly and systematically destroyed.

Wisconsin, one of the Nation's favorite outdoor playgrounds and a State having a great tradition of enlightened conservation, has moved to meet this crisis as best it can. My State has earmarked $50 million, in addition to all other conservation budget money, to be used in the coming decade to preserve as much as can be saved from this vanishing public treasure—to buy up land for public parks and forests, to preserve scenic vistas with long-term easements, to save the wetlands for fish, birds, and wildlife habitat.

But even this program cannot begin to save the environment in which we live against the powerful assaults of industrialization, congestion, pollution, erosion, blight, and decay.

We need a comprehensive, nationwide program to save the natural resources of America.

We need this just as desperately as we need a defense against atomic missiles.

This rather simple bill—to call a halt in 2 years to the pollution of water by detergents—is one small but important step in that direction. We must fight the destruction of our natural environment on every front where the battle is joined.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a report which I have prepared on the detergent pollution problem and also a letter from a constituent of mine. The letter relates to this specific problem in his area.

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

THE THREAT TO THE PUBLIC FROM DETERGENT POLLUTION

The U.S. Congress must ban the use in this country of certain detergent chemicals which are polluting our water supplies, disrupting our sewage treatment plants, and blighting our landscape with detergent foam which may represent a serious health hazard.

The Congress can do this without upsetting the soap and detergent industry, and without denying housewives a valuable aid to household cleanliness.

All that is necessary is to use the powers of the Congress to shift the soap and detergent industry into production of a slightly different type of detergent which will not pollute water, will not interfere with sewage treatment, and will not smother the landscape with foam.

These facts are solidly supported by scientific evidence.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

"The off-taste has been described as oily, fishy, or perfume like.

"The toxic effects of the surface active agents studied in the experiments with rats were produced by irritation of the gastrointestinal tract (10,000 parts per million or more in the diet). To an extent which depended on the concentration of the surface active agents in the diet, this irritation prevented proper nutrition. In severe cases of irritation, death resulted" ("Drinking Water Standards, 1962," U.S. Public Health Service).

Detergents as we know them today have been an important part of our lives only since about the end of World War II. But ever since 1950, their rapidly increased use has caused concern in the minds of scientists, some public officials, and lovers of the outdoors.

Today, after more than a decade of serious research and experience, the detergent threat to public health and to outdoor resources has been thoroughly documented.

Most of our popular detergents today contain a chemical made from crude oil. It is this powerful chemical, alkyl benzene sulfonate (ABS) which makes the detergent such an excellent cleaning agent. It cuts through grease and dirt in hard or soft water. It does not leave a scum or deposit as soap does.

But it is this same chemical which threatens our water supply today. By its very nature, this "surface active agent" or "surfactant" forms a union with the water which is extremely difficult to break. It follows the water wherever it goes. Even the complex processes of a modern sewage disposal plant, which remove the most dangerous human wastes and industrial acids, cannot remove all of this detergent chemical, ABS.

The sewage effluent from these plants, which ultimately is discharged into lakes and streams, is loaded with this detergent chemical.

Similarly, this chemical also defies the purification processes of nature, which we rely on where there are no such sewage plants. Many parts of Wisconsin, including heavily populated suburbs around Milwaukee and highly desirable rural residential land in other areas, rely on individual wells and septic tanks.

In such situations, the detergent chemical—unlike other wastes—passes through the septic tank and the drainage system, filters down through the soil and enters the underground well.

HOW BIG IS THE PROBLEM?

Americans are presently using detergents at the rate of 3.8 billion pounds every year. If packed into one pound boxes 6 inches high and laid end to end, this would more than reach around the world.

A Public Health Service report from the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center at Cincinnati, Ohio, says:

"This is cause for great concern because almost all of this material ultimately finds its way into our surface and ground waters. Until recently, we believed our water supplies were inexhaustible. Today, however, we know this is not true. We must use our waters over and over if there is to be an adequate supply for all of us."

This pinpoints the problem: The use of detergents is growing at a phenomenal rate, and the presence of their oil-based chemicals in our water supplies is steadily increasing because water is used and reused.

This matter of reuse of water is one of the most important aspects of detergent pollution. Until recently, water could be safely reused because most of the conventional pollutants were removed or rendered harmless by the sewage disposal systems and by the effects of oxygen, sunlight, and dilution if they did manage to reach our lakes and streams. But these forces cannot combat the detergent chemical, ABS.

SCIENTIST URGES REMOVAL

After an exhaustive review of 10 years of research on this problem, this conclusion was reached by Edward Wise, senior specialist in science and technology in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

"It has been the writer's observation that removal of detergents and other contaminants at the source is most essential to the protection of our water supply with our increasing population. The old theory, 'dilution is the solution to pollution,' would seem no longer valid."

A similar conclusion was reached by F. M. Middleton at the Taft Sanitary Engineering Center:

"No one would want to give up detergents, antifreeze, synthetic fibers, miracle drugs, insecticides, modern paints, and the myriad other products that make our lives efficient and pleasant. Progress is not, however, always an unmixed blessing. Man may, in his rush forward, foul the environment and unleash forces that will deter him in his progress."

Fortunately, in the case of detergents, there is no need to "foul the environment" any longer. The legislation proposed here to the Congress, combined with the research already done by the soap and detergent industry, makes a prompt solution possible.

Detergents came to us from Germany, where a substitute was needed in the prewar years for the animal fats used in soap.

Germany led in the development of detergents; it was the first to find them a serious public problem; it was the first to pass a law such as this one; and it is the first to develop an adequate substitute for the chemicals which have been found to be dangerous to the public.

Mountains of foam on Germany's historic rivers and the increasing pollution of water supplies led West Germany to pass a law setting December 31, 1964, as the cutoff date for manufacture of detergents containing ABS, which would not break down in the water. In October 1962, the West German government drafted standards for detergents which requires that they decompose at least 80 percent after entering the water supply.

Meanwhile, German scientists have developed new detergent chemicals made from sugar which will decompose, instead of flowing along with the water like the oil-based chemical, ABS.

WILL THIS BE A COSTLY PROGRAM?

Passage of this bill, setting June 30, 1965, as the cutoff date for manufacture of detergents which do not decompose in the water, will involve some temporary disruption to the soap and detergent industry. But it will not put anyone out of business and it will not be a serious problem to anyone.

It allows more than 2 years for a transition which is already technically possible.

The firms which make detergents also make soap, and they also will make the new type of detergent. The most they face is the problem of developing and marketing a slightly different product, but with the same production and marketing facilities and the same vast and growing market.

Engineers tell me that the new type of detergent at present would have to sell for about 15 percent more. Presumably, extended mass production and continued research would bring this cost down.

For the present, however, the slightly higher cost makes it impossible for any detergent firm to shift over to the new type of detergent, even though detergent company scientists themselves have documented the dangers in continued use of ABS detergents.

As long as competitors can manufacture and sell the cheaper type, no company will undertake the transition.

Here is an obvious case where the Congress should simply draw the ground rules, and let free enterprise proceed with the steps it already knows should be taken.

IS 2 YEARS TOO LONG TO WAIT?

Presumably, the only opposition facing obviously necessary legislation of this type would come from the soap and detergent industry. Therefore, simply in the interests of getting a corrective program started, it seems reasonable to allow the 2 year transition period.

Meanwhile, the public should not be too alarmed. The tests made of public water supplies, while astonishing, still do not show the presence of detergents in such quantities as to pose an immediate threat to public health.

However, two important points must be remembered.

First, no one knows exactly what effect these powerful oil-based chemicals have on the human system, even in small quantities, especially when drunk over a long period of time. It stands to reason that their very power to cut the caked grease off a frying pan, and their amazing ability to combine with water and cling to it wherever it goes, make them a danger to the human digestive and nutritional system.

Second, the relatively slight concentrations of detergent in our water supply today should not lull us into inaction because scientists have proven conclusively that this concentration will continue to climb upward and upward. Remember, almost 4 billion pounds a year are being dumped into our water supply, and also that through the reuse of water, the concentration tends to multiply.

The Public Health Service tests indicated that death resulted, in the experiments with rats, only when the detergent concentration rose far above any level conceivable in our water supplies today. However, there have been no conclusive long-term tests involving the human system.

A publication of the official West German Institute for Water, Soil, and Air Hygiene of June 1962, prepared by Dr. H. W. Janicke, finds indications of cancer-producing effects of detergents in the water supply.

This remains to be proved, of course. But let it be proved in the laboratories of the future. Let it not be proved in the stomachs of American citizens. It would be idiotic for Americans to go on drinking this powerful, oil-based chemical, which creeps into their water supply through the sewage system, until some scientist on some future day proves that it is truly deadly.

THE FOAM PROBLEM

I want to discuss two final aspects of the detergent problem: Foaming, which has caused so much public protest, and the disruption of our sewage disposal systems.

It is important to understand this fact: Foaming is part of the detergent problem, but it is not the heart of the problem. If housewives voluntarily used only detergents which did not foam, or if industry voluntarily shifted over to such detergents, or if this bill was aimed only at foaming detergents, the problem still would not be solved. Any detergent containing ABS will find its way into our water supply, whether it has foaming properties or not. Furthermore, the only way to eliminate the problem of foaming is to eliminate detergent chemicals from the water supplies.

It was foaming which brought the detergent problem to the attention of scientists, public officials, lovers of the outdoors and even housewives. The foam has been piling up now for a decade.

On Long Island, some citizens have had to carry water in from the outside because the tap water was so detergent-polluted that turning on the faucet produced a glass of foam.

I am attaching a report of the Wisconsin State Board of Health which describes the most incredible amounts of foam desecrating our landscape. As early as 1950, the board of health reported a wall of foam on the Mississippi River in western Wisconsin which was 15 feet high, 35 feet wide and 300 feet long. In 1956, a helicopter had to be used to blow away foam on the Baraboo River so rescuers could search for a lost boy.

Last week foam cascaded down the Wisconsin River in central Wisconsin. I have a letter from Mr. R. G. Barz, of Merrill, protesting this disgusting sight.

The Milwaukee Journal photographed detergent foam filling the entire bed of Turtle Creek in Rock County in southern Wisconsin. The Janesville Gazette warned citizens to "duck unless you want to be clobbered by suds in downtown Janesville" and pictured "giant billowing seas of foam on the Rock River."

And the Peoria (Ill.) Journal-Star, in a photograph which looked like a spectacular ice jam at Niagara Falls, showed a 40-foot high wall of foam filling the bed of the Rock River at Oregon, Ill.

This is simply revolting. We cannot continue to allow our beautiful lakes and rivers and country streams to be buried in foam—foam which everyone knows comes from detergent pollution which in turn comes from sewage.

This will destroy the recreation industry if it is not stopped at once.

AN ECONOMIC PROBLEM AS WELL

But I want to emphasize one very important point: Foaming is not merely an esthetic problem; it is a serious economic problem and I now believe that it carries a graver threat to public health than the pollution of underground water.

The Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, in a 1962 report, discusses the foaming which has been a growing problem at sewage disposal plants since 1950.

Detergents disrupt sewage disposal plants in two ways. First, their oily mixing powers disrupt the normal coagulation process used in these plants (when the detergent concentration is high enough).

Secondly, foam billows up above the sewage aeration tanks which shuts off oxygen and sunlight, a vital part of the process.

This Taft Center report goes on to state:

"The effect most often mentioned by sewage treatment operations has been excessive foaming in aeration tanks. Bacterial counts in the foam phase have been found to be at least 20 times as great as in the liquid phase. Thus, wind-blown foam could be a significant health hazard."

So far as I know, this shocking fact has been completely overlooked in the discussion of the detergent problem.

Does the American public realize that foam containing 20 times the bacteria count of liquid sewage is blowing away from our sewage disposal plants and spreading itself across the countryside?

This final example—the problem of foaming and the problem at sewage disposal plants—shows the economic issues at stake in this detergent question.

THE CONSERVATION ISSUE

It seems almost unnecessary to mention the threat which detergents present to the conservation of our natural resources, which I believe is one of our most urgent duties as American citizens.

Scientists have found that fish shun water polluted with detergents. It's not that they are smarter than humans. Apparently they just have better detection equipment.

No bubbling spring in the forest is safe today from detergent pollution. No canoeist in the wilderness can be certain that he will not round the bend and become lost in a disgusting mass of detergent foam.

The problem is there for all to see. The only question is whether we have the intelligence and the courage to meet it.

EXCERPTS FROM A REPORT BY JESSE M. COHEN, ENGINEERING SECTION, WATER SUPPLY AND WATER POLLUTION BRANCH, TAFT ENGINEERING CENTER, CINCINNATI, OHIO

Synthetic detergents have caused concern among waste and water treatment people for the past few years for two important reasons. One is that almost the entire industrial production of 3.8 billion pounds is eventually discharged to surface or ground water; second, that some of the surfactants are endowed with remarkable abilities to resist the treatment processes available to the sanitary engineer. * * * Even sewage treatment plants possessing secondary treatment processes are able to reduce only partially the surfactant content Hence, practically all sewage effluents contain some surfactant, which, because it has survived the rigors of sewage treatment, is inherently prepared for an even longer survival against the purification agencies in surface and ground waters.

In many instances the stream water containing the persistent surfactant is used for municipal drinking water supply. * * * A portion of surfactants * * * will persist for longer than 20 days, long enough for this contaminated water to arrive at a water-treatment plant as part of the water supply. * * *

Pollution of ground water is far more serious than similar pollution of a surfact water. Underground waters move slowly. It may take months or even years before contamination appears. But once it has occurred, it may require as much or more time before the water is free again from contamination.

Up to the present time, there is no economical way of removing surfactant material from drinking water.

SURFACE WATER FOAM OCCURRENCES—REPORT OF WISCONSIN STATE BOARD OF HEALTH

Year 1950: On February 6 foam was observed below the Government dams at Lynxville and Genoa on the Mississippi River. A wall of foam 35 feet wide, 300 feet long and 15 feet high was noted at Lynxville, and 50 feet wide, 300 feet long and 10 feet high at Genoa. These occurred simultaneously. There was ice cover on most of the river.

Year 1955: April 2 to April 15 foam was observed below the flood gates at Petenwell Dam. Foam 3 to 4 inches thick. There was ice cover on lower part of Petenwell Pond. April 12 to 15 foam observed over eddy currents below dam at Wisconsin Dells rose to a height of 12 feet.

Year 1956: On March 4 foam 30 inches high was reported below the New Lisbon Dam on the Lemonweir River. On March 7 foam occurred below the Reedsburg Dam on the Baraboo River. There was ice present on the river. Helicopter was used to break up foam in an attempt to assist in search of body of a boy who had fallen into the river.

Year 1957: On February 11 water rushing out from beneath ice on Turtle Creek at the dam at Shopiere in Rock County, churned up a foam at least 7 feet high.

Year 1960: A news report dated December 28 stated that foaming had occurred at the city of Milwaukee water filtration plant.

Year 1961: A news photo dated February 28 shows high foam below a small dam on the Neshoto River in Manitowoc County.

Year 1962: On September 20 an accumulation of foam on the southeast side of Lake Waubesa was investigated. Foam 15 to 20 inches high had accumulated along this shoreline for a distance of about 20 feet out. Samples of the foam were determined to contain less than 5 mg/1 of ABS. In the fall of the year foam was observed on Lake Nemahbin where Highway 30 crosses between upper and lower Nemahbin Lakes. The foam was reported to reach a height of 4 to 5 feet, and occurred early in the week. Beach water analysis in the area showed 0.5 mg/1 of ABS.

MERRILL, WIS., *March 20, 1963.*

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: * * * I was particularly pleased with your program to bar the use of detergents in their present form in this State. I live on the Wisconsin River, south of Merrill, and spend much time on its shores. Nothing disgusts me more than to see much raw sewage and large balls of detergent foam cover the water. Efforts have been made locally to put an end to this practice. However, no tangible results are noticeable. What suggestions can you give me to enable me to pursue this contamination problem?

I am enclosing a photograph removed from the Sunday Milwaukee Journal which illustrates a condition caused by detergents in another community. The condition here has not reached such proportions, however, at times there are hundreds of large balls of detergent foam floating down the river and lodging on the shoreline. This along with paper mill runoff still exists in proportions enough to make fish taken from this water unfit for consumption.

The Wall Street Journal recently carried an article about the Federal Government enacting some legislation to eliminate the use of detergents having components to cause this condition. We, who are dependent on the use of dry wells and water wells are particularly concerned. I believe your name was mentioned as championing the curtailment or barring of further use of detergents. There is no question in my mind that the soap lobby in Washington will strenuously oppose any action.

Having spent several years in Washington during World War II in the War Production Board and also in the Pentagon as a staff member for the U.S. Engineers dealing with supply matters, I am cognizant of the problems involved in passing legislation. Your comments regarding the continued flow of sewage into the river and the detergent problem will be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

R. G. BARZ.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from Wisconsin on his freshman speech before the U.S. Senate. My spirits have been buoyed very high this afternoon by having two such eminent freshmen Senators announce their interest in and their concern with conservation. Indeed, it is not the first time for either of them, for the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin was successful, as Governor of his great State, in obtaining probably the most comprehensive program of any of our 50 States for the preservation and development of the natural resources of his State.

Mr. President, today we have heard remarkable comments from persons in varied offices in government. One was by the former Governor of Wisconsin. Another was by the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTIRE], and was based on his experience with local government. I hope I have contributed from the viewpoint of the housewives. All of us are united in recognizing the danger to health, the danger to fish, and the danger to esthetic values in our country from the excessive use of detergents. I look forward to control of this problem through the Government of the United States.

The bill (S. 1183), introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MCINTYRE), was 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 the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466–466k) is amended by redesignating sections 10 through 14 as sections 11 through 15, respectively, and by inserting immediately after section 9 thereof the following new section:

"REGULATION OF DETERGENTS

"SEC. 10. (a) The Congress finds that the navigable waters of the United States are being polluted by surface-active chemicals used in detergents which resist decomposition in natural waters and water treatment systems, and that the presence of such chemicals constitutes a national problem. The undesirable taste and foaming of drinking water, the additional expense of water treatment, and the ever-increasing concentration of these materials through re-use of water require regulation of the composition of detergents in order to protect navigable waters and public health.

"(b) It shall be unlawful after June 30, 1965, for any person to import for use in the United States or manufacture for use in the United States any detergent, unless such detergent conforms with standards of decomposability prescribed pursuant to subsection (c) of this section.

"(c) The Secretary shall, on or before the one hundred and eightieth day after the date of enactment of this section prescribe and publish in the Federal Register, pursuant to section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003), standards of decomposability for detergents which will assure that all surface-active chemicals in detergents conforming thereto will decompose reasonably quickly and completely after use so as not to pollute the navigable waters of the United States. Included with such standards shall be specific methods by which detergents shall be tested by the Secretary to determine if they conform to such standards. Such standards shall be the sole standards of decomposability applicable to any detergent manufactured for use in or imported for use in the United States.

"(d)(1) Any detergent which after June 30, 1965, does not conform with standards prescribed pursuant to subsection (c) of this section shall be liable to be proceeded against on libel of information and condemned in any district court in the United States within the jurisdiction of which such detergent is found.

"(2) Such detergent shall be liable to seizure by process pursuant to the libel, and the procedure in cases under this subsection shall conform, as nearly as may be, to the procedure in admiralty; except that on demand of either party any issue of fact joined in such case shall be tried by jury. When libel for condemnation proceedings under this subsection, involving the same claimant and the same issues, are pending in two or more jurisdictions, such pending proceedings, upon application of the United States or the claimant seasonably made to the court of one such jurisdiction, shall be consolidated for trial by order of such court, and tried in (A) any district selected by the applicant where one of such proceedings is pending; or (B) a district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties. If no order for consolidation is so made within a reasonable time, the United States or the claimant may apply to the court of one such jurisdiction, and such court (after giving the other party, the claimant, or the United States attorney for such district, reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard) shall by order, unless good cause to the contrary is shown, specify a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business, in which all such pending proceedings shall be consolidated for trial and tried. Such order of consolidation shall not apply so as to require the removal of any case the date for trial of which has been fixed. The court granting such order shall give prompt notification thereof to the other courts having jurisdiction of the cases covered thereby.

"(3) Any detergent condemned under this subsection shall, after entry of the decree, be disposed of by destruction or sale as the court may, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, direct and the proceeds thereof, if sold, less the legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States; but such detergent shall not be sold under such decree for a use which would result in the pollution of the navigable waters of the United States contrary to the purpose of this section; except that after entry of the decree and upon the payment of the costs of such proceedings and the execution of a good and sufficient bond conditioned that such detergent shall not be used contrary to the provisions of this section, the court may by order direct that such detergent be delivered to the owner thereof to be destroyed or brought into compliance with the provisions of this section under the supervision of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary, and the expenses of such supervision shall be paid by the person obtaining release of the detergent under bond.

"(4) When a decree of condemnation is entered against the detergent, court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses, shall be awarded against the person, if any, intervening as claimant of the detergent.

"(5) In the case of removal for trial of any case as provided by paragraph (2) of this subsection—

"(A) the clerk of the court from which removal is made shall promptly transmit to the court in which the case is to be tried all records in the case necessary in order that such court may exercise jurisdiction;

"(B) the court to which such case is removed shall have the powers and be subject to the duties, for purposes of such case, which the court from which removal was made would have had, or to which such court would have been subject, if such case had not been removed.

"(e)(1) The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown and subject to the provisions of rule 65 (a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to restrain violations of this section.

"(2) In any proceeding for criminal contempt for violation of an injunction or restraining order issued under this subsection, which violation also constitutes a violation of this section, trial shall be by the court or, upon demand of the accused, by a jury. Such trial shall be conducted in accordance with the practice and procedure applicable in the case of proceedings subject to the provisions of rule 42(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

"(f) All libel or injunction proceedings for the enforcement, or to restrain violations, of this section shall be by and in the name of the United States. Subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court of the

United States in any district may run into any other district in any such proceeding.

"(g) The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary shall jointly prescribe regulations for the efficient enforcement of the provisions of subsection (i) of this section, except as otherwise provided therein. Such regulations shall be promulgated in such manner and take effect at such time, after due notice as the Secretary shall determine.

"(h)(1) The Secretary is authorized to conduct examinations, inspections, and investigations for the purposes of this section through officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or through any health officer or employee of any State, or political subdivision thereof, duly commissioned by the Secretary.

"(2) For purposes of enforcement of this section, officers or employees duly designated by the Secretary, upon presenting appropriate credentials and a written notice to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, are authorized (A) to enter, at reasonable times, any factory, warehouse, or establishment in which detergents are manufactured, processed, packed, or held, or to enter any vehicle being used to transport or hold such detergents; (B) to inspect, at reasonable times and within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, such factory, warehouse, establishment, or vehicle, and all pertinent equipment, finished and unfinished materials; and (C) to obtain samples of such materials. A separate notice shall be given for each such inspection, but a notice shall not be required for each entry made during the period covered by the inspection. Each such inspection shall be commenced and completed with reasonable promptness.

"(3) If the officer or employee obtains any sample, prior to leaving the premises, he shall give to the owner, operator, or agent in charge a receipt describing the samples obtained. If an analysis is made of such sample, a copy of the results of such analysis shall be furnished promptly to the owner, operator, or agent in charge.

"(i)(1) The Secretary of the Treasury shall deliver to the Secretary, upon his request, samples of detergents which are being imported, or offered for import, for use in the United States, giving notice thereof to the owner or consignee, who may appear before the Secretary and have the right to introduce testimony. If it appears from the examination of such samples or otherwise that such detergent does not conform to standards prescribed pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, such detergent shall be refused admission, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause the destruction of any such detergent being imported and refused admission unless such detergent is exported, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, within 90 days of the date of notice of such refusal or within such additional time as may be permitted pursuant to such regulations.

"(2) Pending decision as to the admission of a detergent being imported or offered for import, the Secretary of the Treasury may authorize delivery of such detergent to the owner or consignee upon the execution by him of a good and sufficient bond providing for the payment of such liquidated damages in the event of default as may be required pursuant to regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(j) As used in this section, the term 'detergent' means any cleaning agent which contains surface-active chemicals."

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). Without objection, is is so ordered.

AMBASSADOR RAYMOND TELLES, FROM TEXAS TO COSTA RICA, RENDERS GREAT SERVICE WITH SEVEN PRESIDENTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the tremendous success of President Kennedy's visit to Costa Rica is now recognized all over the world.

From the welcome given President Kennedy, it is apparent that the President himself is one of our greatest assets in our efforts to strengthen our friendships with Central and South America.

Credit should also be given to the U.S. Ambassador to Costa Rica, Raymond Telles, the brilliant former mayor of El Paso, Tex.

On February 20, 1961, I made the following statement on the Senate floor, at the time of Senate confirmation of the nomination of Mayor Telles to be Ambassador to Costa Rica:

> Mayor Telles and I have been friends for many years; and I know him to be a man of exceptional ability, powerful personality, and deep dedication to the ideal of human liberty.
>
> My prediction is that not only will he make an outstanding record of service in Costa Rica, but this will prove only the beginning step toward even bigger assignments in the future.

Mr. President, Ambassador Telles is bringing a long-range prediction into reality by his outstanding service in Costa Rica.

Texas is proud, as the United States may be proud, of the work being done by Mr. Telles, formerly mayor of El Paso, Tex., where some 40 percent of the population is of Latin American ancestry. Ambassador Telles is a fourth-generation American of Latin American ancestry who, as an Air Force liaison officer, built an admirable record of achievement, in working with Latin American countries during World War II.

The trip by President Kennedy was more than a visit to Costa Rica. It was a visit to Central America, with six Central American presidents as cohosts. They were: President Orlich, of Costa Rica; President Ydigoras, of Guatemala; President Rivera, of El Salvador; President Vielleda, of Honduras; President Somoza, of Nicaragua; and President Chiari, of Panama.

Indeed, it was a visit to all Latin America.

This indicates something of the scope of the planning that faced Ambassador Telles when President Kennedy decided in January to go to Central America.

Ambassador Telles, working with the distinguished Costa Rican Foreign Minister, Daniel Oduber, was in charge of arrangements covering the broad fields of public information, aid, transportation, protocol, security, accommodations, administration, and finance. This included everything from when and where the President would speak and would attend receptions, to where new desk space for additional secretaries would be found.

President Kennedy set up residence in Ambassador Telles' residence in San Jose, so that the Ambassador had to manage protocol arrangements for seven presidents while rearranging his own domestic schedule, as well.

The assignment for Ambassador Telles for this trip by President Kennedy required broad vision and minute attention to endless detail.

It is obvious from all reports that Ambassador Telles has successfully ridden a whirlwind.

I wish to extend my congratulations to President Kennedy, to Ambassador Telles, and to the six Central American Presidents, for an unprecedented demonstration of international goodwill.

This is the kind of diplomatic achievement that builds lasting friendships.

Out of the San José Conference came a Declaration of Central America signed by the seven participating Presidents in the San José Conference. It is a declaration of solidarity, of progress, of peace, and of prosperity for Central America that may well be copied all over the Americas. The San José Conference was not a mere talkfest—it was a conference of solid accomplishment. A brief summation of those accomplishments is set forth in the Declaration of Central America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the official text of the Declaration of Central America as printed in the Wednesday, March 20, edition of the Washington Post be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OFFICIAL TEXT OF DECLARATION OF CENTRAL AMERICA

SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA, March 19.—Text of the official English translation of the Declaration of Central America issued tonight:

"The Presidents of the Republics of Central America and Panama are determined to improve the well-being of their peoples and are aware such a task demands a dynamic economic and social development program based on the carefully planned use of human, natural, and financial resources. It also depends on important changes of the economic, social, and administrative structure within the framework of principles that govern our democratic institutions. They have met with the President of the United States in San José to review difficulties which impede the achievement of these objectives as well as the progress thus far made in the isthmus since the integration programs began and since the Alliance for Progress was jointly established by the Republics of the hemisphere in August 1961.

"Following an analysis of the situation, the Presidents of the Republics of Central America are convinced the best hope for the development of the region is through economic integration and, bearing in mind extraordinary efforts made toward this end in the last decade and of the importance of accelerating overall economic growth, pledge to their peoples:

"To accelerate the establishment of a customs union to perfect the functioning of the Central America Common Market—to formulate and implement national economic and social development plans, coordinating

at the Central American level, and progressively to carry out regional planning for various sectors of the economy.

"To establish a monetary union and common fiscal monetary and social policies within the program of economic integration.

"To cooperate in programs to improve the prices of primary export commodities.

"To complete soonest possible reforms needed to achieve the objectives set forth in the Act of Bogotá and the Charter of Punta del Este, especially in the fields of agriculture, taxation, education, public administration, and social welfare.

"To take the above measures with a view to achieving creation of a Central American Economic Community which will establish relationship with other nations or regional groups having similar objectives.

"The Central American Presidents affirm the economic integration movement in itself constitutes an effort which is laying the groundwork for regional planning in which sectoral plans of common interest to the isthmian republics serve as a point of departure. Their governments already have taken measures to coordinate national plans so their execution will aid, rather than impede, achievement of the objectives of the economic integration program.

"It is intended that the first global plan for harmonious regional development will be presented as soon as possible for evaluation in accordance with procedures set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este. Meanwhile, the Central American Presidents declare their resolve to proceed immediately with their sectoral plans and with projects of interest to the isthmus. The President of the United States agrees to consider a long-term loan to enable appropriate Central American regional organizations, principally the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to conduct an economic feasibility survey relative to this program of regional development."

PANAMA LINK SOUGHT

"The Presidents of Central America reaffirmed their hope the Republic of Panama will participate more closely in the economic integration movement and the President of Panama declares his government fully reaffirms its support of the program of Central American economic integration. He further declares his government is prepared to initiate immediate negotiations with the governments of the general treaty of economic integration as a whole, with a view to concluding a special agreement to facilitate association of his country with the program.

"The President of the United States is impressed by the determination of the Presidents of the Central American Republics to move as rapidly as possible toward integration of the economies of their countries and their intention to formulate a regional economic development plan within which national plans will be monetary, fiscal, economy, and social policies. It is a great step forward in achievement of this objective as well as toward achievement of the goals set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este.

"The President of the United States is prepared to offer the greatest cooperation in preparation and implementation of the regional and national development projects of Central America and Panama and declares that his government will intensify its joint efforts with the governments and appropriate regional organizations in order to extend to them increased technical and financial assistance for this purpose within the framework of the broad regional program entitled joint exposition of the Presidents of Central America and the development plan being prepared by Panama."

UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTION

"To this end he proposes a fund for Central American economic integration to be made available through the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to which the United States would make an immediate substantial initial contribution to assist in carrying out regional development projects in accordance with various sectoral plans now being developed by regional organizations.

"For the longer term he also declares that as soon as the Central American Republics have formulated an overall regional development plan and as soon as this plan has been evaluated favorably in accordance with procedures established in the Charte of Punta del Este, the United States will enlarge and expand its participation in the fund and will work with the Central American countries in obtaining other Free World resources so that the agreed plan can be effectively implemented.

"The Presidents have discussed the fundamental importance to economic development of a vigorous and freely competitive private sector and declare their intention of taking necessary steps to encourage private investment which is prepared to accept nomal responsibilities compatible with development of a modern economy. These measures include establishment of regional trade and promotion offices for the specific purposes of attracting private foreign investment. They also agree that development banks or corporations should be established in each country as soon as possible to provide credit on reasonable terms for the growth of private industry, the President of the United States offering financial assistance to their operation."

BETTER LIVING STANDARD

"Currently they agree that economic and social conditions should be created to assure labor of an improved living standard through better distribution of national income. Furthermore, they agree to encourage and support free democratic labor organizations as a means of contributing toward greater worker participation in the common effort on behalf of the general welfare."

BILLBOARDS AND THE HIGH ACCIDENT RATES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the vehicular accident rate is three times greater per mile in areas having advertising devices such as billboards than in areas without advertising.

This is the report of a study prepared for the New York State Thruway Authority by Consulting Engineers Madigan-Hyland, Inc., of Long Island City, N.Y. Consideration of a certain sentence in the report is vital as we proceed to deal with the subject of billboards and their effect upon accidents. I quote that sentence from the report:

It was recognized that advertising devices are a factor in accidents, principally because they distract the motorists' attention.

The New York authority requested an analysis of accident statistics and records of the New York State Thruway for the past 2 years, 1961–62, to determine the relationship, if any, between the number of accidents and the existence of advertising devices along the route of the expressway.

A copy of this study was released on February 19, 1963, and has been sent to me by the Honorable R. Burdell Bixby, chairman and secretary of the New York State Thruway Authority.

It is significant that the study showed that almost one-third of the accidents attributed to driver inattention on the thruway mainline occurred on the one-eighth of thruway mileage upon which motorists were exposed to advertising devices.

Thus there is now scientific evidence to refute what some billboard apologists have often stated, which is that billboards and roadside advertising help maintain driver attention and reduce accident rates.

Because this coming June 30 is the expiration date for States to elect to participate in the billboard control program in the Federal Interstate and Defense Highway System this study is of tremendous value. I know that many State legislatures at this time are currently considering legislation to allow their States to participate in the billboard control program and receive a bonus of one-half of 1 percent of the highway costs in their jurisdictions. Seventeen States to date have elected to participate in the program, including Oregon and New York. The States soon will be receiving the first of Federal payments under the billboard control legislation.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I have been consulting about plans to reintroduce the proposed legislation to continue that provision. The Senator from Kentucky has long been a great advocate of the control of signboards, in line with the amendment to the Federal Interstate and Defense Highway Act. I think that he and I both feel that this statistical and impartial study bolsters our plans for further signboard control.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the engineers' study which clearly shows the relationship between accidents and advertising devices on the New York State Thruway.

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

FEBRUARY 19, 1963.

Mr. R. BURDELL BIXBY,
Chairman, New York State Thruway Authority, Albany, N.Y.

DEAR MR. BIXBY: You have requested that we analyze the accident statistics and records of the New York State Thruway for the past 2 years (1961–62) to determine the relationship, if any, between the number of accidents and the existence of advertising devices along the route of the expressway.

As you know, authority personnel on the basis of onsite inspections determined the exact locations where signs and other similar devices could be seen by motorists. After examining the authority's detailed records of all accidents occurring on the thruway, we noted that the records indicate, among other things, the type of accident, the location of the accident, and the probable cause. These data are punched into tabulating cards and can therefore easily be summarized.

By correlating the information describing the locations of the advertising devices with the accident records for the past 2 years, it was possible to determine the number of accidents that occurred where the motorist was exposed to these advertising devices and the number that occurred where there was no such exposure.

In preparing the analysis set forth below, however, it was recognized that advertising devices are a factor in accidents principally because they distract the motorists' attention. It was therefore considered essential to endeavor to eliminate all accidents caused by factors other than driver inattention.

The New York State police, at the on-the-scene investigation, classify each accident by probable cause and this information is coded on the authority's tabulating cards. It was therefore possible to exclude from the analysis all accidents except those in which the investigating State trooper reported the probable cause of the mishap as driver inattention.

In order to further restrict the analysis to data that are pertinent, all factors that might influence the pattern of these accidents due to inattention, other than the distracting effect of the advertising devices, should be eliminated from the statistics, so far as possible.

About one-quarter of the accidents due to driver inattention occurred at thruways toll barriers and interchanges. These areas are more likely to have a proportionately greater number of advertising signs and similar distractions situated in relatively close proximity because of their advantageous locations. Accidents occurring at most of these areas therefore are included in the category "accidents that take place where advertising devices were visible." However, there are other factors that increase the likelihood of accidents due to driver inattention at these same locations, such as the need to locate money for toll payment.

We therefore eliminated from the statistics all accidents that occurred at these sites on the ground that the factors noted above might unrealistically increase the accident ratio in such areas of exposure.

In order to evaluate this information about "driver inattention" accidents properly, it also was necessary to relate the accident statistics to the one-way miles of roadway involved.

Drivers were exposed to advertising devices on approximately one-eighth (13.1 percent) of the thruway's 1,118 miles of one-way roadway.

Our analysis of the data for the last 2 years showed, however, that almost one-third (32.6 percent) of the 1,550 accidents attributed to driver inattention on the thruway mainline occurred on the one-eighth of the thruway mileage upon which motorists were exposed to advertising devices.

There was an annual average of 1.7 accidents per mile due to driver inattention on the portions of the thruway mainline where advertising devices were visible, and only 0.5 of an accident per mile for this cause on the stretches where advertising devices were not visible.

The relative number of such accidents per mile in areas with advertising devices, therefore, was three times greater.

Another factor that was considered in our analysis was the effect of traffic densities on accident frequency. Areas of greater traffic volumes are likely to have a greater accident frequency. Such areas also tend to have more advertising devices. Pursuing this evaluation, accident-per-mile data were developed for the New York division of the thruway, which includes high density traffic along virtually its entire length. Separate figures were developed for the Buffalo division, which features a combination of high density traffic in the Buffalo area and moderate traffic volumes in other areas such as the Erie section. A third set of figures was developed for the Albany and Syracuse divisions, which do not have substantial stretches of high density traffic. The results of these studies are shown below in terms of annual accidents per mile of mainline roadway due to driver inattention:

Heavy density area (New York division): Areas where advertising devices were visible, 2.9 accidents per mile; areas where no advertising devices were visible, 2 accidents per mile.

Combination heavy density and medium density area (Buffalo division): Areas where advertising devices were visible, 2.5 accidents per mile; areas where no advertising devices were visible, 0.30 accident per mile.

Medium-density area (Albany and Syracuse divisions): Areas where advertising devices were visible, 0.40 accident per mile; areas where no advertising devices were visible, 0.26 accident per mile.

As expected, the areas of heavy density showed a much higher number of accidents per mile.

However, in all cases (heavy density areas, combination areas, and medium density areas) there were proportionately more accidents per mile where drivers were exposed to advertising devices than in areas where no such exposure existed.

Even in the areas of medium density, where the effect of heavy traffic is minimized, accidents caused by driver inattention were still 1½ times more frequent along thruway stretches where advertising devices were visible as in other areas.

Our analysis of thruway accident records for 1961 and 1962 clearly demonstrated a pattern of substantially more "driver inattention" accidents in all areas where motorists were exposed to advertising devices than in the areas where no such devices existed.

Very truly yours,

MADIGAN-HYLAND, INC.
DANIEL W. GREENBAUM.

THE MALLORY RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Thursday, March 7, an editorial entitled "The Mallory Rule." It was sent to me by a former constituent. I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I received from my former constituent and the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
March 7, 1963.

DEAR WAYNE: As one of your transplanted constituents and admirers it is always refreshing to see your name in print, especially when the Minneapolis Morning Tribune takes special pains to be complimentary to you.

I hope the enclosed clipping is of interest to you—and with all my good wishes for you.

I remain, as ever, your friend,

PHIELL P. HARRIS.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune, Mar. 7, 1963]

THE MALLORY RULE

Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon has served notice that he will fight police pressure groups who are attempting to get Congress to outlaw the Mallory rule laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Mallory rule is a simple and fundamental declaration of a basic right of free men—to be taken before a magistrate without delay following arrest. The high court has said that confessions obtained when this rule is violated will not stand in court. In brief, police cannot hold suspects as long as they please and they are not the valid judges of their own arrests.

"The Mallory rule," MORSE told the Senate, "constitutes a protection of a basic freedom in this Republic and I do not intend, under the pressure of a police department, to support any modifications of it whatsoever. There is no reason at all why anyone arrested for crime should not be taken forthwith to a committing magistrate for commitment or for freedom from commitment."

We haven't always cheered WAYNE MORSE in the past—but we do so now. He couldn't be more right.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask that there be printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial published in the Washington Post of March 21, 1963, entitled "Revising Mallory."

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 21, 1963]

REVISING MALLORY

The difficulties inherent in any attempt to revise the Supreme Court's Mallory rule by legislation are made painfully clear by the tortured report of the District Bar Association's so-called Killough committee. The committee recommends a bill which backs and fills, advances and retreats and demonstrates, in short, how hard it is for conscientious lawyers to tinker with basic constitutional rights.

The bar association bill begins, like proposals already advanced in Congress, by declaring that "confessions otherwise admissible shall not be inadmissible solely because of delay in taking an arrested person before a commissioner." Troubled by what this entails, however, the lawyers have added a proviso—"unless the effect of the delay is to render the confession involuntary."

This is, of course, sheer surplusage. The Constitution itself forbids the admission of involuntary confessions. The trouble is that it becomes exceedingly difficult to determine whether a confession was voluntary or involuntary after it has been wrested from a defendant in the lonely and frightening atmosphere of a police station where he was questioned without a lawyer or even a friend to advise him. This is precisely why the Supreme Court decided to exclude all confessions obtained in such circumstances.

The bar bill proceeds, then, to a section requiring that a defendant be advised of his right to remain silent before being interrogated and at once reveals its complete lack of confidence in this requirement by a succeeding section which says, "Nothing in this act shall be construed to limit or abridge the privilege against self-incrimination." The Mallory rule was designed to assure an accused person of a judicial warning as to his constitutional rights. The lawyers ought to understand full well that a police warning is by no means as efficacious.

Recognizing that police zeal will lead inevitably to coercion of confessions if policemen are allowed to interrogate suspects in police stations, the lawyers have added two sections designed to provide for the disciplining of such conduct by a police trial board. This is a wholly illusory remedy. Policemen are not going to punish each other for having cut constitutional corners in an effort to catch criminals.

One member of the bar association committee, James J. Bierbower, dissented because of constitutional qualms, which do him honor. Those who glibly assume that legislative revision of the Mallory rule raises no constitutional issues, simply because the Supreme Court found it unnecessary to reach such issues in deciding the Mallory case, would do well to read the Court's recent opinion in *Wong Sun* v. *United States*. The Court intimated plainly in that case that it could see no distinction between physical and verbal evidence in determining admissibility. In other words, the Court may protect constitutional rights by excluding confessions obtained as a result of arbitrary arrests just as it has for many years excluded physical evidence obtained as a result of unreasonable searches.

In any case, it is sad and strange indeed to find a bar association inviting the police to arrest and detain citizens without judicial authorization.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Modifying Mallory Rule Opposed By Bar Group," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 22, 1963.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 22, 1963]

MODIFYING MALLORY RULE OPPOSED BY BAR GROUP

(By Jack Landau)

The District Bar Association Criminal Law Committee has dissented sharply with a blue-ribbon report approved by the board of directors which advocated substantial modification of the Mallory rule.

The blue-ribbon recommendations for changes in the Mallory rule were made public March 14 and have been submitted to House and Senate District Committees now considering proposed legislation to alter the rule in favor of increased police questioning of arrested persons.

The Mallory rule excludes from criminal trials confessions and other evidence obtained by police from an arrested man during a period of unreasonable delay between his arrest and his preliminary arraignment.

A specially appointed bar association committee recommended that confessions not be excluded merely because they were obtained during a period of unreasonable delay; advocated a police questioning period with a 6-hour minimum during which police could obtain voluntary confessions; and supported proposals to permit arrests of material witnesses to allow the taking of testimony for future use in trials.

SENT TO CAPITOL

The special committee report, from which one member dissented, was sent to the congressional District Committees and to the District Commissioners after it had been approved by the board of directors but not by the membership. Last Monday, the criminal law division attended a hurriedly called meeting at the behest of Joseph Sitnick, vice chairman of the committee.

The criminal law committee, which is the association's standing committee on criminal law problems, unanimously approved a resolution asking that the Mallory rule not be disturbed, a committee spokesman reported.

The spokesman said that the blue-ribbon panel was composed of prominent members of the bar associations, but not of attorneys who had extensive experience in criminal law. The spokesman said the committee unanimously opposed three pending bills in Congress which are similar in substance to the blue-ribbon committee's proposals for changes in the rule.

The committee also resolved, the spokesman added, to insist that its views favoring the Mallory rule be given the same association publicity as the blue-ribbon report—publication in the Bar Association Journal, submission to the congressional District committees, and to the District Commissioners.

APPARENT CONSENT

The criminal law committee meeting, which was attended by 21 of the 30 members, the spokesman said, also opposed the blue-ribbon report on the grounds that its publication appeared to be with the full consent of the bar association.

The spokesman said the criminal lawyers believed that bylaws require a full bar association vote on any committee recommendations made with a dissenting vote before the association backing is attached to the report.

The criminal law committee also voted against any 6-hour questioning period and against arrests for investigation, which were prohibited last week by the District Commissioners.

In addition, the spokesman said, extreme resentment was expressed at bypassing the criminal law committee by not submitting to it the blue-ribbon recommendations prior to their publication. There is a feeling among committee members, the spokesman said, that the select committee was packed to obtain a predetermined report supporting repudiation of the Mallory rule.

TO ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT

The spokesman said that all the resolutions were sent to Thomas Jackson, bar association president. Mr. Jackson reported that he had received the letter with the resolutions, but declined to comment further pending the letter's presentation to the board of directors.

The criminal law committee meeting also supported the recent Killough decision handed down by the U.S. Court of Appeals. That decision held that a confession obtained during a period of unreasonable delay so tainted a second confession given after a preliminary arraignment that the second confession was also to be excluded from evidence.

The bar association special committee had taken no position on the Killough decision, and had recommended that any further amplification or limitation be left to the courts.

The whole matter is now expected to come before the next monthly meeting of the bar association.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when I was in Mexico this last week talking to a group of Mexican lawyers, it was very interesting to observe the extent to which those lawyers have full knowledge of the principle which is involved in the Mallory rule in the United States. They are at a loss to know why there should be a serious attempt to change the rule.

I am receiving an increasing amount of mail from lawyers throughout the country who are beginning to familiarize themselves with the due process principle that is involved in the Mallory rule. I am gratified that the Minneapolis Morning Tribune and the Washington Post are leading the way in calling the attention of the people of our country to the soundness of the Mallory rule. I welcome this opportunity to put this material on the Mallory rule in the RECORD.

CHANGE IN CHAIRMANSHIP OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I was out of the country there appeared in the Washington Evening Star for March 18 a story entitled "BEALL Let Out as Chairman." The article refers to the fact that the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], was appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, a post formerly held by my very good friend the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], a member of the opposition party. In the course of the story the following language appeared:

It was understood, too, that Senator MORSE was at odds with Senator BEALL on some local legislation due to come before Senator BEALL's old Subcommittee on Business and Commerce. So, the Oregonian reportedly preferred the new Subcommittee Chairman MCINTYRE.

Mr. President, that statement does the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] a great injustice. I rise to clear the RECORD, for I have served with the Senator from Maryland on the Senate District of Columbia Committee for a good many years. He is a dedicated member of that committee and has performed a great many valuable services for the people of the District of Columbia. In the course of the news story the Senator from Maryland is quoted as saying, in effect, that there is no partianship on the committee.

When the majority members came to organize the Senate District Committee, they observed that the Senator from New Hampshire, a member of the majority party, had been appointed as a new member of that committee. The senior Senator from Oregon, along with other Democrats on the committee—with no reflection on the Senator from Maryland whatsoever—took the position that the chairmanships of the subcommittees should go to the members of the majority party. After all, the majority party will and should be held responsible for the policy course of action taken by the Democratic Party in all committees, including the District of Columbia Committee. The fact that I shared the point of view that the subchairmanship should be held by Democrats is no reflection on my good friend from Maryland. I would be glad to welcome him into the Democratic Party if he desired to come in. But in my judgment, a subcommittee chairmanship should be held by a Democrat when the Democrats are in the majority. It should be held by the Republicans when the Republicans are in the majority.

I make these comments only because I think they are due the Senator from Maryland. I consider him a warm, personal friend. In fact, out in Poolesville, Md., where I have a little farm, I refer to him as "my Senator." I josh him occasionally because I think there should be a little road repair operation out there which I would like to put him to work on. The finest personal relationships exist between the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from Maryland. I make that statement today to clear the RECORD. There is certainly no basis for anyone thinking that the senior Senator from Oregon joined in an effort to have the senior Senator from Maryland removed as chairman of the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee, because we do not always vote together, either in the committee or in the Senate. I supported a proposal that all of our subcommittee chairmanships should be held by Democrats. I offer no apology for it. I am proud to take that position, and in taking it I cast no reflection whatsoever on my good friend from Maryland.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire Bassett Evening Star editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

BEALL LET OUT AS CHAIRMAN

(By Grace Bassett)

Senator BEALL, senior Republican on the Senate District Committee, today lost his subcommittee chairmanship for the first time in 8 years.

The Maryland Senator said immediately after an organization meeting that he thought the nonpartisan approach to local affairs would continue.

"We never vote along party lines," said Senator BEALL, who is up for reelection next year.

BIBLE WILL SERVE

The official reason for the change was that Chairman BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, for the first time took the chairmanship of one of the four subcommittees. He will handle fiscal affairs because of his experience and the city's pressing need for funds this year, committee spokesmen said.

Politics, both of the Democratic and committee varieties, appeared to be more persuasive if less vocal reasons for the demotion of Senator BEALL.

There are four Democrats and four subcommittees on the District Committee. Privately, Democrats BIBLE, HARTKE of Indiana, MORSE of Oregon, and MCINTYRE of New Hampshire, all subcommittee chairmen, have wondered if their party was undercutting their own future candidates against Senator BEALL by giving the Maryland incumbent the prestige and publicity that goes with a subcommittee chairmanship in this area.

MORSE FOR M'INTYRE

It was understood, too, that Senator MORSE was at odds with Senator BEALL on some local legislation due to come before Senator BEALL's old Subcommittee on Business and Commerce. So, the Oregonian reportedly preferred the new Subcommittee Chairman MCINTYRE.

Senator MORSE was absent when the committee organized today. He is attending the Central American Conference in Costa Rica.

On his insistence, however, Chairman BIBLE postponed consideration of seven bills, considered noncontroversial after their passage last year by the Senate.

Senator BEALL was named the first minority chairman of any subcommittee of a standing Senate committee 8 years ago by the late District Committee Chairman Matthew Neely, Democrat, of West Virginia.

NEELY SURPRISED BEALL

"I was very much surprised when Senator Neely chose me," Senator BEALL said. "Naturally, the majority has the right to hold subcommittee chairmanships.

"I am grateful for anything I can get from the majority but I can't expect anything," Senator BEALL said.

He said he was not surprised that Senator BIBLE wanted to be chairman of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee.

"Senator BIBLE is interested in fiscal affairs and this move is understandable and is his prerogative," Senator BEALL added.

Asked if he thought politics motivated the change, the Senator said:

"I suppose that at the other end of the avenue nothing is ever done without political motivation."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the story which appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald for March 19, 1963, entitled "Senate District Committee Organized With Chairman Heading Fiscal Unit" represents the fact, in contrast to the story which appeared in the Evening Star. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the 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:

BIBLE ASSUMES KEY POST—SENATE DISTRICT COMMITTEE ORGANIZED WITH CHAIRMAN HEADING FISCAL UNIT

The Senate District Committee was organized yesterday with Chairman ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, assuming the chairmanship of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee.

BIBLE said he was taking over the chairmanship of the subcommittee because of the importance to the District of the President's fiscal program. Mr. Kennedy has proposed a formula for Federal payment that would represent taxes lost to the District and has recommended an increase in the city's borrowing authority.

The Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee also will take up tax increases proposed by the Commissioners. BIBLE has not headed a subcommittee since he took over as chairman of the full committee.

He said he is still hopeful the Senate and House District Committees will hold joint hearings on the entire package of fiscal legislation. He has made such proposals to House District Committee Chairman JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina.

Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, retained his post as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee, Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, as chairman of the Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee, and Senator THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, Democrat, New Hampshire, recently appointed to the committee, was named chairman of the Business and Commerce Subcommittee. He replaces Senator J. GLENN BEALL, Republican, of Maryland, who has headed the subcommittee for the past 8 years. It is most unusual for a Republican to hold a chairmanship when Democrats control the Congress.

BIBLE said the full committee would consider bills to curb crime on which joint hearings already have been held and will take up transportation legislation when it comes from the White House.

Action on seven bills approved by the Senate last year was put off by the committee after it was decided new hearings should be held on them. The legislation failed to clear the House.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the January, 1963, issue of Higher Education, Mr. Oliver J. Caldwell, of the Office of Education, has published an excellent article on the liberal arts, which I feel will be helpful to my colleagues in the Senate as the President's comprehensive education legislation is considered during this session.

I announce today, Mr. President, that I hope to be able to start hearings on the education bill before my subcommittee immediately following Easter.

I commend Mr. Caldwell on the lucidity and clarity with which he has set forth his thesis. It presents in short compass background material which we would do well to keep in mind at the time the specifics of education legislation are under discussion. The type of appraisal and reorientation which Mr. Caldwell advocates if our colleges are to perform their function are, or should be in all of our minds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

THE LIBERAL ARTS IN A REVOLUTIONARY WORLD

(By Oliver J. Caldwell)

(NOTE.—Oliver J. Caldwell has been acting associate commissioner for international education, U.S. Office of Education, since April 1962. Since joining the office in 1952, Mr. Caldwell has visited more than 50 countries and has served as education consultant to many organizations. He also served with the Department of State and on the faculty of the University of Amoy and the University of Nanking, China. Mr. Caldwell holds the B.A. and M.A. degrees from Oberlin College. He has received two honorary degrees.)

We live in a time of continuing multiple crises. The status of mankind is changing. There is a rapid change in the relationships of man to his fellows and to his universe. This is a time of paramount danger. Once we could defend ourselves against danger by force. But now the nature of the forces available to us prohibits their use except as a last resort. Our best defense in these times is the universal understanding which is the goal of liberal education.

The American liberal arts college today has a new mission. Although these colleges owe much to Europe, they are unique. In the past, they have served an evolving American people exceedingly well by giving millions of Americans an intellectual grand tour of their cultural heritage. The liberal curriculum has been a powerful force for sanity in a troubled world. It has built for our country a foundation of idealism and has created a sense of identity with our neighbors of the Western World. Liberal education has been the platform on which we have built a towering edifice of technical and scientific achievement. Our social and political wisdom, which so far has guided us through a growing crescendo of crises, we owe largely to the liberal tradition in our colleges.

But education in a dynamic society must keep pace with social changes and new obligations. I have an uneasy feeling that our system of liberal education is losing touch with reality, that it is not adapting effectively to a new world. The intellectual structure of yesterday is growing obsolete.

There is a critical need for a reappraisal of the processes and goals of liberal education. The nature of the opportunities which challenge our children requires that they receive an intensified and broadened liberal learning which will accurately reflect the realities of their generation.

When we consider the more serious changes in our world, we see that a reassessment of our ideas of liberal education is required.

Recently the president of the American Bible Society and a prominent Russian rocket expert separately stated that the world is becoming a village. Isolation and distance have been destroyed by improved communications and transportation, by nuclear weapons, and by the rocket. Suddenly the earth is shrunken, and every man is neighbor to every other man. Herein lies a great danger because everyman does not understand his neighbor. There are barriers of prejudice and ignorance, supported by political, social, racial, and religious differences. The survival of the village of man requires the removal of ancient barriers by new skills and wisdom, and the creation of a new awareness that all of mankind are one species.

The removal of barriers is a special challenge to American education. Today our liberal arts curriculum emphasizes Western Europe and North America. But Americans live everywhere, and every American is part of the Main. Our Western civilization is only

one of several great traditions. The truly educated man of tomorrow must also understand the other great traditions.

Living together as a family of man requires new awareness and understanding. Liberal education may no longer be based on a single culture. Monocultural education in a polycultural world is obsolete. Liberal education adequate for tomorrow must be polycultural education.

It is said that the volume of man's knowledge is doubling every 15 years. A recent news release states that 90 percent of all of the people in human history who have made major contributions to the natural sciences are alive today. This certainly could not be said of the social sciences, the humanities, and the fine arts. Knowledge has expanded suddenly and also unevenly.

We are faced by a critically unbalanced growth in our intellectual heritage. We seem to know much more about what happens inside an atom than we do about the workings of a human mind. This is dangerous because the energies in the atom may be misused by man's mind. To protect ourselves against ourselves we must learn to know ourselves at least as well as we understand the forces of nature.

We also are challenged by the changing value of various kinds of knowledge. In today's world a 1946 curriculum is not valid, because whole new sciences have been developed. One of the hardest problems we face is the assignment of appropriate priorities to new knowledge; an even harder problem is how to get rid of surplus intellectual baggage to make room for important new knowledge. Perhaps the hardest problem is to identify and preserve the knowledge of the past which is eternally valid.

There is a dangerous temptation to rate only the hard sciences, mathematics, and related subjects as essential, and to eliminate broad humanistic studies to make room for the skills which contribute directly to the conquest of the cosmos and to our military strength. This is very bad reasoning. It is true that we must increase our physical power in order to stay alive and free, but an increased knowledge of humanity and a fresh awareness of spiritual values, are essential if we are not to abuse the new physical power we already have. We must cultivate wisdom if we are to survive in a world in which potential enemies also possess the physical power necessary to destroy mankind.

Surely the answer lies in part in a new and stronger liberal education for everyone. It is our responsibility to make opportunities available to our young people to acquire this new and stronger learning.

Many other changes in our society present challenges to the educator which our fathers never faced. I will discuss only two more, two which have a special bearing on the importance of learning. One is the Communist revolution. The rapid expansion of communism should be likened to the spread of Islam in the first half century after the Hejira. Communism should be considered as both a revolution and a religion. We are more familiar with its revolutionary than with its religious aspects. We should become more familiar with its religious aspects.

It is a religion which denies the validity of religions. It is to other religions as the newly postulated antimatter is to our own material world. For this reason, any genuine coexistence will be difficult until the nature of communism itself has changed. There is, however, reason to believe that communism does change. There are now at least three types of communism which all claim to present the true revelation; these are the Russian, the Chinese, and the Yugoslav versions of Marxism.

Communists of all three types agree on one thing: the importance of the human mind as the source of all social, political, and economic advancement. Thus communism challenges all the nations to educate all of their children.

Americans, though they are only a small minority—6 percent—of mankind, stand as an effective barrier against the conquest of the whole world by communism; to help them continue to stand, American education today has special responsibilities.

It must give Americans the technical skills they need to compete effectively against Communist polytechnic education.

It must also equip every American with a broad general background.

It must help the many emerging hungry nations to develop their human resources.

It must impart to our students reverence for beauty and humility before the unknown lest man in his arrogance destroy himself.

The other multiple pressure of our society and system of education which I will mention is the rising power of the non-Western World. For the past 300 years mankind has been dominated by Western Europeans. They conquered the weaker inhabitants of North and South America and Australia and established new nations on these continents. They made colonies of almost all of the peoples of Africa and southeast Asia. Only Japan of all non-Western nations was able to thrive in the face of Western power, and then only by developing superior military force.

There has been a sudden collapse of the old empires of Western Europe. The former colonies are emerging as free and independent nations. The rapid economic, political, and social developments in many of these new countries are matched by a transfer to them of the authority which once rested in Western Europe.

This situation is aggravated by prejudices, ignorance, hatred, and envy. Much of the trouble rises from the fact of race; the Western World is predominately white, but the emerging new nations are largely nonwhite.

The social, political, and economic facts of our times require that liberal education no longer be content to introduce young Americans to the traditions of Western Europe, the Mediterranean world, and North America. If the principal function of liberal education is to introduce a young mind to its world, then it is clear that the young minds of today must be introduced to the great cultures which now vie with the Western tradition for power in the world of tomorrow.

The Slavic cultures are dominant in areas controlled by the Soviet Union; Chinese culture in its many variations is dominant in eastern Asia; Indian culture is predominant in southeast Asia; Islamic culture dominates the Arabic world which extends from Pakistan to Morocco; the countries of Latin America are rapidly becoming a powerful cultural unit which combines elements of the traditions of Spain and Portugal with the great traditions of the American Indian. There are also a number of important smaller cultures, especially in Africa.

A new liberal education must introduce young Americans to the total cultural traditions of mankind. The inadequacy of our present education structure to this task is dramatized by the failures of many individual Americans to adapt to life in the new nations and by the unwillingness or inability of many Americans at home to understand the nature of the new world in which they live. Americans abroad often establish plush-lined ghettos for themselves in Africa and Asia, and sometimes also in the Latin American countries. While many Americans have been welcome and understanding guests in other countries, millions who have lived abroad have huddled together suspiciously as they looked out at a world they had not been taught to understand. This lack of understanding has been a serious barrier to our success in helping to build a peaceful world order.

We need a new kind of education in the liberal arts college which will perform at least the following functions:

It will prepare all of its graduates to understand that our culture is not an island, that we stand as an equal among equals in a world in which there are many cultures. It will teach every young American, that, while there are many differences among the world's cultures, there is also a common foundation of humanity which all peoples share.

It will prepare a new generation of teachers who at all levels will teach in the context of a single human family.

It will prepare an increasingly large number of young Americans to serve with charity, courage, and insight among men of all cultures. It will also contribute to the evolution of an international civil service under the United Nations which may enable that organization to fulfill its historic function without infringing on any nation's heritage.

There are many efforts underway to meet our growing national need for polycultural education. There have been many attempts to broaden our present monocultural curriculum to make it an effective introduction to mankind. Although it is doubtful whether any of them have been fully effective, all of these efforts are significant:

1. The East-West Center in Hawaii is a noble experiment which will undoubtedly increase understanding among the peoples on both sides of the northern Pacific Ocean. However, it is an incomplete effort because it is limited by law and by the intent of its sponsors to the peoples who live on the shores of one ocean.

2. A great many colleges and universities are developing new languages and area programs. These are excellent and significant enterprises, but they prepare too small a number of specialists in a few fields of knowledge. We need many more of these specialists, and we also need a general reorientation toward mankind for all of our students.

3. Several States, including New York, Pennsylvania, and California, have decreed that their elementary children shall begin to study foreign languages and non-Western cultures. However, according to reports, the educational authorities in these States are finding it difficult to locate teachers who can carry out these directives effectively.

4. Several years ago Colgate University launched an experimental project in which undergraduates were required to take a minor in a non-Western culture. Apparently this effort was not fully successful and the project has been considerably modified.

5. The Elbert Covell College at the University of the Pacific, in an interesting new experiment, will teach all subjects in Spanish except English language and literature. The college should be very useful in helping students from the United States become experts in Latin American affairs, and students from Latin America become experts in U.S. affairs. We need more colleges of this type, and they should cover all the major non-English cultures.

6. Two New York State experiments are of particular interest. The Plattsburgh State University College of Education is trying to reorganize its curriculum to enable instructors to teach most subjects from the standpoint of the total contribution of all cultures to specific subject areas. The State teachers college at New Paltz has for some years carried on highly effective inservice summer training programs to inform elementary and secondary teachers about Africa and Asian affairs. In addition it has established a world study center and now requires all of its graduates to have credits in certain courses in the history and traditions of non-Western cultures.

7. Several of the foundations are promoting the idea of mobilizing total academic resources of a few of our institutions for experimental work in polycultural education.

All of these and many other experiments are an indication of the intellectual ferment of our times. We may hope that we are on the verge of a new renaissance, since the great outburst of learning and creativity of our earlier renaissance was probably stimulated in part by contact with other cultures.

What should we do in the face of all of this activity? A few years ago the faculty of one of our largest universities worked for 2 years on a plan which it adopted, only to have it vetoed by the board of trustees. This plan is worthy of our consideration today, since something like it could be a major step toward providing adequate polycultural liberal education.

First, this plan would establish a core of 54 semester hours which all undergraduates would study. These 54 credit hours would be distributed equally among the social sciences, the humanities including the fine arts, and the natural sciences. These courses would emphasize the total contribution of all of mankind to these specific areas of knowledge. For example, a philosophy professor would no longer teach that certain philosophical concepts originated in Greece, were modified by the Hebraic-Christian tradition, and are the exclusive heritage of a superior people who live in Western Europe, North America, and certain parts of the British Commonwealth. Instead he would teach that certain ideas emerge at a given level of the evolutionary development of many cultures and are in fact a common ground on which men and women everywhere may meet.

Students would be able to count 18 hours of this core toward the fulfillment of their major requirement.

In addition the plan would intensify traditional language and area studies, and each student would be required to take a minor in a non-Western culture. Thus every graduate from this undergraduate college would have a broad polycultural background and also an introduction to a specific part of the world.

This plan could be the beginning of a new conception of the liberal arts in this country. Something like this approach to liberal learning is seriously needed in the United States today.

The 4-year course of study outlined above could be followed by 2 years of study which would lead to a master of international arts for those who desire a more thorough introduction to the world in which they live. Candidates for this degree would take their first year of study abroad in a university approved by their American colleges. They would then return for a second graduate year competent in a language and in the culture of another country. On fulfilling normal academic requirements for a master's degree, they would be better prepared than any people now graduating from American higher educational institutions for a variety of services, including national and international civil service and teaching in American and foreign institutions.

How can these objectives be achieved, and who should attempt to achieve them?

The second question is more easily answered. It is the duty of the American educator at every level from elementary through graduate school to emphasize the fact that we live in a whole world rather than in an island culture in that world. It is going to be many years before we can solve the problem of what should be taught at each level, and how the new subject matter should be taught. There may be a wholesale revolution in American education which will involve a strengthening and deepening of the American curriculum at every level. It is possible that completion of a junior or community college may become a universal requirement, adding 2 years to the traditional 12 of compulsory-free education, and that on top of this perhaps a new 4-year polycultural liberal arts college may be built as the foundation of a new university.

The increased complexity of knowledge, the need for new skills and new wisdom, together with the rapid increase in our average life span, are likely to require not only higher standards, but an expansion of the time allotted to the formal schooling.

The need for polycultural education grows out of the new interdependence of all mankind and the new role of the United States as a leader in a rapidly evolving world. The responsibilities of world leadership compel an increasing number of Americans to live and to work in non-Western societies. If Americans are to serve effectively overseas, and if Americans at home are to understand the nature of their world, it is imperative that we develop a new polycultural education.

A number of Federal programs are already creating, both directly and indirectly, a new polycultural foundation for American education. The various exchange programs now united under the authorization of the new Fulbright-Hays Act are directly contributing to this goal. Since 1947 thousands of Americans have received opportunities to broaden their educational horizons through study, teaching, lecturing, and observing in nonwestern areas. Indirectly, American education has been enriched by the experience of these Americans and thousands of others who have served as educators in such programs as schools for American children overseas and the activities now administered by AID (the Agency for International Development). Our schools and colleges now have a growing number of teachers at every level who have had polycultural experience as participants in various Federal programs. The supply of American educators with polycultural experience will be greatly increased in the next few years by returning Peace Corps volunteers.

One of the more substantial contributions to polycultural education has been the program under the National Defense Education Act, administered through the Office of Education. The Office now has an important new resource in section 102(b)(6) of the Fulbright-Hays Act. The section will enable the Office to cooperate with American institutions in offering polycultural education opportunities to Americans both at home and overseas. This enterprise can be effective only if there is effective cooperation between American educators and the Federal Government in carrying out this program.

Private efforts of the foundations, colleges, and universities, and mission boards created the beginning of an American polycultural education. Private initiative will continue to play an important part in the development of this new education. But time is short, the need is great, and the consequences of failure to instill a new wisdom into our students through our educational processes might be catastrophic.

TERCERA REUNION PARLIAMENTARIA MEXICO-NORTEAMERICANA—REMARKS BY JOSE LOPEZ BERMUDEZ

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also had the privilege, in recent days, of serving as one of the U.S. congressional delegates to the Third Interparliamentary Conference in Mexico. It was a great pleasure for me to serve on that delegation with the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE].

Some very notable speeches were made by our Mexican colleagues at that conference. There were two in particular, Mr. President, by Senor Jose Lopez Bermudez, which deserve the very careful consideration of the Senate. There were others of the same high quality, which undoubtedly will be discussed in the Senate with respect to other foreign relations matters in the days ahead, and some of which will also be offered for printing in the RECORD.

At one of the sessions Senor Jose Lopez Bermudez delivered an able speech entitled "Let Us Win a New Independence," which contained inspiring proof that our friends in Latin America—and particularly in Mexico—are determined to join with us in a cooperative spirit to preserve and strengthen freedom in the Western Hemisphere. I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed as a part of my remarks.

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

LET US WIN A NEW INDEPENDENCE

In the name of the Congress of Mexico, I wish to express our profound acknowledgment to the Legislators from the United States for making a pause in our deliberations in order to render homage to the first of our liberators.

Hidalgo has deserved the highest title in our history: the Father of the Nation.

Like Bolívar and Martí, like Washington and Lincoln, like Sucre and San Martín, like O'Higgins and Santander, like Morelos and Juárez, Hidalgo projects his image upon our time with the universal dimension of the great heroes of America.

Under the shadow of his glory here in Dolores, we are filled with a clean, American pride when we declare that the Independence of Mexico is not the result of the action of cannon, but rather the supreme outgrowth of culture. Hidalgo was the rector of one of the oldest educational institutions of new Spain. The students and professors, who daily listened to his exhortations on liberty, began to see about his head not the soft radiance of the saints, but rather the aureola that marks the great leaders.

Because in his classroom he expounded his ideas as a reformer, Hidalgo was expelled from the illustrious College of San Nicolás. Without fear or sorrow he left his academic teaching, and Hidalgo became the dean of freedom for his people.

Hidalgo, degraded, arrived in Colima with a temporary appointment as a parish priest. There he continued his redemptive preaching: to the children he would speak of hope, to the women of self-sacrifice, to the men he would speak of liberty.

It is said that each morning, accompanied by an old man named Pablo, Hidalgo would go out for a walk. Going from house to house, he would speak words of encouragement and also buy small pieces of copper. One day the old man asked him: "Father, why do you want so many pieces of copper?" Hidalgo replied: "I am going to melt them and cast a big bell, so big that it will be heard around the world."

Hidalgo did not have to cast the bell of liberty over there in Colina; because the bell of liberty was already here in the humble belfry of the Church of Dolores. Ringing the bell, Hidalgo called upon all Mexicans to attend the first liberty mass. All men of his day heard the sound of that bell.

Later when he was urged to seek his own safety, because it was clear that it would be impossible to win a war without soldiers, Hidalgo refused to flee. He knew that wars are won by soldiers, but a revolution is won

by the people. And so Hidalgo was able to make of the war of independence a movement designed to become a regime of law. Simultaneously, he started a profound social revolution which aspires to constitute itself into a state where justice shall prevail.

In the wonderful human resources present in his people, Hidalgo found all those values on which a nation can be built, and its moral wealth preserved.

In the person of Doña Josefa Ortiz de Domínguez, wife of the Magistrate of Querétaro, Hidalgo found the stoic and faithful soul of our women. In a humble heroine in Guanajuato, named Doña Gertrudis Vargas, he found the infinite fortitude of Mexican mothers. Doña Gertrudis stopped Hidalgo near the hill of Zempoala and told him: "Reverend Father, inasmuch as my age and the fact that I am a woman do not allow me to join your ranks, I want to offer to you the life of my only son, because he, as well as you, wishes to live or to die for the achievement of independence."

In the midst of fire in Guanajuato, Father Hidalgo found in the person of El Pipila—the legendary hero who covered his back with a flat stone to protect himself from the bullets of the enemy, and thus set fire to the doors of the fortified Alhóndiga de Granaditas—the spirit of Mexican youth, which is capable of burning down with the fire of its faith the doors of all despotism, in order to open for the fatherland the road to the fullness of human dignity.

Hidalgo, the teacher of patriotism, was able to recognize in Morelos the disciple who was to exceed him in achievements and who equaled him in immortality.

From the moment when Hidalgo became the leader in the struggle for independence, he manifested, not the stature and brilliance of military genius, but rather the character and the determination which made him the first of our social heroes. Not quite 3 months after that memorable night in Dolores when, with a shout, he proclaimed independence, Hidalgo drafted in Guadalajara, in December 1810, two historic decrees. The first proclaimed the abolition of slavery on our soil. The second was the first agrarian decree in the New World. "Because it is my will," declared Hidalgo, "that land should be for the exclusive benefit of the native people in their respective villages."

We do not defend what is Mexican merely moved by that profound sentiment of attachment to our country, something natural to the soul of men in every country. Neither are we moved by blind devotion when we bow before the greatness of our historic relics. Our veneration for Hidalgo flows from what Hidalgo represents in terms of prophecy and as a forerunner on the road to a better justice, without which both emancipation and the happiness of man are precarious values.

What Hidalgo proclaimed when he shouted: "Long live independence. And death to bad government" is the same thing that the hand of Jefferson wrote in a glorious declaration. "But when a long train of abuses and usurpations," stated the first builder of your Nation, "evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security."

Fellow legislators, a son of Guanajuato declared that in our country, in America, and in all parts of the world there are still many "alhóndigas" or strongholds of oppression which must be set on fire. These are the presidios erected during centuries among men by misery and violence, by ignorance and despotism, by sickness and injustice.

Let us reaffirm here in Dolores our determination to endeavor to win the new independence completely, the new independence toward which the American peoples are resolutely advancing. It is independence with peace and prosperity; independence with law and culture; independence with health and equality.

Let us bring together the honor of our flags. Let the immortal bells of Philadelphia and Dolores join their voices in order to recall to the world the example of two peoples who, notwithstanding the marked differences in their cultures and in their economies, in their power and in their customs, in their beliefs and in their technologies, have decided through their own sovereign will to live, with mutual respect, in concord and to grow in labor and dignity.

May liberty rule again wherever dictatorship has despoiled the people of their mandate. May democracy triumph in those territories which violence and terror have delivered to the temporary dominion of tyranny.

Let us establish measures of justice wherever inequality has erected walls of hatred or maintains extensive areas of poverty.

In our living together as nations and also in regard to the internal tasks of our respective countries, let us, from day to day, improve our relations and our policies with such equity and intelligence that neither adverse prices nor unfair wages shall become factors producing hardship or oppression.

Let us disarm within ourselves the law of force, in order to strengthen our spirit and conscience with the noble, peacemaking force of law. Maintaining respect for the borders of our national habitations, let us live fulfilling an ascending destiny wherein men and nations will both know how and be able to earn their bread without fear and to achieve progress without weapons.

Mr. MORSE. Following that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have other remarks by Senor Jose Lopez Bermudez at the Interparliamentary Conference held in Mexico, before Committee IV of that conference, dealing with the whole question of nuclear disarmament, printed in the RECORD.

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

Before no other Congress of the world does the appeal for peace made by the Congress of Mexico acquire greater importance than before the Congress of the United States, because the Congress represents one of the nations which have reached the highest level in nuclear power. The decision of its Legislators to work for peace would be a determinant factor to bring about the disappearance of the anxiety in which humanity lives. This anguish is justified, because while war with conventional weapons which formerly resulted in the destruction of armies and cities, and then ended in an armistice which permitted the people involved both the rebuilding of their societies and the rehabilitation or renewal of the human groups affected. But now the unleashing of nuclear war would mean the total destruction of man and the surrender of civilization and history itself.

For this reason our country has raised its voice in support, invariably of its decision not to admit within the national territory nuclear weapons of any kind, nor the means that could be used to transport them. This decision is based on our purpose not to participate in military blocs or alliances which, as products of cold war are an antithesis to the principle of collective security, the unsubstitutible basis of peaceful living together within the order and principles established in the Charter of United Nations.

Such is the degree of danger of the bombs now at the disposal of the nuclear powers that in their devastating capacity lies, in our judgment, the possibility of controlling the use of the same. This has been the possible reason which illuminated the conduct of the nuclear powers in their decision to use in the settlement of their problems every objective save nuclear war. A few days ago distinguished Senator MORSE stated that the possibility of one nation to destroy its adversary with atomic weapons is in turn accompanied by the risk of being destroyed.

Just as youth, and vital energy and potentiality must be correctly channeled in order to produce good results, otherwise they would only produce danger—likewise nuclear energy should be directed toward its most useful aspect: its use for peaceful purposes.

From the allocations for the warlike use of nuclear energy reductions corresponding to personnel, budget and the general effort should be made, in order to apply the amount resulting from such reductions to peaceful purposes. All activity in connection with nuclear energy for a warlike purpose involves a very small number of countries who control it; whereas with its use for peaceful purposes there would be a way for each and every country to be able to cooperate in the measure of its capacity, and such advance would constitute universal progress. This approach requires the technical and economic assistance so that all countries may participate and cease to be mere spectators, and in turn become actors who cooperate in the utilization of nuclear energy for peace.

This points to the necessity of obtaining the adequate training of a large number of persons, the granting of subsidies in order to study special problems, and the guidance and coordination of programs of scientific world interest, feasible of achievement in the different regions of the world in accordance with their particular interest.

Undoubtedly, the greater the number of trained and competent persons more firmly the world will be guided concerning its responsibility.

I wish to insist on the necessity that exists for us as legislators to make an effort to go forward to meet a new area of law being born: nuclear war.

Man has unleashed a force which man must control. He must control it not only in its technical aspect but also with regard to its moral aspect. While it is possible to speak about the area of atomic energy used for warlike purposes of a desire of the nuclear powers to reach a balance of forces; on the other hand, when we transfer this problem to the area of cold war we can speak of a balance on the basis of fears. A nuclear power may resort to creating a degree of panic among peoples who do not possess atomic powers, in order to impress the immense majority of men and women with the power of its warlike strength.

I consider that this fear to which I refer is produced by each threat that invokes the possibility of nuclear war, by each statement that reaches us, in the manner of radioactive rain which has the power to penetrate our homes and our conscience and to contaminate us with such fear, without any fault or guilt on our part.

The statement of the National Commission on Science of the United States which points to the danger that every person undergoes under ionizing radiation, sufficient would be to entertain the justified hope that we legislators listen to the men of science and to the experts on nuclear energy, with the desire to undertake an effort to present in our Congresses the adequate principles for the protection of our peoples.

If nuclear energy is not controlled both in experimentation for warlike uses as well as for peaceful purposes, attempts against the first and most sacred right of man: the right to paternity.

On the other hand we face the grave international responsibility of states who possess the means for the production of nuclear energy.

The immense majority of peoples who do not possess nuclear weapons face a situation

of anguish: ocean currents or atmospheric currents can bring us highly ionized harmful radiations which inexorably harm our population, and forever. We ask ourselves with consternation: Against whom shall we establish responsibility? How can we determine who was responsible and what is the sanction he deserves?

In short, honorable legislators, I invoke your patriotism to the end that we may express a common purpose in support of the appeal for peace addressed by the Congress of Mexico to all the parliaments of the world, so that as the essential outcome of this meeting we take with us one sole conviction: to continue working for peace, to study those measures that we as legislators can propose in our countries in order to establish principles which provide a greater protection for our populations. One final conclusion: we must make every effort at our command so that our people can demolish that blind alley in which fear of nuclear war holds captive the conscience of the world. Let us break down this dangerous obstacle and come out upon the broad and innumerable roads which peace and science have opened to mankind.

ALEXANDER GRAHAM BELL AWARD TO SENATOR LISTER HILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished senior Senator from the great State of Alabama, was recently honored by the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, Inc.

When the first Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf award was presented to him on March 3d on the 116th anniversary of Alexander Graham Bell's birth, Mr. Justice Burton, honorary vice president of the association, made the presentation.

Mr. President, there is little that I can add to the citation which accompanied the award. All of us, I am sure, join in saluting LISTER HILL for his great humanitarian achievements; and, as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I can testify to the wholehearted support he has always given to legislation designed to assist the handicapped and particularly those who suffer from auditory defects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded, which appears on pages 118 and 119 of the Volta Review, be printed at this point in my remarks, together with the citation.

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

FIRST A. G. BELL AWARD GIVEN TO SENATOR LISTER HILL

The first Alexander Graham Bell Award for service to the deaf was presented to Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, in Washington, D.C., on March 3, the 116th anniversary of Bell's birth. Justice Harold Hitz Burton, honorary vice president of the association, made the presentation.

Senator HILL's sustained interest in combating deafness, and his compassion for the deaf are reflected in his outstanding record of legislative achievements in the fields of medical research, research training, rehabilitation, and education.

His legislative successes in behalf of the deaf speak eloquently of his leadership, his wisdom, his parliamentary skill, and his persuasiveness in the U.S. Senate where he serves as chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee that has jurisdiction over all legislation on public health, medical research, hospitals, rehabilitation, and education. In addition, he is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee with jurisdiction over funds for the programs administered by the Public Health Service, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Office of Education, Gallaudet College, and other agencies of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Senator HILL was a sponsor of the legislation in 1949 that directed the Public Health Service to establish the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness to mobilize our research and research training resources against deafness, other sensory disorders, and all neurological diseases.

The funds available to the Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness for research and research training to combat deafness and speech impairments have increased fivefold since 1958—from $1.3 to $6.5 million. Some of these funds have been used to support the scientists who have contributed to the development and further refinement of techniques that are now so successful against otosclerosis.

Senator HILL provided the leadership for the program initiated in 1962 to provide professional and technical assistance to the States and their committees in the prevention, early detection, and treatment of deafness and other sensory disabilities. High priority is given to refining the methodology for screening procedures of children at an early age so that the necessary early education of the deaf can be initiated.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senator HILL has been a leading advocate of legislation that would improve and strengthen educational and training programs for the deaf. He strongly supported the legislation enacted in 1958 that authorized a loan service of captioned films for the deaf to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In 1962 the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, under Senator HILL's chairmanship, approved legislation to expand and strengthen the program of captioned films for the deaf. With the enactment of this legislation, the scope of the program was broadened and authorization for appropriations was raised from $250,000 to $1,500,000 per year.

It was Senator HILL who introduced the legislation to authorize Federal assistance for the training of teachers of the deaf in 1961 in order to meet a critical shortage of such teachers in the United States. In September of that year his bill was enacted into Public Law 87-276 and the full authorization of $1.5 million has been appropriated by the Congress in each of the last 2 years.

Under this law, scholarships and grants-in-aid have been made available through approved university and college training centers. It has been estimated that approximately 380 persons have undertaken the training to become teachers of the deaf as a direct result of this financial aid under Public Law 87-276, sponsored by Senator HILL.

Senator HILL's leadership in the Appropriations Committee has also greatly benefited the programs of Gallaudet College. Senator HILL's subcommittee recommended appropriations totaling $9.1 million over the past 4 years, and the increases approved each year were earmarked for higher faculty salaries, additional operating funds and new physical facilities.

Senator HILL has also been a consistent supporter of the programs for the deaf that are administered by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and in each of the past 2 years the annual appropriation for vocational rehabilitation has included funds especially earmarked by the Congress for new programs related to the rehabilitation of the deaf. In 1964 the number of individuals with hearing disabilities rehabilitated will reach an estimated 7,000. The increasing level of financial support to the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has made it possible to facilitate the establishment of speech and hearing centers. Also, between 1962 and 1963 the number of traineeships in speech pathology and audiology increased from 253 to 452.

When the presentation of the award was made, the following citation was read:

ASSOCIATION CITATION TO SENATOR HILL

"From time to time there comes upon the scene of human events a man of unusual insight and conviction. After surveying the circumstances involved, he sets his course, and thereafter his faith and confidence in the rightness and justice of his decision are unshakable. Such a man is Senator LISTER HILL.

"Children born profoundly deaf are cut off from the normal experience of speech and language, the prime avenue to information, education, and self-fulfillment. Until medical science produces a cure, the opportunity for them to reach their full potential lies largely with unusually supportive parents and specially trained teachers. Since World War II the shortage of fully qualified teachers of deaf children has become an acute national problem.

"In August 1959, Senator HILL introduced legislation in the U.S. Senate to provide scholarships and grants-in-aid to assist in attracting capable young people into our profession and training them as teachers. His initiative, leadership, and persistence were essential ingredients in the outcome. Public Law 87-276, which has in 1 year doubled the number of students in our training centers, stands as a monument to his effective efforts, and represents a significant and substantial step forward for all deaf children.

"The Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf extends its most sincere expression of gratitude to Senator LISTER HILL for his stanch championship of the cause of deaf children, which will assist materially in bringing to them the abiding blessings of human fellowship through speech and language. In token of deep appreciation, the association does this day confer upon him its highest honor for distinguished service for the deaf, the Alexander Graham Bell Award."

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. 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. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OHIO'S DEVASTATING FLOOD OF 1913

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, 50 years ago, on March 22 through March 27, 1913, one of the worst floods ever to occur in this country swept the Miami Valley in southwest Ohio.

More than 300 people lost their lives and thousands of the residents of this area suffered untold hardships. Property loss alone exceeded $100 million in 1913 values. At that time I was a new member of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio. I can vividly recall helping, along with many of my colleagues,

in the rescue operations. It was a terrible tragedy to witness.

The residents of the cities of Piqua, Troy, Dayton, West Carrollton, Miamisburg, Franklin, Middletown, and Hamilton, and in villages of other sections of Ohio could have thrown up their hands in dismay, disgust, and despair, and quit. However, these hardy, resourceful men and women were not quitters—they were initiators and inventors.

They voluntarily donated $2,156,616 to initiate flood control in the Miami Valley to protect forever their loved ones and their homes from a future terrible natural disaster such as they had just suffered.

From these donations evolved an engineering staff led by Arthur Morgan, who roamed the valley seeking suitable sites for high retarding basins.

A new law was drafted, and passed by an emergency session of the Ohio Legislature, enabling citizens to form conservancy districts and assess their own properties to pay for the necessary flood protection structures.

Thirty-four million dollars was eventually required to construct the necessary dams and levees. Every cent came, not from the Government, but from the pockets of these hardworking residents of the valley. During this week the cities of the valley have been observing the anniversary of this great flood—not in celebration, but in review of the tremendous economic progress of the valley since the communites were flat on their backs and almost counted out.

They can be justifiably proud of their communities and of their fathers and mothers and grandparents, for their wisdom, foresight, and self-reliance.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGES ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate the President on his recent civil rights message.

The proposals the administration has made are both the most far-reaching and the most practical that have been submitted by a President during this century. There are some who would like to solve every civil rights problem this year. However, because of the inability or unwillingness of this body to reform its rules, we know that it will be difficult even to bring to a vote many of the measures in this category.

President Kennedy has not proposed a radical, divisive program or one subject to constitutional objections. Rather, it is a program designed to overcome the most pressing facets of the civil rights problem. It is bold, intelligent, constructive, and well conceived. Most important, it is one that, with sincere bipartisan support, can pass this Congress. These recommendations are not political bones tossed to an interest group with no hope of implementation. They are desperately needed tools with which to fight the insidious disease of bigotry and discrimination.

Mr. President, there was one aspect of the President's message that impressed me as being of great importance. For the first time since 1952, a President has endorsed America's need to observe basic human rights on other than political or legal grounds. Heretofore, Presidents have told us that constitutional government demands our obedience to the Supreme Court's decision; that our international image will suffer unless we treat all men with respect; that our economy will not achieve its full potential until the opportunity for equal employment is granted without regard to race; that no governmental official is truly representative unless every qualified elector is allowed to cast his ballot. All of these are important reasons for eliminating discrimination. They are politically sound judgments based on cold logic. However, for the first time in many years we have a President who has had the insight and compassion to say simply, that integration is right, that discrimination is wrong, and that equality is demanded by every moral and religious principle. This would be true even if all political considerations dictated otherwise. President Kennedy's affirmation of the dignity of man is important to every American, but especially meaningful to the Negro who is struggling to obtain the equality which rightfully should have been his a hundred years ago.

In itself, the President's recognition of the moral principle underlying the civil rights problem is a major step toward its solution. The next major step, enactment of the President's program, should be taken by Congress.

Having made these general observations on the President's message, I would like now to comment briefly on each of the recommendations. The first of these concerns voting rights. Inasmuch as the ballot is the cornerstone of democracy, it is most appropriate that the Congress first assure the most basic of our rights. To those who argue that national voting legislation would constitute usurpation of the rights and powers of the States, I say that Federal intervention to guarantee the right to vote will make less urgent certain other civil rights legislation. I have always contended that if every qualified person were given the franchise and exercise that franchise, that many civil rights problems would be resolved at the local level without the necessity for Federal intervention in his behalf. The vote gives the individual a voice in his own destiny. This is a voice that is heard clearly by all those persons who periodically place their personal careers in the hands of the voters.

Almost without exception, Federal judges are men of great integrity. However, their crowded calendars in many instances have made a mockery of the swift justice which is indispensable in securing basic civil rights.

I am sure all of us agree with the legal maxim that justice delayed is justice denied. With the heavy calendars in our courts, it is very difficult to have a prompt adjudication of these many cases. In one case, the President noted, it took 19 months to resolve a voting complaint. When a man's right to vote is not determined expeditiously, his right to vote in the next election is lost forever.

The Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 were great advances, and this administration has been the first to take full advantage of their provisions. But they are not sufficient. To fill the gaps in our Federal election laws, to guarantee the integrity of the Federal electoral process, the President has made four recommendations. First, in counties where less than 15 percent of eligible persons of a race are registered, Federal registrars would be authorized to register those who are qualified under State law immediately upon filing of a suit. The decision of the Federal referee would be subject to review by the court. In my opinion, this is a moderate approach to a difficult problem. In any county in which there are fewer than 15 percent of the Negroes registered—and the President noted that there are 200 such counties in the country—a pattern of discrimination is clearly apparent. In such a case it is not only unwise, but also morally wrong to force an applicant to wait another year before his right to vote is vindicated. We know that one vote can conceivably change the result of an election. We must be certain that that vote is cast.

Earlier today I spoke about the recent gubernatorial election in my State, in which 1,265,000 votes were cast. The question of who was elected, after a recount, was settled by a majority of 91. Therefore a single vote is important. We must be certain that every impediment to the casting of a vote is removed. We must make certain that the vote can be cast legally without interference.

This is by no means a radical proposal. It is a principle of American law that justice delayed is justice denied. If the threat of immediate harm is so great that to await the decision of the court would deny effective relief, then courts should adhere to the time-honored precedent of granting temporary relief. The President's proposal provides one more judicial tool for preventing the frustration of deferred justice in the process of litigation.

The second request of the President is that voting suits be given first priority in the Federal courts. This would mean that voting cases would be decided by the courts much more quickly than such cases are decided now. This is another measure which would help make every man's right to vote a reality in the present, not a hope for the future.

Like the proposal for registrars, this expediting legislation is not a radical innovation in our legal system. As early as 1903, legislation was passed which provides that cases brought by the United States arising under the Interstate Commerce Act and the antitrust laws shall be accorded expedited treatment in the courts (49 U.S.C. 44).

Mr. President, when we can give expeditious treatment to the matter of railroad charges and transportation rates, and matters related to antitrust laws, it seems to me that such a basic political right and privilege as the right to vote should be given equally expeditious treatment.

The denial of the right to vote is indeed a threat to national security in that

it is a threat to the foundation of democracy, and the fight against it cannot await the solution of other lesser problems. Together, Federal referees and expedited court action would be effective weapons against the frustrating delay that now exists.

Next, the President requested legislation which would specifically prohibit the application of different standards to those seeking to register for a Federal election. The Civil Rights Commission's 1961 Report on Voting is replete with examples of Negroes being given ridiculous, impossible tests, while white residents of the same county were being registered as a matter of course. This practice is a flagrant violation of the 15th amendment; and the President's recommendation is designed to combat it. The proposed legislation is not only constitutional in the sense that it does not violate a constitutional provision; but such legislation is also affirmatively required by the mandate of the 15th amendment.

The last voting proposal is essentially the same as the principle provision of the administration's 1962 civil rights bill. It would create a presumption that those who have completed the sixth grade are literate for the purposes of election registration. We all have heard of cases where Negroes with postgraduate degrees have been denied the franchise because of a literacy test, while uneducated whites have passed the same tests. This being true, how many perfectly literate Negroes with a grammar or high school education are unconscionably denied the right to vote on the basis of their alleged illiteracy? The President's proposal is designed not to abolish the literacy test, but to insure that it is administered on an objective basis. This would be a legitimate, reasonable exercise of Congress power to implement the 15th amendment.

These, then, are the President's recommendations concerning voting, and these are the proposals that must be enacted if we are finally to eliminate the evil which has haunted the conscience of the Nation so long. For 2 years the President has enforced the existing voting laws with unprecedented vigor. Of 35 suits which have been brought under these laws, 25 have been brought by this administration. It is time for Congress to meet the challenge and to assume its responsibility by passing the requested measures. I hope there will be early action on these four proposals.

Education is the second area of concern which the President treated in his message. He noted the great progress that has been made recently in school integration. He also noted, however, that the progress is much too slow. There are a great many things that I feel Congress could do to help solve this problem. But since politics is the art of the possible, the President has wisely chosen those proposals which will both aid the progress of integration and have the greatest possibility of being adopted by Congress.

The message asks action of Congress on two proposals. First, he advocated a program of technical and financial assistance to aid school districts in desegregating. All of us here are well aware of the great social and financial burden which was placed upon the South by the Supreme Court's decision in 1954. The Court, of course, was the first to recognize the various problems which the school boards would face; and it was with this in mind that the Court left to each locality the difficult task of the implementation of its decision. It is now for Congress to join the other two branches and authorize the Executive to alleviate the difficulties faced by school districts honestly attempting to obey the law of the land by providing them with financial and technical assistance.

The President has also again asked Congress to remove the words "separate but equal" from the Morill Land-Grant College Act. This phrase is not simply outmoded. It is unconstitutional and self-contradictory; it should be deleted from the act immediately. This could be done rapidly and, I would hope, with little or no controversy.

In both these proposals the President has asked Congress to do that which it has unfortunately failed to do for the last 8 years; that is, to recognize the legality and the morality of the Supreme Court's school integration decision.

The President then considered the extension of the term of the Civil Rights Commission. Again, this year the Commission will die if its term is not extended. It is ridiculous for Congress to spend its time rehashing the same objections in this biennial fight; and I know it must be discouraging to those who work so hard for the Commission to have to wait for our approval every 2 years before they can plan their studies.

I say "objections"; really they are objections without much substance. It is needed as a guardian of our basic civil rights, not only the rights of the Negro, but of every person in the land.

The President has asked that this year the commission be extended for at least 4 years and that it be authorized to act as a national civil rights clearinghouse. This request must have top priority, for if we do not act during this session there will be no Commission. Every member is or should be familiar with the scholarly, objective reports the Commission has made during the past few years. In themselves, they justify the Commission's continued existence. I compliment the members of the Civil Rights Commission for service beyond call of duty, for the highest form of patriotism. Civil rights are so closely associated with emotion and politics that the aid of an independent and expert group is essential for the dissemination of objective information. Too much of the information the country receives is from those in both the North and South, who, consciously or not, color the facts to conform with their convictions. The Commission is the organization which informs Congress and the President of the true facts. The Commissioners are disinterested and nonpolitical experts from all sections of the country whose integrity and objective approach are above question.

When I say they are disinterested, I mean they are without prejudice. They are not zealots. They are men who have earned the right to advise the Nation on the difficult problems of civil liberties and civil rights—earned the right because of the exemplary performance in the law, in education, in the civic life of the Nation, and in their scholarly attainments.

We now know that all civil rights problems will not be solved in the next 2 years. In fact, both because of the failure of Congress to use its power to help solve the problem, and because of the size of the problem itself, I hold no illusions about the chances of full solution in the near future. The Commission has proved its worth beyond a shadow of a doubt, and we must extend it for 4 years at the very least.

The value of the Commission's work to Congress and the executive branch is inestimable. However, this expertise should also be made available to others—to Federal agencies, States, local communities, and the general public. The people need to know the true facts as much as we do, and there are many governmental bodies and organizations which could profit greatly from technical assistance by the Commission. It was for this reason that the President asked for an extension of its authority as well as its life. It is for this reason that we must grant it.

Last week the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] introduced the administration's bill (S. 1117) to extend the Civil Rights Commission for an additional 4 years and also to broaden the scope of the functions and work of the Commission.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his constant efforts in the area of civil rights and civil liberties. He is a source of great inspiration and strength to the Members of this body. He deserves our cooperation and support.

The bill which was introduced by the Senator from Michigan has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I sincerely hope that the committee will give this important legislation early and favorable consideration.

The President reported in his message the accomplishments and goals of the administration in the fields of equal employment, equal public accommodations, and the use of Federal funds, as well as in the fields of voting and education. The record is indeed impressive, but the President alone should not have to carry the whole burden, and he alone cannot solve all the problems. He must have our help. His program is meaningful; it is not oppressive to any section of the country; in fact, it is fair, it is just, it is considerate, and it deserves our immediate attention and our wholehearted support.

Mr. President, the Attorney General recently addressed a meeting of the Civil Rights Committee of the New York City Central Labor Council at which he commented extensively on the President's civil rights message. The speech is an excellent analysis, and I believe Senators will find it interesting and informa-

tive. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a fine address by the Honorable Chester Bowles delivered at Lincoln University, Oxford, Pa., be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. The speech is entitled "Emancipation: the Record and the Challenge" and is another example of the wisdom, courage, and commonsense of this outstanding and distinguished public servant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many Senators have asked: Will the Senate be able to pass important civil rights legislation? My answer is that there are Members of this body who have made personal commitments, as well as political commitments, and who, as well, have endorsed the commitments of political parties to pass civil rights legislation. The number of such Senators is a majority. Congress can do much to alleviate the growing tension in this country over racial problems by acting constructively, by acting with a sense of intelligent moderation, which is exactly the kind of program proposed by the President of the United States.

Many of the President's critics will say that the program does not go far enough. Many will say that it invades the rights of the States. What the President has done is to analyze where we are and to attempt to bring the Nation another step forward in the guaranteeing of the basic political and social rights of the American people.

The right to vote is a precious right. It is a right that this Nation has fought for, and for which many of our people have died. It is a right which we insist upon for people behind the Iron Curtain as well as for people on this side of the Iron Curtain. It is a right that we talk about for the peoples of Latin America. It seems to me that the least we can do is to assure this right to every American of qualified age. Every American should be entitled, at least, to have one voice and one vote in the decisions of his government.

The only way that decision can in any way be affected by the individual citizen is through the exercise of the franchise, the right to vote.

I wish to commend President Kennedy for his forthright and statesmanlike message on civil rights. It has been before us for some weeks; and I believe the message carries a message of hope and reassurance, if Congress will but expedite its action upon it.

I heard the comments of several of my colleagues on the occasion of the adoption of the resolutions which provide the funds for the respective committees of the Senate. Those comments clearly outlined the fact that civil rights measures will be given prompt attention in the appropriate committees of this Congress. I call upon those who have responsibility in the committees to see to it that these bills are introduced, that they are promptly referred to the appropriate committees, that they are scheduled first for subcommittee hearings, consideration, and report to the full committees. Then the full committees will take whatever action they see fit and will report the legislation to the whole Senate for decision.

This Congress will be unworthy of being called a great Congress, or even of being called a good Congress, if it fails to respond to the demonstrated need of the American people for protection of their voting rights and voting privileges.

Once we in Congress have acted to give proper protection to those rights, we can say to the American people that the rights should be exercised fully, intelligently, and constructively, so that the citizen can exercise his responsibility to participate in the election process as a well-informed and conscientious citizen.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY, TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMITTEE, NEW YORK CITY CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL, AFL–CIO, MARCH 9, 1963

I suppose it is inevitable that most of us are near-sighted about national problems. We are able to focus on them only as they apply close to home and we find it difficult to see how they affect people in other fields and other States. One of the curious things I have found since becoming Attorney General, however, is that when it comes to civil rights, we very quickly become farsighted. We are quite ready to point accusing fingers at the South and are easily outraged by a Little Rock, by the beating of Freedom Riders, or by a Meredith case. Yet we respond to discrimination right around us with blank and uncomprehending stares. The attitude is "the other fellow is wrong" and the more wrong he is, the more that automatically puts us on the side of the angels.

There is no question that segregation in the South is socially, politically, and morally wrong. But there is deep-seated segregation in the North, also, and it is just as wrong. Racial discrimination is a national, not a regional problem, and it cannot be solved simply by individual instances of Federal action on behalf of freedom riders or a single college student. The solution requires the hearts, the voices, the mind, and the muscle of individuals and organizations all over the country, public and private. The President said last week, in his civil rights message:

"The cruel disease of discrimination knows no sectional or State boundaries. The continuing attack on this problem must be equally broad."

I am particularly pleased to be with you here today because labor, and especially groups like yours, historically have been committed to social justice and social action. For years, unions have been in the forefront of efforts toward equal opportunity for all workers and all citizens.

Last year, Mr. Van Arsdale's local 3 provided an example of such leadership by including 200 Negroes and Puerto Ricans among its 1,000 new apprentices. The New York Council of Painters also has opened its apprenticeship program to Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

In the past few months, 122 international unions, representing more than 10 million workers have joined with the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and pledged themselves to union programs for fair practices. The dual seniority problem is the subject of wide and serious attention by labor. Segregated locals are fast disappearing. Indeed, probably at no time in the long history of the American labor movement have so many union leaders given such deep and effective attention to the problem of providing equal opportunity for all, regardless of race.

Yet we would be dishonest with ourselves if we did not admit that some discrimination continues to exist within the labor movement, and by no means only in the South. I am thinking, for example, of a particularly ironic situation that exists right now in Washington. Howard University, a distinguished Negro institution, is building a new gymnasium. At least four of the building trades locals involved, however, have no Negroes working on the project. For that matter, these locals have only a handful of Negro members or apprentices.

The fundamental responsibility for solving problems like this is that of labor itself. Your group and others like it do a great deal to help. The Government also has a responsibility in this field: the work of the Vice President and the Equal Employment Committee is well known to you and the President has directed me to seek legal techniques, rules, and procedures to deal with such discrimination.

But there is a more fundamental responsibility for both you in the labor movement and for us in Government. We are as firmly opposed to discrimination in voting, education, and other fields as we are to discrimination in unions. It is in order to help the Nation act more effectively against discrimination that the President last week sent Congress a special message on civil rights. The administration's program includes three legislative proposals, concerning voting, education, and assistance to areas and organizations undertaking desegregation.

The first and most important bill deals with voting. The people's vote is the people's voice and when some people cannot vote they cannot effectively speak against injustice and deprivation of other rights.

It's like the story told at the time the 19th amendment was being voted on by the States. A decided antifeminist complained to his Congressman: "Can't you do something to stop them scarecrow suffragettes from voting?" The Congressman replied, "You mean my charming constituents of the fairer sex?"

We have worked very hard under existing law seeking to guarantee the right to vote to all citizens. The Department of Justice has filed 35 voting suits, 25 of them in this administration, challenging discrimination or threats in southern counties against Negro registration applicants. But this is a painfully slow way of providing what is, after all, the fundamental right of citizenship. There remain more than 200 counties in the South where less than 15 percent of the eligible Negroes are registered.

Even where we have brought suit, the cases require extremely detailed preparation. In our suit in Montgomery County, Ala., for example, it was necessary to analyze 36,000 pages of voted applications and to subpena 185 witnesses for the trial. Such suits each require the total attention of 4 to 6 of the 40 lawyers in our civil rights division for several months.

It often takes many more months before Negroes finally can register and vote. In Ouachita Parish, La., for example, the Department filed suit in July 1961. Although 24,000 out of the 40,000 eligible whites were registered to vote, only 725 of the 16,000 eligible Negroes were registered. Another 5,000 Negroes had, in fact, been purged from the voting rolls.

In the 33 months since we brought the suit, a special election for Congress has passed. A general election has passed. And still not even the date for trial has been set. It may

well be 1964 before we finally secure a decision and Negroes can register and vote freely.

This is neither an extreme nor an isolated case. There is a real and immediate need for speeding up the process.

We are asking Congress, therefore, to authorize that voting suits be given preference on court dockets and tried in an expedited manner. This parallels the laws of many States which give priority to election suits in an effort to resolve them before the election is over and the chance to vote wiped out.

Even if cases can be expedited, there still will be a timelag between the filing of a suit and the issuance of orders against further discrimination. Therefore, we have asked Congress to provide for the appointment of temporary Federal referees to determine the qualifications of registration applicants during the time voting suits are pending in court.

In addition to the need for speed in guaranteeing the right to vote, there also is a great need for insuring fairness in determining who is qualified to vote.

Some Southern States use the literacy test to make this determination. As a result, barely literate whites, coached by the registrar, often are registered. Meanwhile, Negroes—like a National Science Foundation graduate student from Cornell, or teachers with advanced degrees—arbitrarily are declared illiterate and thus ineligible to vote.

Other States have used the constitutional interpretation test. Applicants must copy and explain sections of the Federal or State Constitutions. Negroes often are required to copy and interpret long, archaic sections of a State constitution, or are required to explain what due process means, to a registrar who knows no law.

Whites, meanwhile, copy such provisions as, "There shall be no imprisonment for debt." One white gentleman, who was registered, interpreted that section in these words:

"I think that a Neogroe Should Have 8 years in college Be for voting Be couse He dont under Stand."

We should reflect on such examples more in sadness than in irony, because they demonstrate the double burden of injustice inflicted on the Negro. Not only is he prevented from registering and voting, but the method of doing so is a grotesquely unfair test.

There's an acid joke about the Negro who attempted to register in a southern county. The registrar asked him to copy and interpret the 14th amendment. He did so, brilliantly. "All right, if you're so smart," the registrar said, "recite the Gettysburg Address from memory." The Negro did. "OK, give us the second inaugural speech." Again the Negro came through beautifully. Finally, the registrar pulled a Chinese newspaper out of his desk and asked, "Can you read this?"

"That's easy," said the Negro. "It says, 'No Negroes are going to vote in this State this year.' "

We are asking Congress in our proposed voting measure to prohibit specifically the use of different tests or standards for different registration applicants. And we have asked that completion of the sixth grade should be regarded as evidence that an applicant is literate.

We also are asking Congress for two other pieces of legislation, both stemming from a need for assistance as well as enforcement. Our experience has demonstrated that people want to obey the law. In the field of education, for example, the violence last fall at the University of Mississippi should not overshadow the fact that 60 southern school districts were desegregated last year—peacefully and without fanfare. In many cases the Department of Justice assisted through informal consultations.

Communities in the South not only want to obey the law, but they want and need assistance in doing so. One of the laws we seek would establish in the Office of Education a program of technical and financial assistance to communities in the process of integrating their schools.

Such a program would help such school districts profit from the lessons of others—such as Atlanta, where public and private bodies combined with great success in 1961 to desegregate schools without incident. Many communities lack the background and resources required to minimize tensions both outside and inside the schools and to assure the maintenance and improvement of educational standards.

We have applied the same principle of providing information in our third legislative proposal, for the extension and expansion of the Commission on Civil Rights. Not only community governments, but many organizations, both public and private, both in the North and the South, can benefit substantially from expert guidance and information about how others have handled integration problems.

The Civil Rights Commission has the background and ability to satisfy this need and the President consequently has recommended that it be authorized to serve as a national civil rights clearinghouse—providing information and technical guidance to any requesting agency.

Combined with continued effort under existing laws and policies, this, then is the administration's civil rights program. There are those who say this program does not go far enough. It is true that there is other civil rights legislation which might be introduced, such as a bill seeking authority for the Government to initiate school desegregation suits. But I would say to these critics that it is perfectly simple to introduce and support bills that have no chance of passage. But to do so would endanger measures that do have a chance. These critics have no responsibility for action. It is the aim of this administration to seek action and progress, not merely talk and headlines.

Further, let it be clear that this civil rights program is only that—a program. To sit back and wait for progress to come just because somebody in Washington has asked for new laws is as starry-eyed as waiting for the day labor minstrels once described when "the mills are made of marble and the machines are made of gold."

It took courage and effort for the labor movement to achieve the economic standards it enjoys today. It will take the same kind of effort to achieve the social ideals we profess in the field of civil rights.

We stand not only for labor or the Negro or minority groups, but for the ideal of freedom and dignity which underlies our society.

I come here today to call on you for your efforts on behalf of the administration's program. I come to ask you to speak out and act as a body. I ask you to go back to your internationals, your locals, and your communities to seek their support, both for this program and for its aim.

"Race discrimination," the President said in his civil rights message, "hampers our economic growth by preventing the maximum development and utilization of our manpower. It hampers our world leadership by contradicting at home the message we preach abroad. It mars the atmosphere of a united and classless society in which this Nation rose to greatness. It increases the costs of public welfare, crime, delinquency, and disorder. Above all, it is wrong."

EXHIBIT 2

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE CHESTER BOWLES, PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE AND ADVISER ON AFRICAN, ASIAN, AND LATIN AMERICAN AFFAIRS, AT LINCOLN UNIVERSITY, OXFORD, PA., FEBRUARY 15, 1963

EMANCIPATION: THE RECORD AND THE CHALLENGE

Last autumn I made a month-long trip through 13 African countries. At each of my stops one question was inevitable, urgent, and recurrent: What about James Meredith at the University of Mississippi?

Time and time again, at press conferences, official dinners, and meetings with students, I was asked to explain events in Mississippi, their meaning for the future, and the views of the U.S. Government.

I soon found that the most effective means of extricating myself from a difficult tactical position was to take the offensive.

Where else, I would ask, have you ever heard of a government with such strong convictions about racial equality and such respect for law that it was willing to muster 16,000 soldiers to enforce the right of 1 Negro student to an integrated education?

The Meredith case, I would add, demonstrated that the United States is dedicated to the rule of law and to equal rights, despite the most bitter opposition from many Mississippians.

Fortunately, my questioners were so polite that they failed to ask me what surely occurred to them as an obvious followup question: Why, 100 years after our Emancipation Proclamation, was it necessary to call up an Army division to secure a basic human right established under the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution?

The answer to that unasked central question is clear to all of us: The process of fully integrating the 10 percent of our Nation which is Negro into the fabric of American society has been painfully slow—tragically and outrageously slow.

In regard to the democratic rights of our Negro citizens we have lived for nearly a century in a condition of moral sickness—relieved to have ended slavery, but callously indifferent to the child of slavery.

We have refused to face up to the implications of our faith and our democracy; we have postponed the action that our national conscience must demand of us.

And so a majority of Americans have continued to procrastinate and to refuse to become involved—sometimes out of malice or fear, more often because their attitudes have become insulated by the hardened cake of custom.

Yet when the history of our era has been written, it will be said that the pace of progress toward true emancipation has been far more rapid in the last decade than in the preceding nine decades, and that in 1963 the struggle for equal dignity and opportunity at long last began to assume promising new forms and extraordinary new vigor.

It is startling to remind ourselves that only a few years ago Negroes were still segregated in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Indeed I recall my own astonishment in 1949 when, as Governor of Connecticut, I desegregated our State National Guard and discovered that I was the first State Governor to do so.

Of all the changes that have marked these years of progress, however, none has been so important and so dramatic as the change in the attitude of Negroes themselves. In the last few years there has emerged a new sense of urgency, of impatience, of determination.

I might illustrate the pace of this change by citing a personal experience in 1954, the year of the Supreme Court decision.

I had recently returned from service in India, deeply conscious of the influence of Gandhi and especially of the moral power he had used in gaining freedom for his people from British rule: the moral power of passive resistance, victorious against the physical force of an empire.

In the spring of 1954 I was invited to speak at a distinguished Negro institution in Atlanta. In my talk I said that I knew of no case in history where one race had been able to deliver both freedom and dignity to another. Freedom, I said, was something that had to be fought for and won; regardless of the rights and wrongs, it could never be achieved without struggle.

I then described the role of Gandhi in leading such a fight for Indian freedom and how, through a passive but militant program of action, he and his followers eventually triumphed over the vastly superior military and economic power of the British Raj.

I concluded my talk with an appeal to the Negro students present to hold up their heads with pride and confidence and to develop a comparable program of cooperative action directed at achieving the equal opportunities guaranteed under our Constitution and reaffirmed by the Supreme Court.

To my surprise, I found that what I had regarded as a logical, temperate appeal had left my audience in something of a state of shock.

This was later explained by a student leader on the grounds that most of my hearers had never felt any personal responsibility for group action designed to establish their rights as citizens, and were hesitant to accept such responsibility now.

In the following months a remarkable pioneer, Dr. Martin Luther King, a man deeply influenced by Gandhi, assumed leadership in a historic first step toward firm, direct action on the Gandhian model—the Montgomery bus boycott.

Yet the temper of the times was slow to change. Even as late as 1958, when I wrote an article for the Saturday Evening Post, entitled "What Negroes Can Learn From Gandhi," I received many letters from thoughtful Negroes who questioned my central thesis. Though sympathetic with my objectives, they felt that action by Negroes could not be expected to solve their problems; responsibility belonged to others.

How dramatically the atmosphere has changed in these last 5 years. Today it is evident that Negroes with a new vision and a new commitment to results have taken command.

This is true not only among student groups—although many of them have led the way—but among the older and more established elements as well.

Indeed, what has been most striking about this new movement among our Negro citizens has been its dynamism, its depth of moral commitment, and its explicit charge of inaction against many leaders of previous generations.

Impatience is the watchword of the new generation of Negro students—and high time it is for such impatience.

Yet impatience is a quality of mind, not a program. What lies ahead? And, the most important question of all, what are the implications of the Negro's struggle for the future of American society?

In the last 10 years the principal focus of the continuing battle for equal rights has been twofold; in the area of school integration—the route to the intellectual excellence, and peaceful human relations both inside and outside the school building; and in the area of voting rights—the route to political responsibility.

Let us consider in some detail the first of these basic areas: what has been accomplished, and what we have learned for the future.

Much has been said about progress toward school desegregation, and we should be gratified by this progress. Yet 9 years after the Supreme Court's historic decision, out of 3,200,000 Negro children attending schools in the 17 Southern States and the District of Columbia that formerly practiced segregation, only 200,000 are in fact now attending integrated schools. And of these 200,000 the vast majority are in schools that are either 95 percent Negro or 95 percent white.

In other words, the record still shows that old patterns of segregation remain largely unchanged for the vast majority of Negro students. And because of the complexities of our laws, the opportunities for delay, and court acquiescence in so-called token integration as evidence of compliance, this situation will be slow to change.

As our new Ambassador to Finland, Carl T. Rowan, pointed out in a recent article in the Saturday Evening Post "There is something about these legal dodges, these obvious frauds, that leaves me baffled."

Nine years after the Supreme Court's decision, it seems to me that not just Negroes, but all of us, are entitled to ask: Precisely what is the meaning of "all deliberate speed"?

I for one think it means something more than the so-called token integration that we have witnessed so far. I am tempted to say that the 14th amendment, as the "law of the land," should be regarded as exactly that, and enforced like any other law.

Yet it is far easier to deplore the slow pace than to provide effective answers. On the basis of our experience, what can be said about the nature of segregation as a problem?

In the first place, it would be simple but unfair smugly to castigate the South for the snail's pace of integration—for its failure by and large to comply with a court decision that is overwhelmingly unpopular in that region. In view of the equally slow rate of change in many parts of the North, this would be sheer hypocrisy. Segregation is clearly a national problem, not a regional one.

Now can we escape from our national dilemma and responsibility by thinking of integration as purely a legal question dividing those who believe in upholding the law from those who seek to circumvent it. This turns the problem inside out. The Supreme Court acted because the constitutional guarantee of equality involves the deepest political principles of this Nation; on the basis of these principles, segregation poses a moral issue which goes to the heart of our society.

In short, the primary reason why racial discrimination in America must ultimately be ended is not because of a clause in our Constitution, nor, as we sometimes hear, because of the Communist challenge, nor because of the need to curry favor with the new African States which now account for nearly one-third of the United Nations.

The reason is purely and simply because racial discrimination is fundamentally wrong. It flies in the fact of our Judeo-Christian heritage, our democratic ethics, our sense of how man should treat his brother.

And it is every bit as wrong in the North, where custom and economics serve unwittingly as the enforcement agency, as it is in the South, where the local police and often the school boards themselves more dramatically strive to hold back the clock.

Let us look the facts squarely in the face: In many Northern cities which customarily elect liberal mayors, liberal city councilors and liberal Congressmen, the professed equal protection under law still hides extensive segregation in fact—by residential exclusion and by the natural selection of poverty. As a result, in only a handful of northern cities do more than 20 percent of the Negro students now attend school with white children.

If we are to be honest, therefore, the conclusion seems to me inescapable that an immediate and perfectly executed legal application of the Supreme Court's order—welcome though it would be—would not by itself eliminate the pattern of segregation; it would only establish it along new lines.

This is not to minimize the tremendous achievements of a whole generation of able lawyers and strategists who have fought and won literally hundreds of legal battles on behalf of racial democracy. Without the dedication and leadership provided by such men as the late Walter White, A. Phillip Randolph, Lester Granger, Roy Wilkins, Thurgood Marshall, Robert Weaver, Whitney Young, and many more, we would not be making the extraordinary progress we are achieving today.

Yet these great leaders would be the first to agree that their efforts have been designed to establish the legal rights of our Negro citizens in order to create a solid framework for the civil rights breakthrough which is yet to come—that legal action alone is inadequate to free the 15 million Americans who still suffer discrimination because of the color of their skin.

To illustrate the point, let me briefly consider the present results of integration in the city of Washington, D.C., from a hopefully impartial viewpoint.

Here is a city that has rapidly evolved from a southern to a northern community. Yet after a program of successful school integration, approximately 80 percent of the schools in Washington, although theoretically integrated, are in fact still attended mostly by Negro students.

The problem does not lie, as some have charged, in the mechanics of integration. If responsibility can be fixed anywhere, it should focus on the totally inadequate social, health, welfare, and educational programs forced on the District of Columbia by a long record of congressional stinginess, indifference, and neglect.

What can be done about this? A great deal can be done about it—starting with home rule for the Capital City of the United States, continued White House pressure along the lines of the President's recent message, and increased welfare and educational program funds.

In the meantime, our experience in Washington underscores the fact that school integration alone is not an adequate answer. The Supreme Court decision and the enlightened and courageous action of many school boards and city governments in carrying out its provisions are important steps toward the elimination of all discrimination. Yet such action cannot be expected by itself to solve the basic problem.

What can we conclude from these first years of struggle toward full equality for the Negro student?

The primary lesson for us, I believe, is that what has to be changed is not simply the school districting and admission process, but the attitude of the whole community—white and Negro alike.

Court orders cannot transform the hearts and minds of people. A reluctant and grudging acceptance of the inevitable force of the law will prove inadequate, for laws can win support only if they embody the moral purposes of our society.

Therefore, the task of those who are determined to establish equal rights, opportunities, and responsibilities for all Americans

goes beyond victorious court decisions and becomes a task of persuasion: to convince people that these decisions are right, and especially, to convince white people that integration is not personally or economically damaging.

Only in this way can we bring the divergent elements of every community into growing harmony.

This particular aspect of the problem was aptly put in a recent magazine article in which the writer described our objective in terms of persuading the man who wouldn't mind a Ralph Bunche as a next-door neighbor also to accept a Ralph Brown.

Unless we can so broaden his perspective, white neighborhoods will remain white, Negro will remain Negro, and all the laws, court orders, and Federal directives in the world will not suffice to make a fundamental alteration in the ugly persistent pattern of segregation.

What I am saying is that school integration is not an end itself but one means among many of reaching the fundamental objective of our democratic society which is nothing less than complete social, economic, and political equality for all Americans.

A second means to full democracy, of course, is the right to vote. On this vital issue I am proud of the record that the present administration has made toward the enfranchisement of Negroes in Southern States.

But here again progress is inevitably slow, with a tangle of legal obstacles to be overcome, county by county, State by State.

The 1960 Democratic platform, which as committee chairman I helped to draft, pledges this administration "to assure equal access for all Americans to all areas of community life, including voting booths, schoolrooms, jobs, housing, and public facilities."

In my opinion, that pledge still stands at the top of our agenda in dealing with the unfinished business of our society.

So much for the lessons of the past decade. What are our responsibilities for the future?

Let me begin with the task facing Negroes.

It seems to me that the basic question that confronts the Negro community today is essentially a tactical one of how our democratic objectives can best be achieved.

As I see it, there are three courses of action available:

At one extreme is the strictly legalistic approach through continued court action and patient efforts at public education.

At the other extreme are those, such as the Black Muslims, who assert that the only answer lies in violence and separation.

A third course which lies between these two extremes can perhaps be best described as a policy of continued legal action backed by a persuasive militancy among all Americans—white and Negro directed toward the conscience of the white man. It is this combination approach which in my opinion offers the greatest hope to Negroes and to the future of our society.

This means nonviolence undertaken in full acceptance of the risks of the violence it may provoke; but nonviolence directed toward the conscience of the white man. It is this combination approach which in my opinion offers the geatest hope to Negroes and to the future of our society.

This brings me to an important point: One of the most remarkable phenomena of the struggle for equality in this country has been the extraordinary patience of most of our Negro fellow citizens.

James Baldwin recently wrote, in "The Fire Next Time," of his immense respect for generations of Negro Americans who understood that "the country was in no hurry to educate Negroes," and who "put their pride in their pockets in order to do it." He spoke of "that unsung army of black men and women who trudged down back lanes and entered back doors saying 'yes, sir' and 'no, ma'am' in order to acquire a new roof for the schoolhouse, new books, a new chemistry lab, more beds for the dormitories, more dormitories."

I share Mr. Baldwin's respect. After 100 years of penitent yes, sir's and no, ma'am's, it is extraordinary that the Negro's patience has not long since erupted into violence.

However much we may deplore it, a sense of frustration, antagonism, and belligerence after a century of patient and until recently largely fruitless effort, is understandable in human terms. Indeed, it is possible that the new dynamism we are witnessing among today's Negro students and leaders may in fact be turned toward negative and destructive channels.

This would be both tragic and self-defeating. Instead of eliminating the evils of segregation, it would tend to perpetuate them.

On the other hand, blind, unquestioning patience, I regret to say, is unlikely to produce results either. After a century of waiting for the courts and the Government fully to implement the 14th amendment, we may conclude that in this revolutionary era "trickle-down democracy" is much too slow a process.

What is needed is not just equal rights in law but equal skills in fact, leading to equal opportunities. The quality of Negro education must be improved through local school boards, by court action, by militant pressure from local citizen groups, and by more adequate budgets.

There must also be a greatly invigorated new effort to strengthen and to assist Negro youngsters who are now handicapped by inadequate housing, education, and cultural opportunities.

Can this be done by whites working in behalf of Negroes? Can it be done by legal recourse to the courts, the Federal Government, and State legislatures? To some degree—perhaps to a large degree—it can.

But I believe the major progress that has been made in the last decade has been due, not to the Supreme Court decision of 1954, great as it was, which acted essentially as a trigger, nor to meager and long overdue legislative handouts, but to the new militancy, the new unity of purpose, and the new willingness to make sacrifices which is becoming evident throughout the Negro community.

The problem for the Negro community is to find a constructive approach that is vigorous enough to produce results, yet not so provocative as to close doors that have already been opened or are in the process of opening.

What now can we say of the chief responsibility of all Americans, both white and Negro, in this struggle for the realization of our democratic objectives?

One easy reply is reliance on Government action.

Yet there is a clear limit to what even our Federal Government can do. To be sure, Government must be prodded and pressured; but Government has to deal with scores of problems; and its attention is necessarily divided. Discrimination is only one among many problems, all important, all clamoring for solutions.

For this reason alone, it is shortsighted and inadequate to look wholly to Government. What white Americans need is a new climate of urgency, a new framework for action, a new perspective on the basic problem and the means of dealing with it on a local neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis.

Basic to such an approach, in my opinion, is a nationwide inventory, an analysis, of the civil rights problems of every community in the United States as a basis for community action.

I am not suggesting a critical exercise by unfriendly snoopers armed with sliderules and IBM cards. What I have in mind is an honest evaluation by a committee of public-spirited local citizens of both races, working through religious and civic groups with the support of the community.

The efforts of these committees would be narrowly directed at factfinding. But their reports would inevitably become vehicles for discussion, disagreement and, I am sure, in many cases an evolving consensus about the unfinished business of local democracy and what can and should be done about it.

If the growing national concern about discrimination can be channeled into hundreds of community programs throughout the country, spectacular progress may be achieved in the finest tradition of American democracy.

A citizen's "check list" for communities both North and South of the Mason-Dixon line might include the following questions:

How many Negroes are members of the police force? The fire department? City hall? The school system?

Do Negroes have a full opportunity to get such jobs? And if so, are they promoted solely on merit and performance?

What kind of housing, both public and private, is available to Negroes? What kind of medical and hospital care?

Is there direct or indirect discrimination in public housing and entertainment facilities?

What about private enterprise jobs? Do Negro workers have jobs which use their skill to the fullest?

Is vocational and professional training freely available to qualified Negroes?

Are the police and the courts as fair to them as to other sections of the population?

A widely-publicized, objective study by nongovernmental groups in each city under the sponsorship of a national committee of outstanding citizens, with able and respected local leadership, supported by churches and synagogues, could do much to develop agreement in thousands of communities in regard to such questions.

And once the facts are agreed upon, responsible Negroes and whites working together can learn to deal with them effectively through constructive democratic action.

In closing, let me add a few words about the vitally important role of the Negro in contemporary American history.

Thoughtful observers recognize the new Negro movement toward full equality and first-class citizenship as a unique phenomenon in American society. No other cause is compelling the allegiance of so many young Americans with such intensity and fervor.

This fact has deep significance in the present condition of American society. For the Negro's struggle is taking place within a Nation that too often appears to have forgotten its own moral values, and to have largely lost its sense of positive purpose. Indeed, it may be said that our Negro citizens have a clearer idea of what they really want than any other Americans.

In our efforts to deal pragmatically with a vast agenda of new and unfamiliar problems, we Americans have been losing something of the moral direction which has always been basic to the health and vigor of our society.

We have not only condoned the slick operator and cynical manipulator; in a backhanded sort of way, we have glorified them. We have adopted the semantics of materialism and manipulation to explain some of our most admirable actions. It is as though we felt it necessary to justify decency by proving that the real reasons for our actions are not so decent as they might seem.

Indeed, at the very moment in history when the true nature of our world contest with communism is coming into focus, we find ourselves faced with a crisis in values. The moral standards in which we profess to believe are marred by our immoral tolerance of tax evasion and false expense accounts, of fake advertisements, the thumb on the

scale, the adulterated product, and the exploitation of violence as entertainment.

In our national effort not to seem gullible, not to seem vulnerable to criticism from any quarter, to avoid controversy, and to prove that we are "realists" who do not "go off half-cocked," we have developed a moral gap between the beliefs to which we subscribe and our actual day-to-day performance. This moral gap can become an increasing danger to our survival as a free society.

It is in this context that I see a special responsibility and opportunity for American Negroes. For in the course of removing our national curse of racial discrimination, the Negro can force all Americans of good conscience to reexamine their own sense of values.

And so the leaders in the civil rights struggle can help to bridge the dangerous gap which increasingly exists between beliefs and actions. They can reawaken in their fellow Americans a commitment to the moral objectives on which our society was founded—and this reawakening can give a new tone, a new vigor, and a new honesty to the American Nation.

Regardless of color, most Americans now know in their hearts that the time for explanations is over and that the time for action is here on the great frontier of civil rights.

The challenge to the American Negro is enormous.

Today we see him increasingly accept that challenge, and in so doing set a standard for all Americans to follow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the previous order, until noon on Thursday of this week.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, March 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 25, 1963:

IN THE COAST GUARD

Capt. Albert J. Carpenter, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 25, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

Richard H. Holton, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARCH 25, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I John 2: 17: *He that doeth the will of God abideth forever.*

Eternal God, our Father, grant that the motives, which daily impel our thoughts and actions and the aims and aspirations, which dominate our lives, may not be at variance with Thy will and the true, the beautiful, and the good.

Inspire us with a passionate desire to devote and dedicate our strength of body, mind, and heart to every worthy enterprise and forward movement that will minister to the health and happiness of all mankind.

May we never seek to avoid and escape our responsibilities to have a share in promoting not only the material and physical welfare of humanity but in elevating and enforcing its moral and spiritual well-being.

To Thy Name, through Christ Jesus, our Lord, we shall give all the praise and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 21, 1963, was read and approved.

COSTA RICAN CONFERENCE SHOWS SUPPORT FOR ACTION TO ISOLATE COMMUNIST CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the conference of Central American leaders meeting with the President and congressional representatives recently in San Jose, Costa Rica, has produced evidence that a firm basis for hemispheric isolation of Communist Cuba not only exists, but cries for leadership and action.

The exuberance and warmth which our President and delegation received in Costa Rica dramatically proves that the hopes and aspirations of our Latin neighbors are riding with the United States, a fact which is given additional credence by the unanimous support which this Nation received in the Organization of American States last October during the Cuban missile crisis.

But the Communists are organizing rapidly in Latin America, ironically they plan to convene in Brazil shortly, a country which is at this moment pleading for U.S. financial aid. In the face of this threat to the freedom of this hemisphere, we cannot withhold a solution to the Cuban problem.

As the President has now stated, our immediate policy is the isolation of Cuba. It is gratifying to see that one of the topics discussed at Costa Rica included measures I have long recommended as necessary to place Cuba in solitary confinement—namely the ban on movement of Castro agents and propaganda, and the restriction of Cuban Government funds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the United States assume the first step of leadership by closing U.S. ports to nations which engage in sea trade with Cuba, then make the following proposals to the OAS for adoption by the nations of this hemisphere:

First, close hemispheric seaports to nations engaged in sea trade with Cuba,

Second, close hemispheric airports to airlines flying into Cuba,

Third, ban movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout Latin America,

Fourth, ban relay of unofficial telecommunications messages to and from Cuba, and

Fifth, freeze Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, adoption of this plan by the Organization of American States would effectively place Cuba in solitary confinement. Isolation of Cuba is now a matter of official U.S. policy, and the above steps are our only immediate recourse to the Cuban problem short of an act of war.

If we are serious about fighting communism in this hemisphere, we will act quickly in the coming days with a concentrated, hard-driving campaign to place the policy of isolating Cuba into practice.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS TRANSFERRED

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that all special orders heretofore entered into for tomorrow and Wednesday be carried over until Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would those that were scheduled for tomorrow come first then on Thursday?

Mr. BOGGS. That would be my understanding, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, might I inquire of the majority whip whether his request was to the effect that all special orders for today and tomorrow go over?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the request is for those special orders for Tuesday and Wednesday.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PROTECTION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform the House that I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. James J. Rowley, Chief, U.S. Secret Service, relative to the protection of the Vice President of the United States.

The letter follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
U.S. SECRET SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In response to your request for my comments on the remarks yesterday by Congressman SILVIO O. CONTE, regarding the Secret Service's appropriation request for additional staff to carry out its responsibilities under present law which calls for the protection of the Vice President, may I say that a number of questions were raised that need clarification.

As you know, the present law states: "Subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, the U.S. Secret Service, Treasury Department, is authorized to protect the person of the President of the United States, the members of his immediate family, the President-elect, the Vice President or other officer next in order of succession to the office of President, or the Vice President-elect; protect a former President, at his request, for a reasonable time after he leaves office."

This law was approved October 15, 1962.

The request to the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, made on March 11 of this year, was the first time that the Secret Service sought, in the routine presentation of its operating needs for the coming fiscal year 1964, the funds it had determined as needed to carry out its responsibilities under the law.

At the hearings last week I furnished the subcommittee the number of personnel the Service had determined was needed, after careful consideration of the responsibilities and nature of duties required. As this testimony was made in executive session, and has not been made public by the subcommittee, I feel I must stand upon my position as outlined to the subcommittee.

At this point it is appropriate to point out that Vice President JOHNSON had not made any requests for the protective services proposed nor was he consulted concerning the number of personnel determined to be necessary to properly protect the person of the Vice President. The request for appropriations was made because the present law, Public Law 87-829, broadened considerably the scope of the Service's protective responsibilities which in turn requires additional personnel to carry out its provisions.

The present law differs markedly from the law under which the Secret Service protected the Vice President during the previous decade. On July 16, 1951, spurred by such events as the assassination attempt upon President Truman at the Blair House, the law which set forth the protective duties of the Secret Service was amended to include protection of the Vice President at his request.

The new law has three objectives: To close loopholes that existed in the old law with respect to threats against, and Secret Service protection for, the person who is next in line for the Presidency. Second, to remove from the Vice President the discretion as to whether he should or should not receive Secret Service protection. Third, to authorize Secret Service protection of a former President for a reasonable time after he leaves office.

Therefore it was clear that the intent and purpose of the present law was to focus upon the inadequacies of the old law regarding the succession to the Presidency, by authorizing adequate protection to the President and the Vice President, or in the event of their deaths, the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Secretary of State, etc. The law closed the gap by recognizing the reality that Presidents in the past have been killed, or died in office, and so have officers in the sequence of possible succession.

Further than that, the new law took heed of the fact that in the period 1951 to 1962 the President had no choice whether or not he was protected by the Secret Service. But as to the Vice President, he was to be protected only upon his request. Should he not choose to request it, the Secret Service was not authorized to furnish it.

The reasoning behind this phase of the law was clear: If a Vice President did not ask for protection, he was highly vulnerable to attempts upon his life. When he asked for protection only upon occasion, this kind of part-time protection was highly unsatisfactory, and indeed, ineffectual. Anyone who wanted to harm him need only plan to do so at a time when the Secret Service was not guarding him.

A bill to eliminate the discretion of the Vice President as to whether or not he will receive protection was first proposed in 1960, and was passed by the Senate in that year, but was not acted upon by the House of Representatives. When the law was first proposed, the Treasury Department, in its transmittal of the legislation, expressed the opinion that the existing law, providing protection for the Vice President only at his request, "presents an untenable situation." The Treasury further pointed out that part-time protection is ineffectual, since anyone with a premeditated design to harm the Vice President would be expected to execute his plan at a time when no Secret Service protection was afforded.

The bill was again introduced in 1961, and lay pending until it was passed by the Senate and approved on October 15, 1962. In retransmitting it the argument was again put forth that gaps in existing legislation needed closing with respect to those individuals who were next in line to the Presidency.

I would like to further emphasize that the growing importance of the Office of the Vice Presidency, the troubled times in which we live—marked by international plots and counterplots, the possibility of actions of the mentally unstable—all have fortified my belief that the assignment of Secret Service agents to the protection of the Vice President is in the best interest of the U.S. Government.

Congressman CONTE referred to the difference between the number of men assigned to protect Vice President JOHNSON prior to the passage of the current law, and the number now being requested. In the light of my experience over the past 24 years, and through the accumulated experience of our agents in protecting Presidents of the United States, I feel that I am in a position best suited to make such plans and prescribe the manpower needed.

Under the old law, the protection by the Secret Service was intermittent, and not around the clock. To provide the manpower needed, the Service drew upon its existing personnel, generally from the field offices. Now that the law calls for adequate, full-time protection, it is obvious that more individuals are needed.

In order to carry out its responsibilities, the Secret Service must now provide full-time around-the-clock protection for the Vice President's residence and for his person. To provide such protection on a minimum basis it estimates 36 persons will be required on the basis of a 40-hour working week for each agent, plus time off for holidays, sickness, and annual leave.

Congressman CONTE indicated he would agree to protection of the Vice President 24 hours a day for 365 days a year, but that no more than two agents should be made available to do this entire job except when the Vice President was on an exceptionally important mission. Such a limited number of agents, of course, could not even begin to provide protection on an around-the-clock basis, 365 days a year.

I agree as to the inadvisability of taking agents away from their duties in the field in order to provide protection. This is just what our request for personnel is designed to avoid. The only way to insure adequate protection is to establish a detail specifically charged with the task, and not to rely upon part-time services from personnel assigned to other duties.

The issues raised by Congressman CONTE are sensitive ones. No one impugns the courage of the President or the Vice President, or any of the gentlemen covered by the provisions of the law. This is not a question of their courage, nor of their own desire for privacy or freedom from the burden such protection necessarily imposes. The responsibilities we face are the safety of the men who stand at the highest elective posts in the land. We must adequately plan to meet such contingencies as accidents, or deeds of violence, as unpleasant as they may be. The Secret Service as the organization which must meet this full-time responsibility, cannot do so on a part-time basis.

It is clear that the protection called for in the law, and for which we have asked the necessary appropriations, is not for the individual, but for the position of the Vice President—a position second only to that of the Presidency of the United States—the position from which the Nation will draw its next Chief Executive in the unhappy event that this would become necessary because of death.

There are a great many Americans whose lives may be in greater potential danger than that of the Vice President, as Congressman CONTE said, but they are not the President nor those who would be, in the event of tragedy. We in the Secret Service feel strongly that this is what the law considers in assigning us the responsibility of providing the necessary protection.

If Congress does not wish to provide the funds necessary to carry out the mandate of the new law, it should be repealed. As long as the law is on the books, however, I feel that it is my duty to provide for its proper administration.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. ROWLEY.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

The Treasury Department today said that the request of the Secret Service for 36 positions in order to fulfill its statutory responsibilities of protecting the Vice President has apparently been subject to misunderstanding because of the nature of protective work.

There will not be 36 agents accompanying the Vice President at once. There will normally be only 4 assigned at any one time to protective duties, which means advance work as well as on-the-spot protection. The protective organization would also include two agents assigned to the Vice President's Washington residence and one agent to his Texas home.

How, then, does the total figure come to 36? Because there are three 8-hour shifts to be filled, because the weekends must be covered as well as week days, and because sick and annual leave must be taken into account. The overall number includes supporting personnel bringing the total to 36.

Under the old law, Vice Presidents were furnished protection upon request (not necessarily the request of the Vice President, but also of the President or the Secretary of the Treasury). This was unsatisfactory because a Vice President or other people acting on his behalf should not be required to make the decision as to whether or not he needs protection. That is the reason for the legislation giving this responsibility to the Secret Service through the Treasury Department. It was first proposed and passed by the Senate in 1960. It became law last October.

The following points will also help clarify recent discussions of this matter:

1. The Secret Service as an interim measure assigned 19 agents to the protection of the Vice President last fall after the new legislation was approved. In order to meet its responsibilities to the extent possible in the absence of any appropriated funds, it became necessary for the Secret Service temporarily to draw agents from the field for this purpose.

2. The law authorizes rather than directs this protection of the Vice President. This provision is identical to that authorizing protection of the President. The purpose of last year's legislation was to give the Secret Service responsibility for protecting the Vice President in the exact same manner as it already had the responsibility for protecting the President.

3. Under the former law, Vice President JOHNSON refused to request full-time permanent protection. He made only occasional requests for oversea travel and where large crowds or other special circumstances made temporary protection necessary in domestic travel.

GRATEFUL MEMORY AND HOPEFUL FORECAST

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is the centennial year of Boston College. Boston College has exercised a mighty and beneficial influence upon the intellectual and moral thought of our country and has been a glory and credit to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. All sacrifices of the past in establishing this institution are vindicated as one beholds this magnificent higher institution of learning as it stands today.

A nobler civilization is the dream of all men through the ages and it has been this high hope that Boston College has served so steadfastly. Beginning humbly, it has flourished in the great traditions set down by Jesuit educators some four centuries ago. Prompted by the age-old search for truth, goodness, and beauty, its endeavors have enriched our civilization.

I recall once reading an anniversary address by Henry Van Dyke in which he said: "The occasion is one of grateful memory and hopeful forecast." Such an event is this. Grateful memories of a heritage won by toil, hopes, and prayers, and hopeful forecast for a better world won by the search for truth and the attaining of wisdom.

Boston College has been fortunate indeed in the dedicated and talented men who have been associated with her through the years. I might add that Father Walsh, who is providing one of the richest periods in the history of Boston College, is a worthy successor to the great men who built this school.

A small but determined group of men led by Father John McElroy saw their hope for a college to serve the large Catholic community of Boston materialize with approval of a charter for Boston College on April 1, 1863. The years ahead were filled with struggle but the college grew and the city grew around it. The enrollment increased steadily each year and by 1905 it had reached 500. Cramped college facilities led to the building, under the leadership of Father Gasson, of this loveliest of campuses at Chesnut Hill and the first classes were held there exactly 50 years ago. The school continued to expand and today the original faculty of six Jesuits has grown to become the largest collegiate teaching community of Jesuits in the world.[1]

Although the history of Boston College is not unique in its growth amidst tremendous hardship, it is a towering monument to the devoted men of the Society of Jesus who have made this community of learning possible. The test of the ages imparts confidence in the Catholic system of education where the teaching of Christian morality is never lost sight of and goes hand-in-hand with the mental training of youth.

While recognizing the value of specialized skills, Boston College has adhered to the Jesuit belief in the excellence of a liberal arts education. In his "Idea of a University," Cardinal Newman wrote:

> A university training is the great ordinary means to a great but ordinary end; it aims at raising the intellectual tone of society, at cultivating the public mind, at purifying the national taste, at supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm and fixed aims to popular aspirations, at giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age, at facilitating the exercise of political power, and refining the intercourse of private life. It is the education which gives a man a clear conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them. It prepares him to fill any post with credit, and to master any subject with facility.

This has been the function of Boston College.

The 100th anniversary of this institution brings forth grateful memories of great men and great ideas which have been fulfilled throughout the years of growth and maturing. And the occasion also brings to mind illustrious men who have passed through the portals of this college as students, such as our beloved Cardinal Cushing and the honored and eminent Cardinal O'Connell who exclaimed as a student:

> I am more in love with the college than ever. There is plenty of hard work, but there is happiness and fine feeling all around.

Because of its solid foundation and rich heritage, Boston College offers today a hopeful forecast. In these critical times, with the ever increasing needs for an educated citizenry, Boston College is a fortress of broad and humane learning, a kind of learning which is often overlooked in today's clamor for vocationalism in American education. With higher learning so essential to our democratic way of life, the role of the private college becomes vital. The Jesuit school, particularly, provides the necessary well-rounded mental development for coping successfully with the deepening complexity of our age. The undergraduate and graduate schools of Boston College must continue to send out men and women who will provide leadership for our Commonwealth and other parts of the world. Our American way of life depends upon these graduates sent out as well equipped teachers, priests, lawyers—serving as judges, legislators and attorneys, and leaders for industry, business, and the community.

A century ago Ralph Waldo Emerson penned these lines:

> Daughters of Time, the hypocritic Days,
> Muffled and dumb like barefoot dervishes,
> And marching single in an endless file,
> Bring diadems and fagots in their hands,
> To each they offer gifts after his will,
> Bread, kindom, stars, and sky that holds them all.

Our age brings days of unlimited opportunity—days in which our moral strength and intellectual power can be used to shape a better and more peaceful world despite pessimistic moods and alarm over the development of nuclear weapons, inordinate scientific knowledge, and precarious international relationships. The days bring gifts of greater challenge than ever before. In a recent writing, Cardinal Cushing warned:

> The urgency of the times makes it imperative for us to take counsel, to sharpen our thought in regard to the specific ideals for which we stand. This is a period of transition, of realinement. We are seemingly at the end of a civilization.

The times are dangerous, but there is hopeful forecast in a university such as this one, dedicated as it is to truth and wisdom, both human and divine. The

---

[1] Frost, Jack, "The Crowned Hilltop," Boston: Hawthorne Press, 1962.

knowledge and morality imparted by Boston College will be of no small value in the contests which face us. We echo the words in Proverbs:

Through knowledge shall the just be divided.

I congratulate Boston College on its splendor and successful achievements. My sincere hope is that Boston College may continue to develop and prosper, that the sphere of its influence may ever increase, and that the sons and daughters of Boston College will be found in the coming years, as in the past, leading useful lives, doing good to their fellow men, ever faithful to the teachings of their glorious alma mater, and improving and strengthening our institutions of government.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, marks the 142d anniversary of the Greek war of independence. I am pleased to pay tribute to the Greek people and their indomitable spirit. Greek learning, philosophy, science, and drama have had a profound impact upon our modern civilization. In the United States we live under a system of government propounded from Greek culture—democracy, a word held sacred by all Americans.

In their homeland, the spirit of ancient Greece resides in the hearts of all the inhabitants, just as it did when their nation was a conquered territory under the rule of Ottoman might. The Greece of 1821 was governed by Turkish officials and had been since the fall of Constantinople in the 15th century. The populace was not unduly persecuted by their Muslim overlords; in fact, many Greeks had attained responsible positions in the government of the Sublime Porte. Yet ethnic mores and deeprooted traditions recalled to the citizens of the Hellenes that their land was the home of the hero, of democracy, and freedom. Bondage could not and would not be tolerated forever.

The weakening of the Turkish Government gave to the conquered peoples of the empire an opportunity to seek autonomy and, as in the case of Greece, independence. Borrowing from their heroic past, a group of peasants armed with clubs, scythes, and slings, and led by the Archbishop Germanos of Patras, raised the banner of liberty at Kalavryta on March 25, 1821, and declared their fight for freedom. Ships, so important to the defenders of Athens against the forces of Darius and Xerxes, were employed to defend the coastlines against invading armies from Turkey and Egypt. Familiar terrain was used to great advantage against alien troops by selecting in advance propitious sites for battles to be fought. Rebellion soon spread across the Isthmus of Corinth to Attica and Boeotia.

The nations of the world first became cognizant of this struggle when the Greek Orthodox patriarch, Gregorious of Constantinople, was executed. His execution was followed by a series of massacres of Christians which the Russian czar, as Protector of the Orthodox Church, took as a personal affront. The cause then became one for all of Christendom.

In the United States the sympathy of the American people was so great that cities and towns were named to honor this struggle for liberty. Thus we have several Athens, a Spartansburg, Corinth, an Ithaca, and 31 Troys. Groups of Philhellenes sprang up throughout America to fill ships with much needed clothing, medical supplies, and food. Daniel Webster spoke in the House for official support of the Greek patriots, while President Monroe inserted in his famous address, which contained the Monroe Doctrine, a section expressing America's sympathy and urging aid for the Greeks.

The ranks of the insurgents, swelled by volunteers from America and Europe, including the poet, Lord Byron, were at first highly successful. The Acropolis at Athens, the symbol of democracy for the world, was seized, as were many other cities throughout the Peloponnesus. A constitution was proclaimed in January 1822 with Prince Alexander Mavrocordato presiding over the first national assembly at Epidaurus. The Turks, in retaliation for their losses on the mainland, attacked with full force some of the islands and proceeded to massacre the inhabitants. Chios was used as an example to the others, as a threat not to join with the rebels; 25,000 inhabitants were slaughtered, and 45,000 were sold into slavery. This warning only enraged the Greeks to greater ferocity; so when Turkish garrisons fell into their hands, all were put to the sword. The reciprocal atrocities left the land ravaged and war torn.

There followed a period of internal strife among the victorious Greek forces. Mavrocordato was discredited and challenged by other leaders, which led to civil war between the Greek parties. The Government, though, was able to suppress the internecine strife and prevent the Turks from reconquering any territory.

In 1824, the sultan, unable to check the advance of the insurgents, called upon Mehemet Ali, Governor of Egypt, for succor. The pasha's son, Ibrahim, eluded the Greek fleet and, on February 24, 1825, landed at Modon in the Morea with a well-equipped army of 4,000 regular infantry and 500 cavalry. There followed a series of victories for the Turks, and the Greek forces retreated to the cities which they held in the south. Missolonghi was besieged for 12 months and capitulated only when command of the sea was lost. Athens, too, was taken, but the Acropolis held out until forced to surrender 9 months later.

It was now the turn of the European powers to enter into the fray. England, France, and Russia had pledged on May 6, 1827, that Greece should be given autonomy under Turkish suzerainty. Fearing now that the Porte would again enslave the populace, a joint British-French-Russian fleet entered Greek water and attempted to relieve the besieged rebels. At the battle of Navarino on October 20, 1827, the allied fleet completely destroyed the Turkish ships, thus preventing supplies from reaching Ibrahim's troops. When the hard-pressed sultan called for a holy war against the insurgents and their allies, Russia declared war on the Ottoman Empire and proceeded to attack the Porte from the north. The command of the Greco-allied fleet in the Peloponnesus was entrusted to Lord Cochrane, while the land forces were put under the command of General Church.

Now on the defensive, the sultan agreed by protocol, signed on February 3, 1828, and implemented in the treaty of Adrianople, September 1829, to complete independence for the Greeks. Turkish troops soon began evacuating Greek territory, and independence became a reality. The rebellion had lasted many years. Victorious but utterly devastated, Greece emerged as a sovereign state, created and sanctioned by the Convention of London on May 11, 1832.

The years following independence were ones of internal consolidation and acquisition. Thessaly, most of Greek-inhabited Epirus and Macedonia, Crete, and the majority of the Aegean Islands were added to the kingdom. Dissension between the Greek people and their Bavarian Prince Otho, who had been selected by the convention powers to be ruler, brought about the deposition of the king and the election and installation of Prince William of Denmark, who took the title George I of the Hellense, the progenitor of the present king. When he took his oath of accession, he promised to uphold a new constitution which proclaimed a monarchical democracy.

With the advent of World War II, much of what had been accomplished since independence was destroyed. On October 28, 1940, the Italians invaded the country from Albania, and were immediately repulsed by the Greek army under the command of Alexander Pagapos. The Germans, though, came to the aid of their stricken ally and soon overran the entire mainland and islands. The King and his government fled into enforced exile. During the 3½ years of occupation, the country suffered severe economic damage. The merchant marine, the lifeblood of the nation, was reduced to one-quarter of its size. Industrial production fell by 80 percent, while half the roads were destroyed and railroads were completely immobile.

Resistance to the Germans began with passive noncooperation, which soon developed into sabotage and the formation of guerrilla bands. Severe reprisals by the invaders only instilled in the people greater determination and courage. When the Germans finally retreated in 1944, they left behind them a situation comparable to 1821—complete chaos and devastation.

Peace was not yet destined for the war-weary Greeks. Guerrilla bands in the north, lured by Communist propaganda and promises, refused to surrender their arms to the central Government. Abetted by aid from Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, these Communist bands seized towns and carried out acts of terrorism against those loyal to the regime in Athens. To insure complaisance in the regions under their control, children were captured and held as hostages. It has been estimated that over 24,000 boys and girls had been spirited into Yugoslavia and Albania by the guerrillas. The Communist forces were so successful as to lay siege to Athens. On December 24, 1947, the Communist leader Markos Vifiades felt confident enough to proclaim a provisional government.

The central Government, an unworkable coalition, was unable to decide on a course of action. Moreover, when the army did take to the field, obsolete methods and armaments proved ineffective against the elusive guerrillas.

On March 12, 1947, President Truman asked and received from Congress authority for immediate financial and economic aid to Greece. This commitment, known as the Truman Doctrine, proved to be the catalyst for effective action against the Communists. By 1949, with the defection by Yugoslavia from the Soviet bloc and the closing of its border to the Greek guerrillas, the last of the Communists had surrendered or had fled into Albania.

At the conclusion of the civil war the Government was able to turn its attention to internal development and the alleviation of the financial crisis caused by the two wars. It was only by means of massive aid from the United States (almost $1 billion granted under the European recovery program and other aid programs) that recovery was effected. A visitor touring Greece today sees much construction work. Port facilities, piles of rubble a few years ago, have now been cleared and enlarged to accommodate increased shipping. Large factories rose in the cities and the countryside to increase an already expanding industrial production.

Perhaps the most phenomenal recovery has been the merchant marine. In 1946 the fleet totaled only 500,000 tons. Today shipping is surpassing the 5 million ton mark. The Greek flag, a white cross and horizontal stripes on a field of blue, is seen in ports-of-call throughout the world, flying from the masts of freighters, tankers, and liners.

Tourism, too, has played an important part in Greece's resurgence. Emphasis is placed on the ruins of their ancient past. In Athens the Acropolis and the partly restored Agora are the major attractions. Dramas are held in the Roman theater built on the side of the Acropolis by one of Rome's conquering Emperors. Elsewhere, Delphia and the ancient Greek city-states of Thebes, Corinth, and Sparta, receive their share of the tourists' curiosity. A booming resort center is attracting many to Rhodes, where Greco-Roman architecture mingles with Crusader fortification.

To America and the Western World, Greece is more than just a tourist spot. As a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, it is a link in the chain encompassing the Soviet bloc, a bulwark for democracy and the free-world. The United States has strategic bases on the Greek mainland. The country joined NATO in order to increase its security against Communist aggression from within and without. With the combined allied weapons to support its claims, Greek security is thus safeguarded.

Greece continues to be a bridge between Europe and Asia. Militarily, because of its strategic location, it is the link between NATO and CENTO. Its people, though, have remained primarily unchanged. As in 1821, Greece is a nation of small farmers. With all its contributions to civilization, the average Greek tilled his few acres and raised enough food to support his family. Population increases have demanded that every available acre be cultivated. Where none existed, terraced plots were hacked from the mountain sides or gorges. Unfortunately, the land could not support its own people. Emigrants by the hundreds of thousands left their homeland and settled in other parts of the globe. Those who came to America brought with them their religion and their crafts. Throughout the United States, Greeks and descendents of Greek immigrants form an integral part of the community, be it mayor, representative, restaurateur, or wine grower. These people of Greek origin have been told the story of how their forefathers fought for liberty during the war of independence in their homeland. They know that the Greek nation celebrates its independence day on March 25, the day when the glorious struggle for freedom began. We in the United States, whose own forefathers strove for Greek sovereignty, extend to our friends and allies in the Hellenes greetings on their independence day. We, too, remember our past and salute with pride the Greek nation.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM SHOULD BE EXPANDED

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy on Saturday called attention to the seriousness of the unemployment problem, which he termed the Nation's No. 1 domestic problem for the 1960's.

The proposed tax cut will certainly provide a stimulus to economic activity. But the extension of the accelerated public works program would have more immediate and tangible effects than a tax cut. I believe that Congress should not only appropriate the $500 million which the President has requested to meet the current authorization, but should extend the accelerated public works program another year. On February 4, I introduced H.R. 3311 providing that an additional $900 million be authorized beyond the $900 million currently authorized for the accelerated public works program.

Mr. Speaker, we have already seen the beneficial results from this program. Men have been put back to work on useful, productive work. More than that, these projects—water and sewer lines, sewage treatment systems, public buildings, streets, and other projects, have made communities all over the Nation better places to live and more attractive to the expansion of industry.

I therefore urge that Congress take action to appropriate the $500 million requested by the President, and also to extend the authorization of the accelerated public works act.

Perhaps the excellent report of General Clay on foreign aid will give the Congress some ideas on how we may obtain the necessary funds to carry on the accelerated public works program.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate today and the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Small Business Committee be permitted to sit during general debate on March 26, 27, and 28 of this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DENIAL TO THE FEDERAL COURTS OF JURISDICTION IN LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT CASES

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States recently proposed in a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Legislature.

This proposed amendment would deny to the Federal courts jurisdiction in legislative reapportionment cases in States affording direct initiative by the people in voting on this subject. It would restrict Federal court activity in this traditionally State area to cases in which a

State does not provide to its citizens a procedure whereby they can directly initiate a vote on State legislative reapportionment.

Control of this issue by the people is fundamental to our Federal system. This is basically the business of the people, not of the Federal courts, and as long as a State provides a rational means for the people to express their will the Federal courts should stay out.

This proposal is not an attack on the Tennessee decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. In cases where there is no recourse of initiative from the acts of the State legislature the amendment would not apply.

It may be that the Supreme Court does not now have jurisdiction in this field. But I believe the Oklahoma Legislature is right in its stand that a point of such significance should be specifically resolved.

THE ROYAL GREEK DECREE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I read a release from the Royal Greek Embassy and Information Service dated March 16 announcing that "a royal decree has been issued banning vessels under Greek flag from carrying any kind of cargo to Cuban ports." My enthusiasm rose as I completed reading the first paragraph. Immediately I was reminded of President Truman's determined action to save Greece in their hour of greatest peril. President Truman engaged in no if's, and's, or but's. He made no exceptions. He decided the road ahead was clear—we must not permit the Communist takeover of Greece. Pursuant to his determined stand, he initiated a historic program which stopped the Communist takeover of Greece as well as Turkey, and which has preserved the national independence of the Greek people. I could not help but feel that here was an act of real reciprocity in the cause of freedom.

My enthusiasm was chilled as I read the second paragraph, coming as it did like a cold, biting, friendless storm out of the north. That paragraph stated, and I quote:

> Exception is only being made for ships under time charter contracted prior to the promulgation of the present decree.

The effect of the royal decree was thereby nullified. Anyone with an iota of commonsense understands that the need is now to stop all, and I repeat, "all," merchant vessels entering Cuba flying any flag of the free world. We are not primarily interested in what countries may do to help our cause; that is, the cause of the whole Western Hemisphere, in the next year or two ahead. Our interest is what are they doing to help the cause of freedom in the Western Hemisphere now.

I ask that the Greek Government make a full public disclosure of the number of vessels flying the Greek flag which are under time-charter contracts to anyone who has shipped cargo to Cuba during the past 12 months. That disclosure should include such time-charter contracts with any government or individual. That disclosure also should divulge the length of time left on each contract for every vessel authorized to sail under the Greek flag which has carried any cargo to Cuba during the past 12 months. Anything less will confirm my judgment, and the judgment of any reasonable person who understands the realities of international commerce, that the royal decree is made meaningless by the second paragraph of the news release which I have quoted. This is a necessary disclosure, a practical disclosure to which the American people are entitled, concerned as they are by the Russian beachhead in Cuba.

The record shows that the American people, among other things, have contributed nearly $3½ billion to Greece since 1945. The Presidential advisory committee, which has made its report to the President, makes note of the fact that Greece stands 10th among all the nations of the world in terms of the amount of money received from the American taxpayers.

No one, in honesty, can say that the American people have not been generous toward the Greek nation in its hour of greatest need, as they have been generous to all who are willing to fight for freedom. That record suggests that the Greek Government should move with haste to make public the information which I have requested. Any response short of 48 hours would make an equal sham of the word "haste."

SUMMARY OF THE NET BUDGET RECEIPT AND EXPENDITURE TRENDS (THE ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET) IN CURRENT FISCAL 1963 (AS OF FEBRUARY 28, 1963) COMPARED TO FISCAL 1962 AND TO BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members and others who may find it of interest, I include the second monthly synoptic tabulation of the trend of net budget receipts and expenditures in the current fiscal year 1963 as of February 28, 1963, with comparisons to the official budget estimate for the fiscal year 1963 and to corresponding actual data for the previous fiscal year 1962.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

Budget revenues are officially projected at $85,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of $4,091,000,000, over actual budget revenues for fiscal 1962. Through the first 8 months—to February 28, 1963—actual budget revenues exceeded the corresponding 8 months of fiscal 1962—to February 28, 1962—by $4,051,000,000.

To reach the net budget revenue prediction of $85,500,000,000 for fiscal 1963 will require net revenues of $33,537,000,000 in the 4 months, March–June 1963. In the corresponding 4 months of fiscal 1962, net budget revenues were $33,497,000,000.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures are officially projected at $94,311,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of $6,524,000,000 over actual budget expenditures for fiscal 1962, of which $1,901 million is for national defense and $4,623,000,000 is for other than national defense.

Through the first 8 months—to February 28, 1963—actual budget expenditures exceed the corresponding 8 months of fiscal 1962—to February 28, 1962—by $4,644,000,000, of which $2,323,000,000 is for national defense and $2,412,000,000 is for other than national defense.

AVERAGE MONTHLY EXPENDITURES

Using straight averages in both instances, the table discloses that expenditures during the first 8 months of fiscal 1963 averaged $7,757,000,000—slightly less than the projected average of $7,859,000,000 for the full fiscal year of 1963 based on the official budget estimate of expenditures—a little less for national defense items and also slightly less for nonnational defense items.

To reach the net budget expenditure prediction of $94,311,000,000 for fiscal 1963, net budget expenditures in the 4 months March 1–June 30, 1963, would have to aggregate at least $32,249,000,000—in other words, a monthly average of at least $8,062,000,000 during the 4-month period as against the actual monthly average of $7,757,000,000 in the first 8 months of fiscal 1963. Thus the monthly average in the 4 months, March–June, could rise $305,000,000 above the monthly average during the first 8 months without exceeding the budget total of $94,311,000,000 for the full 12 months. On the other hand, the table discloses that expenditures for all of fiscal 1963 are officially budgeted at a monthly average $544,000,000 greater than the actual monthly average for all of the preceding fiscal year 1962 and that, in comparison to this, in the first 8 months of fiscal 1963 the actual monthly average exceeded the corresponding 8 month average of fiscal 1962 by $580,000,000. Stated another way, in the first two-thirds of the fiscal year about 71 percent, or $4,644,000,000 of the officially projected $6,524,000,000 expenditure increase, fiscal 1963 over fiscal 1962, has been realized.

BUDGET DEFICIT

The official budget estimate of the deficit for fiscal 1963 is $8,811,000,000, or $2,433,000,000 larger than the actual deficit in fiscal 1962.

Through 8 months of fiscal 1963 the actual deficit is $10,099,000,000, or $593,000,000 larger than the deficit during the corresponding 8 months of fiscal 1962.

The comparisons and the trends will, of course, vary each month between March 1 and June 30 in relation to the full year amounts and in relation to each other.

The table follows:

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the administrative budget), 8 months of fiscal 1963 versus 8 months of fiscal 1962 and comparison with full year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 8 months			Budget estimates for fiscal 1963 compared to actual for fiscal 1962		
	1963	1962	1963 compared to 1962	Budget estimate, 1963	Actual, 1962	Estimate, 1963 over actual 1962
1. Budget receipts (net)	51,963	47,912	+4,051	85,500	81,409	+4,091
2. Budget expenditures (net):						
(a) National defense (per official budget classification)	34,603	32,371	+2,232	53,004	51,103	+1,901
(b) Other than national defense	27,459	25,047	+2,412	41,307	36,684	+4,623
3. Total expenditures	62,062	57,418	+4,644	94,311	87,787	+6,524
4. Net surplus (+) or deficit (−) (line 1 minus line 3)	−10,099	−9,506	−593	−8,811	−6,378	[1]−2,433
5. Average monthly expenditures:						
(a) National defense	4,325			4,417		
(b) Other than national defense	3,432			3,442		
Total monthly average	7,757	7,177	+580	7,859	7,315	+544

[1] That is to say, the budget predicts an increase of $2,433,000,000 in the size of the deficit in fiscal 1963 as compared to the actual deficit in fiscal 1962.

Sources: Budget for 1964 and monthly Treasury statement for Feb. 28, 1963.

THE GREAT FLOOD OF THE MIAMI RIVER IN 1913

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this week in Ohio, citizens in the Miami River valley are assembling in many meetings to recall and discuss the great flood which took place 50 years ago, between March 22 and March 27, 1913, in which more than 300 persons lost their lives in the floodwaters of the Miami River and its tributaries. Cities such as Dayton, Middletown, and Hamilton were inundated; thousands of homes and factories were destroyed or greatly damaged; commerce and industry were brought to a standstill. Smaller communities, such as West Carrollton, Miamisburg, Franklin, Piqua, and Troy, were virtually turned into ghost towns.

As a young law student, I went into the devastated area as the floodwaters receded to make reports for the great Bradstreet credit concern and saw firsthand the catastrophe that had struck that section of Ohio. I heard and I saw there how men and women of all walks of life worked and labored against great odds to save lives, to take care of the injured and the sick, and to feed the hungry.

Once the waters had receded it would have been easy for the citizens of many of these cities and towns to have turned their backs on their home communities and to perhaps move elsewhere to start a new life. Yet, they came from a hardy stock of pioneers and made their own hard decision to stay and to do what they could to see to it that there would never be another such major catastrophe in that area.

They did not appeal to the Federal Government. Instead, they sent their representatives to the Ohio General Assembly in Columbus, which had been called into an emergency session, and requested that legislation be enacted under State law to permit those in the flooded areas to solve their own problems through the establishing of a conservancy law under which the Miami Conservancy District came into being. This conservancy district built a huge system of dams to hold back floodwaters in the future and to give protection to the communities that had been destroyed in 1913. The conservancy district was given the authority to levy taxes against the properties that would benefit from this great new flood-control program. Rich and poor, alike, working together to attain freedom from future flood disasters, contributed more than $2 million to the project. At a cost of more than $33 million, the great Miami Valley was given flood protection through huge dams and levees which ever since that time have withstood the ravages of recurrent storms and high water and have given flood protection to the communities in that area of Ohio.

As a result, the people of the Miami Valley have prospered. Today the valley is a great industrial and commercial center, growing and thriving, equaled by few areas in the United States. All this has come about by the courageous reaction of the Miami Valley people in 1913 and their willingness to meet themselves the tremendous cost of attaining the flood protection they desire. No Federal funds were sought or used; no State funds were made available. Instead, the miracle that was accomplished—one of the greatest engineering feats in modern times—came about through men and women who stood on their own feet and met their own responsibility to solve their own area problems.

So, this week, many citizens of the great Miami Valley are looking back 50 years to the time of death, destruction, danger, and despair. All of those who personally experienced the disaster, or learned of it from their elders, are recalling the great efforts that were made to restore the valley and its cities to that which they had been before 1913; and, in rebuilding, to build even better communities than ever before. As a result of their efforts their great homeland in western Ohio has prospered, and also the State and the Nation have benefited, through the readiness, the willingness, the courage, and the faith of Ohioans to meet their own problems and to create the great Miami Conservancy District which has protected the valley from floods and permitted their dreams to be fulfilled, their families to live in safety, and to so rebuild as to make the Miami Valley one of the most productive, one of the most prosperous, one of the most beautiful areas to be found anywhere in the whole Republic.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, as a lad nearly 14 years old at that time I have many vivid memories of the terrible flood disaster which struck the great Miami Valley 50 years ago on March 25, 1913. My father owned a rather large grocery store located on the northeast corner of Broadway and Riverview in Dayton. Wolf Creek, usually only a few inches deep, crossed Broadway about a block south of my father's store and as it began to rise higher and higher toward the top of its banks everyone became alarmed. One of the first thoughts was, naturally, to get in a supply of food. People began to crowd into the store in such numbers that the clerks could not get around to wait on them. It finally became necessary, in fairness to all, for my father to close the doors from time to time and limit the amount of food that could be sold to each customer. This was my first experience, Mr. Speaker, with a distribution system similar to the food rationing restrictions that were put in effect during the war years later.

The floodwaters continued to rise until they finally got up as high as the handrails of the old iron Wolf Creek bridge there on Broadway. The water came up Broadway almost to my father's store and reached the second floors of the homes south of the bridge. Boats began to appear as though by magic and folks of all ages in both good and bad health were rescued from the second floors, attics, and rooftops in spite of the very treacherous crosscurrents. Deeds of bravery without number could be cited. As the boats reached shallow waters men and boys would wade out

to help the folks disembark and get them to the homes of friends or strangers who provided them with food, shelter, and medical care. Schools, churches, and other public buildings were immediately pressed into use to care for the victims. Farmers and other folks from the surrounding higher areas came to their aid with wagonloads of food, clothing, and other needed supplies of all kinds. I shall never forget the great thrill, Mr. Speaker, of seeing all those people open their hearts, their homes, and share their possessions with the flood victims without any hesitancy and with no thought whatsoever of being repaid. It was a time and experience I shall never forget.

After the first fright and removal of the victims from the scene, new dangers began to appear. Explosions occurred—buildings were destroyed—the sky was lit by fires in areas where it was later discovered there were people who could not be reached for rescut. People prayed—some had forgotten how but they prayed anyway and God did answer them. The rains slackened; the floodwaters began to recede a small fraction of an inch at a time until finally the great Miami and its tributaries were once again within their banks.

Gradually, Mr. Speaker, many amazing stories came out about the work that was done during the tragic disaster. The National Cash Register Co., for example, under the personal direction of its founder and president, the late John H. Patterson, had made all its facilities available to the flood victims. Boats were built to use in rescue operations. A hospital area was set up in the plant and a number of babies were born there. One baby, appropriately named "Cash" Durst, grew up to become employed by the National Cash Register Co. Mr. Patterson, a man of tremendous vision and ability, devoted his energies after the flood to developing plans for preventing any recurrence of such a disaster in the Miami Valley area. As soon as his plans were well underway Mr. Patterson set about revitalizing the economic growth of the entire valley, improving its governmental structure and its educational facilities and programs. We who live in that area owe much to the vision, leadership, wisdom, and energy of this great man. Inspired by John H. Patterson, others have followed his example and continue to develop the potentialities of the area to an extent never equaled in any other part of the country. Mr. Patterson had many close, personal friends who gave generously of their time and resources in helping him spearhead a drive to raise a fund to study the problem and do something about it. In a community just prostrated by a great calamity, the raising of funds by public subscription was a tremendous undertaking. Nevertheless, the people, poor and rich, young and old, contributed $2,156,616 within 3 months following the flood. Goaded by the leadership of the Honorable James M. Cox, who resigned after serving two terms in the U.S. Congress to become the Governor of Ohio, the State legislature in a special emergency session enacted a law that has withstood the tests of courts and time, the conservancy law of Ohio. This later led to the formation of the Miami Conservancy District, which was administered by a board of directors headed by Col. Edward A. Deeds, its first president. One of the board members was the Honorable John A. McMahon who had been an illustrious and distinguished member of the U.S. House of Representatives for three terms during the years between 1875 and 1881. It was he who actually drew up the Conservancy Act. Arthur E. Morgan who, you probably know, at one time headed the Tennessee Valley Authority and later became the president of Antioch College, was appointed the chief engineer for the conservancy district. It was he who masterminded the whole complicated flood prevention plan that has protected and will continue to protect the Miami Valley area from disasters such as occurred in 1913. We who live in that area take justifiable pride in the success of this unique and effective flood prevention program. I say "unique" because every cent, amounting to more than $34 million, to provide this protection has come from the residents of the valley. Not 1 cent has come from the Federal Government or the government of the State of Ohio. Even now, as the citizens of the area desire to improve the system, they pay for it themselves.

This week in Dayton, Ohio, and in the entire valley, one of the major industrial and commercial centers of our Nation, an observance of the 1913 flood is in progress. We are not celebrating a flood anniversary—we are proudly recalling and recognizing 50 years of economic recovery and progress unequalled in our Nation's history. Yes, we are remembering that the "Promises Made In the Attic" were kept and that hard work, adherence to the underlying sound principles of our Nation, cooperation with our neighbors, and love of our homesites have produced a valley of vitality and progress. On behalf of the people in the Third District of Ohio whom I have the privilege of representing here in the Congress, I am happy to join my colleagues from our neighboring districts in paying tribute to those great men in the past whose vision and leadership brought about the establishment of the Miami Conservancy District and to those dedicated men who now administer the program so effectively.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, it will, in my opinion, serve a useful purpose to reflect upon a major disaster in the great Miami Valley a half century ago, and what was done to prevent its reoccurrence.

The unprecedented and uncontrolled floodwaters of that river from March 22 through March 27, 1913, brought death and destruction to the Miami Valley from Piqua to Hamilton, Ohio, with all of its attendant suffering. Cut off from the rest of the world by the devastating floodwaters, the residents could only seek shelter and food from their neighbors and pray for better days. But these hearty souls, after the floodwaters receded, refused to abandon their homes and communities to seek homesites elsewhere. They chose to remain and begin anew, and this they did in a manner and with success never previously attained.

These citizens, through their elected representatives in the Ohio Legislature, enacted into law the authority for a system of flood control unequaled in excellence and accomplishment in the United States, if not in the entire world. The Ohio Legislature provided the legal system—through the Ohio conservancy law—but the local people, by approving and paying tax assessments against their own property in accordance with individual benefit to each parcel within the flood plain, insured completion of the project and its completely satisfactory operation ever since completion.

Today, the valley is free from floods in its urban communities. Five huge earthen dams, levees, and channel systems provide complete protection for the major communities. Unbelievable as it may be to those who say that an all-powerful Central Government is needed to solve all our problems and to pay for the solution of them, in part, at least by deficit financing, this great flood control system was conceived, planned, executed, and paid for by the people within the flood plain of the great Miami Valley without any help from State or Federal Government.

This week the valley citizens are observing the flood date of 50 years ago, but they are celebrating the effective conquering of the elements and with justifiable pride. They can without reservation point out that this undertaking was accomplished by local people for the benefit of the valley, the State, and the Nation, and it has served as a model for much of the world.

The valley is now one of America's industrial, commercial, and educational empires and the people did it by and for themselves.

Lest my colleagues and others who may hear and read our story think we have magnified our performance, I wish to incorporate in my remarks the objective editorial found in the Saturday Evening Post in the issue of November 16, 1946. I quote the editorial in its entirety.

THIS FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT WASN'T ON THE CUFF

When the spring rains start washing down the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi River Basins next year, residents of nine western Ohio counties will not be obliged to grab their cots, frying pans, and chicken coops and scramble for higher and drier ground.

Their security was assured by their own action 30 years ago when the Miami Conservancy District completed five dams and improvements of channels in the Miami, Stillwater, and Mad Rivers. There have been no serious floods in the district since 1917, although neighbors in the Ohio Valley each spring prepare to pack up and leave with the first thaws and heavy rains.

Unbelievable as it may be to many American communities today, the Miami Valley this year completes this course in self-treatment for a $100 million flood headache without once calling in Dr. New Deal or any of his interns. The local remedy was applied after a 1913 flood swept through the rich agricultural lands and busy industrial centers of Dayton, Troy, Middletown, and Hamilton. Four days later, as they kicked at the mud and debris, the stunned citizens counted the actual damage at $100 million, plus 400 lives lost, business as stagnant as the pools of dirty water in the streets, thousands of head of livestock drowned, and tons of good black dirt gone forever.

Despite this heartbreaking disaster there was no anguished cry for aid from Washington or the State capitol at Columbus. True, the refinements of Federal aid had not been thought of then, but Congress was only too happy to logroll a hodgepodge of river and harbor bills to relieve localities of the costs of local improvements. Instead of calling on the logrollers, the thoroughly drenched Miami Valley citizens took the quaint stand that control of the river was their job, and not a legitimate burden on the taxpayers of Montana or New York.

All they asked from the lawgivers at Columbus was permission to form the conservancy district, with power to levy taxes for the purpose of keeping the rivers from their doors and barnyards. That permission was granted by the State legislature. No appeal of any kind went to Washington, and the only entrance of the National Government came when a Federal district court ruled that the United States had no objection.

The district issued almost $34 million in bonds. Proceeds were used for construction of dams and channel regulation, and that ended the floods for the Miami Valley. In this engineering project there were no extras such as hydroelectric power, swanky fishing and recreation resorts or resettlement projects. Flood control was what the Miami Valley people paid their money for and flood control is what they got.

Today, as the district prepares to levy the final assessment for retirement of the last bonds, the flood-free communities, farms, and individuals of the Miami Valley are pretty proud of their accomplishment. It's theirs and they paid for it without outside help, advice, second guessing or the nostrums of the District of Columbia school of medicine. Equally pleasing to most is the fact that the district provided no plum tree for anxious jobseekers. Only 56 persons are employed on the entire project, hardly enough to staff the public relations office of almost any Washington bureau you care to name.

COMMUNISM IS NOT NEGOTIABLE

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, many of the citizens in this country will argue that communism is negotiable. The people using this argument are usually those who have only a surface understanding of communism. The following article from the Northwest Progress, of Seattle, Wash., very graphically points out our current stance against communism:

NOT NEGOTIABLE

If there is any lesson that can be learned from Castro's takeover of Cuba it would seem to be this: That as far as our State Department goes, we have learned absolutely nothing at all.

The U.S. policy in Cuba is based upon the same political principle that has determined our dealings with atheistic communism in China, Hungary, Vietnam, Yugoslavia, Poland, and all the other nations that have fallen to Red aggression.

Our State Department has always operated on the principle that communism, however dangerous, is negotiable. As long as that principle is maintained as a modus agendi by the U.S. Government, regardless of the sincerity of the men involved or the name of the administration, what happened in Hungary had to happen in Cuba and what has happened in Cuba must happen in all of America, North and South, unless we change our policy.

Communism is not negotiable. The reason for saying this is not political but philosophical. Despite the new "nice guy" mask Khrushchev is wearing, he is still a Communist. As such, he will be content with but one objective: mastery of the entire world. He has told us this, he has set about scientifically and methodically to prove it. Cuba is just one more step along the way.

Communism understands but one law: force. And brute force is not negotiable. Force is only countered by counterforce. The brief blockade was a beautiful example of this simple fact.

We have been told that we must not "fear to negotiate." Where communism is concerned, dare we make such a statement? It might be good rhetoric—but what about the logic? It would seem that in dealing with Khrushchev, negotiation ought to be our greatest fear. If Cuba has not taught us this, it has taught us nothing.

Our verbal threats against Russia's presence 90 miles off the Florida coast are beginning to sound about as dangerous as the "do that again and I'll spank" of an indulgent mother to her spoiled child.

Soviet presence on the island of Cuba cannot be tolerated. Everybody in the free world agrees to this. This presence cannot effectively and completely be removed by mere negotiation. Recent history attests to that.

An editorial in this week's issue of Life magazine outlines some excellent steps that could be taken to rid ourselves of Castro's so-called defensive Russian army.

While the Life editorial's specific recommendations may not be in every instance as carefully conceived or outlined as those of a military strategist, still the principle upon which they are based is absolutely correct. The editorial rightly contends that "It is time for deeds as well as negotiations * * *."

BRAZILIAN LOAN

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, again we have been had. The Brazilian Government has announced plans for hemisphere Communists to hold a conference in Sao Paulo starting today.

On March 18, in a speech in the House of Representatives, I called to the attention of Congress the fact that Brazil was going to host the second Communist-inspired continental congress of solidarity with Cuba. The first such congress, 2 years ago in Mexico City, is widely regarded as having brought about violent efforts to subvert the Governments of Venezuela and Peru and with organizing leftist agitation in Panama and Puerto Rico.

This is obviously giving aid and comfort to the enemy of democracy, and literally thumbs the Brazilian nose at the United States.

Furthermore, in a speech on the floor of the House on March 21, I called attention to the fact that three members of the 15-man Brazilian Cabinet are notorious Marxists, two others were former Communist Party members. Goulart's press secreary is a self-declared Communist. The powerful National Industrial Workers Confederation, which unites industrial unions, is under Communist control. The big oil monopoly, Petrobras, is run by an extreme leftwinger. Regardless, the State Department will loan Brazil the money she requested.

While we heard anguished cries from the Brazilian Government when the State Department announced Communist infiltration of Brazil, it has yet to refute these charges.

As far as I am concerned, Brazil should not get a plugged nickel from the United States.

YUGOSLAV MILITARY ATTENDING ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE AT FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if our citizens know that a uniformed military officer from Communist Yugoslavia attends the regular Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. I wonder if they know that no less than four general officers of the Yugoslav Army are graduates of our top staff college. I wonder if they know that clearance for this must come from the White House. I wonder if they know that this has been happening for some years.

Mr. Speaker, what goes on here? Even the most uninformed among our citizenry knows that such military men have sworn allegiance to a Communist flag; that everything they learn at our General Staff College goes right back to Communists; that Yugoslavia is in close military liaison with the Soviet general staff.

Whether or not attendance at classified classes is barred to these men, the vast military knowledge they gain in a full course at Fort Leavenworth is undeniable. It is the sheerest lunacy to condone educating Communists about the operations of our general staff on the theory that it encourages splinter groups within the Soviet periphery.

I believe that we should investigate so that we can know just who cleared this assignment in this administration as well as under whose individual direction and initiative this sorry practice was initiated years ago. It is not the Army's

fault. Orders for such inanity come from on high, not from the Army, of that we can be certain.

This is further glaring evidence that the present administration does not understand that all genuine Communists are deadly serious in their fanatical desire to destroy the United States. This is so whether they are Russian Communists or Chinese Communists or Yugoslav Communists. One does not appease a rattlesnake by inviting him into his house.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest, over the weekend, the Clay report on foreign aid and think that there is much of value in it. Many of the things that it points out are matters which some of us in the Congress who have been studying the aid program have been saying for years.

Perhaps, the thing that catches the attention first is the suggestion that hundreds of millions of dollars can be cut from the annual programs without damaging them. In fact, the inference is clear that the programs would be better for having reduced amounts of money to spend.

But, there are other, less obvious, but equally important proposals. One of those relates to the selection of the countries which receive our aid. From the report, I gain the very strong impression that the committee feels that we should be much more selective in the matter of our aid and should concentrate our efforts in those countries with which we have a community of interest and which will not treat our assistance as a mere basis for bargaining with the Communists to get aid from them also.

Reference is made to the participation of the private sector of our economy and here again is a matter upon which most of us in the Congress acted a year ago over the strong protests of the Agency for International Development and the State Department. Now, the committee finds that this action has been helpful. On the whole, Mr. Speaker, one feels anew that before we act upon the foreign aid authorization and appropriation bills this year most careful scrutiny should be given to the whole program to the end that, as a minimum, very substantial dollar reductions be made and that the recipients of our assistance be more carefully chosen.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PEACE CORPS PERSONNEL

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the stated dedication of higher echelon personnel in the Peace Corps, I offer the following news article without comment:

TOP PEACE CORPS PERSONNEL TO TAKE 2-WEEK RETREAT

Some 160 executives of the Peace Corps will spend 2 weeks at the Corps training camp in Puerto Rico, reports Deputy Director William Moyers.

"The idea is to spend 2 weeks in a close and familiar setting with the volunteers and also to balk desk flabbiness," explains Moyers.

While on the Caribbean island they will collect their regular salaries ($11,000 a year and up) and have their expenses paid.

WHY THE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE 15-ACRE FARMER, MR. FREEMAN?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 of this year I expressed my fears to this House that Freeman and company would attempt to use a double set of standards for our Nation's farmers in the forthcoming wheat referendum in that one method of voting would be required for the small 15-acre wheat farmers and another for the larger producers. My fears were not unfounded as the Department of Agriculture has now filed its "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" in the Federal Register to amend existing regulations relative to voting in the 1964 wheat referendum. The Department is proposing that the regulations be changed to read as follows:

(4) WHEAT

Any producer who has a farm acreage allotment shall be eligible to vote in any wheat referendum held pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 1336, as amended: *Provided*, That a producer on a farm with a wheat acreage allotment of less than 15 acres shall be eligible to vote only if the operator on such farm files with the county committee, not later than 7 days prior to the date of the referendum, an election in writing to be subject to the wheat marketing quota for the farm.

Should this regulation be put into effect by Mr. Freeman it would mean that our Nation's 15-acre wheat producers would have to agree in writing at least 7 days before they voted that they would comply with the administration's program—should it be approved in the referendum. If they did not so signify their intent to comply with these new Freeman rules, they would be ineligible to vote. Large wheat farmers would be eligible to vote on election day automatically without previously signifying their intentions to do so.

Is it consistent for the administration to protest the inability of some citizens to vote in general elections due to unnecessary and discriminatory voting regulations and then to arbitrarily place such regulations in the paths of the Nation's small wheat farmers to keep them from voting in a referendum?

Why double standards for our American wheat producers, Mr. Freeman? Is it necessary to make first- and second-class citizens out of our wheat farmers in order to make your supply-management theory work? If so, this is another good reason why your supply-management approach for agriculture should not be adopted.

What is the real reason for this preelection signup for our 15-acre wheat farmers, Mr. Freeman? You cannot argue that you need this information in order to ascertain who these 15-acre farmers are as your county committees already have this information. It cannot be argued that a farmer could not just as easily and as quickly signify his intent at the time he came in to vote. It could, however, be argued that since your program will be extremely detrimental to our small wheat producers and as a consequence they will probably not look upon it with favor, that the powers that be do not want them to vote and this accounts for these additional and burdensome regulations being placed upon them. It also could be argued that a 7-day open season on our 15-acre farmers who do sign up will be needed in order to launch an all-out, concentrated attack upon them in the hope of convincing them to vote right. If this is the case, someone has misjudged these farmers as they do not succumb to badgering and cajoling.

Whatever the reason for this proposed regulation, it is not sufficient to warrant such rank discrimination among the wheat producers of America. I therefore, urge you, Mr. Secretary, in fairness to these small wheat farmers, not to put this proposed regulation into effect.

THE NEW FRONTIER

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, after reading the President's speech made at Chicago on Saturday, I am wondering when he is going to stop his changing moods and let the American people know when and where he expects to find the New Frontier. On Saturday he said that perhaps if we do not have a tax reduction we may not have a recession, but here he changed his mood. He went on to say:

But, if we do not have tax reduction our unemployment may go from 6 to 7 percent.

In the campaign in 1960 President Kennedy promised he was going to end

unemployment, but I say seriously that in his changing moods and changing course of action, he might at least let everybody know what the New Frontier is and whether he ever expects to find it. His changing mood is giving the American people and business the jitters. Perhaps if he stopped changing his position so frequently, business could settle down, expand, and be in a position to put more people to work and end the rise in unemployment.

CAN WE CUT FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN YOUR DISTRICT?

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing much talk about the need for reducing Federal expenditures for years, but getting very little action.

Although the talk still continues, the fact remains that in fiscal 1963, out of a total Federal budget of $94 billion, the following appropriations were passed unanimously: About $50 billion for national defense, $5½ billion for veterans' benefits, and $3½ billion for space exploration. These items, together with interest on the national debt which is a fixed charge, account for approximately 75 cents out of every tax dollar.

Because of the unanimity with which these appropriations were endorsed by my colleagues, those who are calling for decreased spending evidently want cuts to be made in the appropriations which consume the remaining 25 cents out of every tax dollar.

Since each Congressman knows his own district the best, I would appreciate hearing from each of my colleagues about his suggestions for cutting down on Federal spending in his own district. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I would be pleased to total the suggested amounts and pass the information along to my chairman.

If a flood control or land reclamation project which is scheduled for construction in a Representative's district is considered unnecessary by him, I would appreciate hearing from him about it. Likewise, those of my colleagues who object to their districts receiving area redevelopment funds or moneys for their local schools under the aid to federally impacted areas legislation should not hesitate to let me know about it.

Those of my colleagues from farm areas should feel free to tell me how much less they want spent in their own districts for price supports, and those who represent urban districts should similarly advise how much less they wish their districts to receive for urban renewal.

Does any Congressman wish to file objection to the spending of money in his district under the Federal road program? If so, just let me know. For that matter, I should also like to hear from anyone who dissents from the expenditure of Federal funds in his area for hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act.

Naturally, I should also welcome any information from anyone who would like a large defense contract terminated in his district.

When I total all the response, I shall announce the result. I doubt that I shall require an adding machine.

WASTING MONEY

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Printing of the Committee on House Administration, I have been advised that a number of bills will be considered tomorrow. This has reminded me of a wasteful practice that has gone on for years and which is proposed to be perpetuated in another way. I am referring to the printing of calendars which are distributed to the Members. Now that is a small item and I will probably be branded as a nitpicker. But we are spending $27,473 a year to print calendars to be distributed to the Members, and each one of us gets 10 of these calendars and more if we request them. To me that is an utter waste of money and I intend to try to stop it. If there are others who concur in my views with respect to this, I would appreciate it if they would so inform the Subcommittee on Printing stating that they do not endorse this waste of money. With millions of calendars of every conceivable size and design being distributed by all types of businesses as well as individuals, I cannot believe that anyone is being denied a free calendar, and for that reason can see no reason why the Congress should approve this waste of money. This is just one of many small ways in which Members of Congress can effect small savings, which total a substantial sum. The greatest good that can come from this action of discontinuing this practice is that it would indicate Congress' desire to practice economy—and once we make the start, I believe it will result in greater and substantial savings.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET HYPOCRISY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the partisan statements of Republican leaders in reference to the President's tax reduction and budget proposals border on political hypocrisy.

They have apparently forgotten, in their zeal to discredit the Democratic program, that the largest peacetime deficit in history occurred during a Republican administration in 1959 and totaled $12.427 billion.

They have apparently forgotten that the cumulative deficit during the Eisenhower Republican administration was $21.953 billion.

They criticize the President's efforts to stimulate the economy with a tax reduction at a time when a deficit will occur.

I would call their attention to the year 1954—during the Republican administration—when there were tax reductions totaling an estimated $7.4 billion. This came at a time when it was obvious there would be a deficit, and there was a deficit.

The tax reduction included removal of excess profits tax, reductions in individual income taxes, reduction in excise taxes, and revisions of the Federal Revenue Code.

The Republican leadership now takes the position that tax reduction in the face of a deficit is an unpardonable financial sin.

But in 1954, when the economy was lagging, the Republicans turned to tax reduction and the economy showed a substantial upswing. With the healthier economy, the Republicans were able to achieve surpluses.

The Republican leadership questions an increase in the national debt ceiling. Yet during the Republican administration the debt ceiling was increased for fiscal 1955, for 1958, for 1959, and 1960.

So it is apparent that the criticism of the Republican leadership stems from sheer partisan politics. When a Republican President called for tax reduction, an increase in the debt ceiling, and a deficit budget, this was acceptable, even praised.

But when the Democratic administration in office attempts to stimulate a lagging economy and increase Federal revenues looking toward ultimate balancing of the budget, then—in the Republican view—an outrageous financial crime is being committed.

The facts are that we are falling $30 to $40 billion short of our potential in national output, $18 to $20 billion short in wages and salaries, and $7 to $8 billion in business profits. We have an unemployment rate of more than 6 percent and persistent, large budget deficits.

Failure to act now to stimulate the economy is inviting another recession. Our high tax rates are repressive. A tax reduction is needed urgently.

Certainly our expenditures should be carefully studied. They have been carefully studied. Some reductions are being made. But to achieve the sort of budget reduction the Republicans advocate would seriously hamper our defense efforts—because that is where the bulk of the budgetary increases have been.

The best way to balance the budget is to balance the economy. The increased economic activity from a tax rate will produce more revenues which can and will be used to achieve a balanced Federal budget.

The Republican leadership would do well to lend its support to a sensible economic program of this kind, rather than devoting its time to irresponsible sniping for political purposes.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT AMENDMENTS

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to correct what I believe to be a serious inadequacy in this legislation.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall include in his standards for designation of counties under this act, standards based on the migration out of the county.

The present law provides that this shall be one of the things considered in formulating the standards. But it is very necessary to make counties eligible on this basis alone if we are to stem the tide of migration to already overcrowded metropolitan areas.

The many communities which are losing population today because of a lack of jobs would like to be able to retain the young people who are leaving today. With just a little help, such as assistance through the Area Redevelopment Act, these communities could establish new industry and provide new jobs for these young people.

The figures on unemployment and income do not show these counties to be within the standards adopted by the Secretary of Commerce for designation under this law. However, the fact is that many of these counties which are rapidly losing population are in very serious trouble. What has happened is that, instead of hanging on, these people who have lost jobs have moved out of the county. Those who had businesses have shut them down and gone elsewhere, usually to work for someone else rather than open a new business.

The net effect has been that the unemployment rate and the income rate in the counties do not reflect the total situation. Those who are unemployed show up on the rolls of a big metropolitan city. They show up on the welfare rolls of these cities. The effect is the same on the national economic picture. The people are still unemployed. The county still is deteriorating from lack of industry and employment opportunity. And we are now doing nothing about it.

The expansion of this program, Mr. Speaker, as proposed in the bill I have introduced today, will have an immediate stimulating effect on the economy of many rural areas across our land just because of the existence of this provision. The effect when the provision is implemented with proper funds and administrative action would be tremendous.

When people want to help themselves, I feel we should assist them in this effort. That is the purpose of this bill. I hope my colleagues will give it their prompt and serious consideration.

COMMUNIST INSPIRED CONTINENTAL CONGRESS OF SOLIDARITY WITH CUBA MEETS IN RIO WHILE UNITED STATES GIVES MORE AID TO BRAZIL—TO BUILD TRADE WITH RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I along with other Members of this House of Representatives had the privilege over the weekend of visiting Guantanamo Bay, the American military base in Cuba. I do not want to make that particular visit the principal subject of my remarks, but it does have a relationship to the subject which I do want to discuss rather briefly and that is the question of the proposed foreign aid to Brazil, particularly in view of the announcement which we see on the UPI ticker just today, to the effect—it has been known before of course, but the number of countries attending has not been known—the fact that the Communist-inspired Continental Congress of Solidarity With Cuba meets in Rio de Janeiro the 28th of this month, Thursday of this week, and who is going to be in attendance—78 countries have decided to attend at this meeting which is commonly known as a meeting for the purpose of ultra liberals and some Communists to carve out a solidarity with Cuba—that means Communist Cuba program. Included in these 78 countries are Cuba itself, Russia and Red China, and a number of other countries are to be involved including many in this hemisphere. Representatives from 78 countries are attending. Despite this and other evidence of the growth of communism in Brazil as even stated by the State Department itself in Brazilian Ambassador Gordon's testimony before the Selden subcommittee to the effect in Brazil the Government has been infiltrated with Communists, the student movement has been infiltrated with Communists as well as the labor union movement.

Of course, there was an effort by the State Department to claim that this testimony which appears in the record of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs was taken out of the context and did not really mean what it says. Anybody who reads it will note that it is very clearly stated that there has been Communist infiltration in the Government, in union movements, and in student groups—on page 247 of the hearings I quote "The principal field of infiltration and influence is in the labor unions. In the Government staff there has been infiltration. The student movement in another major area of penetration with the National Student Union now being dominated by Communists."

What does all this amount to? And I am going to take a few minutes to review the extent of Communist infiltration and buildup in Brazil. As a matter of fact, the fearless reporter who had the intestinal fortitude to state the facts of what is going on in Brazil was just recently declared to be persona non grata by the Government because he had the intestinal fortitude to put in the record for all to read the story of the Communist buildup in Brazil. I am sure most of you have read that article by Mr. Stein with regard to the amazing Communist buildup in Brazil which is, I believe, self-explanatory. I include the article at the close of my remarks.

Here is what happened, for instance, in Costa Rica during the visit of the President on March 20 with regard to our policy in giving foreign aid to these Latin American countries who still recognize and do business with Castro's Cuba and who do not do all they can to oppose Communist subversion within their countries, but, as a mater of fact, in some instances are even encouraging it.

Here is what one Costa Rican student stated at the time of this visit at the University of Costa Rica:

> It is foolish for you Americans to give money to corrupt, oligarchy-controlled Latin American governments without supervising the expenditure of every dollar. You're throwing money down the drain, and in the end you'll lose both the money and the country. And you shouldn't make an exception of our own Government, however advanced it might be.

These were students in a university in a country with a long history of democracy and social progress, conditions lacking in most Latin American countries. This was the advice of students given to reporters at the time of the President's visit at the Costa Rican Conference on March 20, 1963. Good advice, I believe, but advice which we are not heeding these days.

Who is going to be in attendance at this conference in Rio, in a country to whose Government we are proposing to give $55 million of a $1½ billion program for the purpose of building up the economy of Brazil so she can continue to trade with Soviet Russia? I understand, although it has not been officially announced at the movement, by the wire services, that the President is expected to make a pronouncement concerning it sometime today that this $55 million to Brazil has been agreed to as the first installment despite the fact the Government of Brazil refuses to condemn this conference, as a matter of fact is going to let it go on in Rio de Janeiro, is weakening in its opposition to communism, is doing business with Russia, and continues to recognize Castro.

Who are some of the Brazilians who are going to be in attendance at this conference? I think this indicates the extent of the infiltration of communism in the country. Who are some of the Brazilians who are going to be in attendance at this Red continental congress?

There is going to be Luis Carlos Prestes, Secretary General of the Brazilian Communist Party. Another is General Luiz Gonzaga de Oliveira Leite, president of the Brazilian Association of Reserve Officers; and Francisco Juliao, a federal deputy and founder-president of the Castroist Peasants' Leagues.

Dante Pelicani, president of the National Federation of Industrial Workers,

and Almino Afonso, Minister of Labor in President Goulart's Cabinet and leader of Goulart's Brazilian Labor Party in the Federal Chamber.

Clodsmith Riani, a Labor Ministry functionary and chief of labor's general strike command. Mario Shemberg, a well known Sao Paulo physicist, and Roberto Morena, who, according to Lacerda, served as a political commissar with the Communist forces in the Spanish civil war.

Where did this list come from? This list came from a list of those expected to be in attendance, taken from the luggage of Luis Carlos Prestes, secretary general of the outlawed Brazilian Communist Party, as he departed recently on a trip to Havana, Prague, and Moscow. It was taken from his luggage by Carlos Lacerda of the city where the convention is going to be held; namely, Rio de Janeiro. His public security officers were the ones who got possession of these documents. No one has denied them. There is not any question but what in all probability these persons named are not only going to attend but it also gives best evidence of their background and their inclination.

Many of them are very substantial people in the Goulart government. How could these people maintain these positions under the Brazilian Government setup if the President did not agree to their receiving these positions, because the appointive power in Brazil is with the Executive, not even subject to confirmation by the legislative branch.

So these people are in the government at least by sufferance of the President himself.

I am not going to read in detail, but I have in my possession a document that reviews the history of the buildup of the Communist Party and of Communist subversive activities in Brazil, starting back in April of 1960, when Francisco Juliao, whose name I just mentioned, and Santos Morais, accompanied the Brazilian presidential candidate on his visit to Cuba in April 1960.

During that visit, Juliao and Morais had a personal meeting with Fidel Castro in which they requested Castro's financial support for the Peasants' Leagues. Castro studied the request, and after consultation with Che Guevara, he informed Juliao that his decision was to not support the leagues, a decision that was due in great extent, to the observation made by Guevara that there was no existing proof that these leagues were organized.

In November 1960, Juliao made a visit to Red China, where he again requested financial assistance, this time from the Communist Chinese government. Juliao obtained the promise of financial help which would have to be channeled through the Castro government.

The reason I am spreading this information on the RECORD is I believe our Government should seriously reconsider any approval of a loan to Brazil until Brazil shows its ability to clean out the Communists that are known to have infiltrated the Brazilian Government, and insist that Brazil withdraw recognition of Castro's Communist government and stop doing business with him and to side with the forces of freedom—having opposed the United States at Punte del Este and during the quarantine refusing to join it.

I made a similar request that related to Mexico the other day. Until Mexico stops permitting the inflow of persons for subversive purposes—including U.S. citizens—through the open door of subversion out of Mexico City and the Cuban Embassy, we should not give it any aid. Even the CIA Director himself admitted there were individuals going to Cuba for training purposes in 1962, at which time I brought out the fact that there were some 73 Americans as well going down there in violation of the U.S. laws—and unprosecuted.

After a strong protest, that aid should be withdrawn from Mexico until this open door is closed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish to commend him for the statement he has just made. For the life of me I cannot understand how this Government can seriously consider giving one thin dime to Brazil under the circumstances that exist. The Finance Minister of Brazil and the Ambassador of that Government in Washington told our subcommittee that Brazil would not hold the Continental Congress for Cuban Solidarity or whatever the specific title of that meeting, the Communist meeting in support of Cuba. But now the meeting is to be held, apparently, with the sanction of the Government of Brazil, and President Kennedy and this administration ought not to give Brazil one single dime as long as this meeting is in the works.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. Of course, he is an authority on this subject, being a member of the Selden subcommittee, at least to that extent, and I am glad that he placed on the RECORD the fact that assurances were made to that committee. This is something I did not have knowledge of myself, that Brazil did make assurances that this congress would not be held, which obviously seems to me to be a condition precedent in Alliance for Progress funds being seriously negotiated at this time. And, I will say to the gentleman further that I called the State Department, Mr. Moscoso's office, and I inquired in regard to the Alliance for Progress funds and I tried to get some information even in regard to what requests had been made, and that was denied me. As to the conditions that were being considered, they would not even discuss that. I said, "Are you going to attempt to gain assurances that if they get this money, they are going to fight communism instead of permitting it to grow in that country, as part of the policy of the United States, and what should be the basic policy of our Alliance for Progress funds" and I was denied any information of any kind at that time and have received none subsequently.

So far as the buildup is concerned, I could quote, for instance, from the Worker, the Communist newspaper in this country, on Sunday, March 17. And that happened to be the very weekend that I was asking for this information, the very weekend that the State Department was trying to expunge from the official records of the Selden committee the testimony of its own Ambassador to Brazil to the effect that there was infiltration in the Government, in the unions, in the student movement. Here is what the Worker said on that very Sunday, March 17, when the papers reported the fact that the State Department did not mean what it said. This is a report by Art Shields:

Brazil Communist Party's strength doubles in 2 years, says Carlos Prestes.

The very man I was just referring to who is going to this Rio conference:

Big changes are coming in Brazil, and the Brazilian Communist Party is much in this changing picture.

Its strength has doubled since 1960, says Luis Carlos Prestes, the party's general-secretary.

They say in the last 2 years that the Peasant Union has expanded from 50,000 2 years ago to 600,000 today.

Further quoting from the article:

The movement for peace, which is the party's central issue, has made great advances.

I met Prestes when he talked to a group of correspondents during a short visit to Moscow.

Further quoting from the article:

Prestes gave us many details of the rising strength of the people's forces. Thus the Communist Party's ties with the militant working class of Brazil have grown much stronger since the late 1950's.

The student movement is rapidly growing. It is led by Communists in alliance with members of the Catholic youth.

"The influence of the Communist Party and other democratic groups is rising in the ranks of the Brazilian Army," said Prestes, who used to be an army colonel himself.

Further quoting from the article:

The big job internationally is to win socialism with the least sacrifices. "But socialism" he said, "cannot be prevented." He proudly declared, "We Brazilians are fighting to become the second people in Latin America to open the door to socialism."

This was the very day the State Department was trying to expunge from the records of the Congress its own testimony with respect to the Communist buildup in Brazil.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand that the gentleman made a request of the State Department to give the gentleman information as to the amount of money we have spent in Brazil in this Alliance for Progress program?

Mr. CRAMER. No; that information is readily available to everyone, including the gentleman from Florida, and the gentleman from Florida is well aware of it. What I asked for was how much they are now negotiating for; how much have they requested? The news

reports vary as to the amount of money involved.

I was told that I could not get this information—that I was not entitled to it—and they would not discuss what the Brazilian Finance Minister asked for.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, how long ago was that request denied to the gentleman?

Mr. CRAMER. That was on Saturday, March 16, 1963, the very day before this Worker article came out.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The reason I ask this is the fact that I have a constituent who is interested in the amount of money being proposed that we spend in Brazil. He asked me that question in a letter.

Has the gentleman from Florida any information or is the gentleman going to place in the RECORD the amount of money that has been spent heretofore in Brazil?

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado if the gentleman will look at my remarks of March 18, 1963, page 4428, the gentleman will see that information, indicating that some $450 million to date is to be repaid by Brazil, and they are asking for forgiveness on that. He is asking, according to the press, for release of $84 million to the $553 million U.S. aid which was given to Brazil since 1951. And according to today's report, $55 million more is requested as the first of three yearly amounts.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, when the gentleman discussed with them the question of the request that had been made, did they give the gentleman any substantial reasons why they would not give the gentleman the information?

Mr. CRAMER. They said negotiations were underway and that they had no information to give, even though my request related to the request of the Brazilian Government at the outset of the negotiations which, at least speculatively, was printed in the press time and time again. But a Member of Congress is not entitled to have this information. Mr. Moscoso, who is in charge of the Alliance for Progress administration, would not advise me as to present demands or negotiations which were made even at the outset, and this I cannot understand.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa. However, permit me to say before I yield to the gentleman that my interest is obviously not only a personal one but I believe the people of this country are entitled to know that information under these circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado that the asking price of the Brazilians is the round figure of $500 million—one-half billion dollars. That is what they want.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand from testimony which is available that the asking price now by Brazil is that they want one-half billion dollars for next year?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will have to take my word for that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Oh; surely.

Mr. GROSS. The asking price, the Brazilian asking price, is in round figures $500 million. This is on top of, as I understand it, somewhere near $1.5 billion already made available to Brazil in various financing deals. And from the $500 million there would be a refinancing, as I understand it, of payments to Soviet-bloc countries of certain short-term credits that are due or very shortly coming due. In other words, they would like to obtain money from U.S. taxpayers to refinance their obligations to the Soviet-bloc countries, among other things.

This is a rather complicated thing, but it boils down to the asking from this country in various ways of refinancing, new money, and so on and so forth, approximately one-half billion dollars.

Mr. CRAMER. To substantiate what the gentleman from Iowa says on trade with Russia as part of the Brazilian deal it was reported from Rio de Janeiro in the press that just before Dantas, the Finance Secretary, came to this country to negotiate as follows:

> Brazil is about to sign a long-term $160 million-a-year trade agreement with the Russians as part of a 3-year plan the United States would be asked to help finance.

The announcement further stated:

> Government sources said they do not expect the United States to press for curbs on Iron Curtain trade which will be approximately doubled by the new agreement and may be increased to as much as $300 million a year by 1965.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman, with reference to his treatment by the State Department, that Mr. Martin, who is Chief of the Latin American Desk in the State Department is the same Mr. Martin who not too long ago stated in hearings before our own subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture that he had proceeded to carry out one program, having to do with Brazil, by the way, without any regard to the wishes of the Congress or even, for that matter, taking the trouble to bring the matter to the attention of his superiors as under the law he was supposed to do.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. I believe that the American people are entitled to this information. That is why I requested it, as well as because of my concern over the statement of the Department of State itself to the effect that Communist infiltration in Brazil had reached what I would call serious proportions and still existed, which is found in the record of the hearings of the Selden Committee.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about training schools for subversives in Cuba, by Castro and the Communists. This report which I am placing in the RECORD gives an example in very specific detail of how these schools are carried on, how the students are brought in, and even names some of the students. They follow up their activities in Brazil, after their training.

For instance, from July 28 to August 20, a total of 52 Latin Americans attended the guerrilla warfare instruction course. Besides the 12 Brazilian students from the Peasants' Leagues there were 12 Venezuelans, 17 Argentines, 6 Paraguayans and 5 Panamanians.

This was way back in 1961. The principal Brazilians taking the course were the same men who later directed the development of the guerrilla movement of the leagues in Brazil. They were, for instance:

Clodomir de los Santos Morais, ex-Deputy of the state of Pernambuco, member of the Communist Party of Brazil (PCB) and the principal aide of Francisco Juliao.

Joaquin Ferreira, member of the Communist Party and ex-Economist of the "SUDENE," a state organization for the so-called development of Northeast Brazil, under the direction of Celso Furtado.

Pedro Mate de Barros, leader of the youth sector of the Communist Party and law student in Pernambuco.

Adamastar Antonio Bonilla, one of the secretaries of the state committee of the Communist Party in Rio Grande do Sol.

Armando Luiz de Carvelho, also known as Palmeira, member of the Communist Party of Pernambuco.

The instruction course was given in Managua, a camp near Havana, where the general headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Army is situated. Maj. Guillermo Franco was in charge of the course. The holding of this guerrilla course was carefully disguised, even within Cuba. The "students of guerrilla tactics" were presented officially as delegates to the 26th of July anniversary festivities and after that date as visitors and tourists. This was the second course of this nature under the patronage of the Cubans, the first having been held in May 1961.

These instructions included daily rifle practice, guerrilla maneuvers simulated in the mountains of Los Organos, the handling and identifications of weapons and ideological indoctrination. The "students" were instructed in the dismounting, handling, and maintenance of various American firearms, including models M–1 and M–3, Garand, and Hatchkiss and Browning machineguns. The instruction was limited to American weapons, according to explanations of the instructor, because they, as guerrillas, should capture and use the arms of the enemy. They were familiarized with the manufacture of "Molotov cocktails" and the M–26 incendiary bomb. The instructor explained that this bomb has been perfected by Che Guevara to be shot from a rifle.

> Some theoretical classrooms were operating in Granja del Pueblo Hermanos Saiz [Saiz Brothers People Farm] under the direction of Major Franco, where the "students" attended classes. Franco, a very close confidential friend of Fidel Castro, also held

the position of paymaster, handing out funds for the occasional expenses of the "students." These latter were constantly reminded that a good revolutionary must be well indoctrinated in the Marxist-Leninist theories. Besides Major Franco, the following members of the Cuban Revolutionary Army acted as instructors: Rolando Lazaro Requeijo, Antonio Reina Jimenez, and Teodoro Braunn. The Panamanians, under the direction of Jorge Ferreira, were subjected to a special rigorous course.

It goes on to describe the balance of the course and how they were hidden in the hotel and were taken out on a 1-day basis for the trip, so it would not appear they were other than tourists:

The majority of the trained guerrillas returned to their respective countries on August 20, 1961, arriving on the 21st or 22d. The plane that was to take the Brazilians, Argentines, and Paraguayans was overfilled, because some visitors—not "guerrilla students"—also had taken passage on that plane. For this reason, those who had less urgent needs to return remained another 2 days in Havana, as tourists, leaving on a second Cuban plane on August 22. This plane also transported the Uruguayan delegation. The plane returned via Port of Spain, reaching São Paulo on August 23. The Brazilians who landed on this occasion were arrested by the police, charged with carrying subversive propaganda. But they were set free, together with the propaganda, on the same day.

After the resignation of Janio Quadros in August 1961, and the absence of a subsequent revolution, Fidel Castro decided that he should give massive financial support to the Peasants' Leagues in Brazil—

And that is what has been happening—

transforming the revolutionary sector of the leagues into a liaison agent for the Brazilian revolution in the same manner as his group had acted for the Cuban Revolution. In the meanwhile Juliao would continue his preaching that the leagues constituted an organization whose objective was to better the status of the peasants.

They set up a general headquarters in Recife, at 216 Respiolo Street. These headquarters consist of the following personnel. I will put those names in the RECORD.

They went on with the initiation of the establishment of Peasants' Leagues Councils in several states of Brazil. The name of the head of this movement to maintain contact with the Cuban movement and the description of these activities likewise will be in the RECORD.

Quoting again:

Morais began the supervision of the purchase of a number of farms in which guerrilla training could be held. In each one of these farms, Morais placed a director who was responsible for this training. In October 1962 six separate locations existed, in Goiss, Maranhao, Matto Grosso, Estado de Bahis, Rio, and Rio Grande de Sul. During the previous year, at least two other farms were closed down. One in Matto Grosso, and the other in Parana. At the end of 1961, the director of the Dianopolis Farm in the State of Goias, was Amaro Luiz de Carvalho, known by the name of "Palmeira," member of the Brazilian Communist Party of Pernambuco.

It goes further through the buildup of the Peasant League movement, how they operate, the training they receive, the contact they have not only with the Cuban Embassy but the Embassies from Russia and Red China and Communists from throughout the world as well.

I think you will find this heretofore unpublished documentation in detail of the buildup in the Peasants' League, a Communist organization in Brazil not only interesting reading but essential information in connection with this consideration of a loan to Brazil at this time. This entire history of the League from which I have taken excerpts appear at the end of my remarks. This comes from a source I consider beyond question—and related to known incidents reported to the press and from other sources.

HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PEASANTS' LEAGUES IN BRAZIL—PROOF OF SUBVERSION IN BRAZIL

Deputies Francisco Juliao and Clodomir de los Santos Morais accompanied the Brazilian presidential candidate, Janio Quadros on his visit to Cuba in April 1960. During that visit, Juliao and Morais had a personal meeting with Fidel Castro in which they requested Castro's financial support for the Peasants' Leagues. Castro studied the request, and after consultation with Che Guevara, he informed Juliao that his decision was not to support the Leagues, a decision that was due in great extent, to the observation made by Guevara that there was no existing proof that these Leagues were organized.

In November 1960, Juliao made a visit to Red China, where he again requested financial assistance, this time from the Communist Chinese Government. Juliao obtained the promise of financial help which would have to be channeled through the Castro government. This financial aid would not be extended under the heading of support to the rural organizations led by Juliao in Pernambuco, but would be for the purpose of creating and developing the guerrilla groups in Brazil which would be capable of spearheading a violent revolutionary movement with the objective of overthrowing the Government of Brazil.

Juliao returned to Brazil at the end of December 1960, and immediately left for Cuba in order to attend the celebration of the second anniversary of the Cuban Revolution. When he returned later to Brazil, he selected Clodomir Morais to head the revolutionary groups of Peasants' Leagues, while he acted as the figurehead of an organization ostensibly dedicated to the peaceful promotion of interests of the Brazilian farmers. In his speeches and statements to the press in the beginning of 1961, Juliao said that he hoped that the P.S.B. Socialist Brazilian Party and the P.T.B. Brazilian Workers' Party, presided by João Goulart and the Communist Party would be able to unite in their efforts to bring about agrarian reform through peaceful means. When he was reminded of the belligerent nature of communism, Juliao answered the reporter by stating that "communism is different in Brazil."

While Clodomir Morais was engaged in the work of the basic organization of establishing the mechanism of guerrilla warfare, Juliao alternated his tasks between making speeches in favor of the Leagues and traveling between Brazil and Cuba. In 1961 Juliao made three trips to Cuba. In June and July of that year, Morais selected 11 members of the Peasants' Leagues to accompany him to Cuba, where they were taken for a specialized course in guerrilla warfare.

This group of 13 Brazilians left Recife on July 21, 1961. They traveled together with a group of Argentines and Paraguayans in a Britannia plane chartered specially by the "Compañía Cubana de Aviación." The plane made a stop at Rio de Janeiro to take on other passengers, also making another stop at Port of Spain, for refueling before landing on July 22, at the José Martí airport in Havana.

The group were welcomed and shown around by representatives of the Cuban Institute of Friendship with Nations (ICAP) an organization which ostensibly promoted the trip. The group pretended to be members of the Brazilian delegation to attend the 26th of July celebrations.

They were lodged in the hotel Riviera in Havana. During the first few days they took an active part in all the various festivities commemorating the 26th of July anniversary. On the afternoon of July 24, a reception was held in honor of the Soviet's cosmonaut, Maj. Yuri Gagarin, who was visiting Cuba, followed by a public dance, that night. On July 25, a sports parade was held; the following day, the 26th, a huge public demonstration was held and on the 27th, the visitors were taken on a tour of Cuban beaches in Havana. On the night of July 28, together with representatives from other Latin American countries, the Brazilian left the hotel and riding in official Cadillac cars they were taken to the instruction camps for guerrilla warfare, where they were divided into nationality groups and lodged in different instruction centers.

From July 28 to August 20, a total of 52 Latin Americans attended the guerrilla warfare instruction course. Besides the 12 Brazilian students from the Peasants' Leagues, there were 12 Venezuelans, 17 Argentines, 6 Paraguayans and 5 Panamanians.

The principal Brazilians taking the course were the same men who later directed the development of the guerrilla movement of the leagues in Brazil. They were the following:

Clodomir de los Santos Morais, ex-Deputy of the State of Pernambuco, member of the Communist Party of Brazil (PCB) and the principal aid of Francisco Juliao.

Joaquin Ferreira, member of the Communist Party and ex-Economist of the "Sudene" (a state organization for the so-called development of Northeast Brazil, under the direction of Celso Furtado).

Pedro Mate de Barros, leader of the youth sector of the Communist Party and law student in Pernambuco.

Adamastar Antonio Bonille, one of the secretaries of the state committee of the Communist Party in Rio Grande do Sol.

Armando Luiz de Carvalho, also known as Palmeira, member of the Communist Party of Pernambuco.

The instruction course was given in Managua, a camp near Havana, where the general headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Army is situated. Maj. Guillermo Franco was in charge of the course. The holding of this guerrilla course was carefully disguised, even within Cuba. The "students of guerrilla tactics" were presented officially as delegates to the 26th of July anniversary festivities and after that date, as visitors and tourists. This was the second course of this nature under the patronage of the Cubans, the first having been held in May 1961.

These instructions include daily rifle practice, guerrilla maneuvers simulated in the mountains of Los Organos, the handling and identifications of weapons and ideological indoctrination. The students were instructed in the dismounting, handling, and maintenance of various American firearms, including models M–1 and M–3, Garand and Hatchkiss and Browning machineguns. The instruction was limited to American weapons, according to explanations of the instructor, because they, as guerrillas, should capture and use the arms of the enemy. They were familiarized with the manufacture of Molotov cocktails and the M–26 incendiary bomb. The instructor explained that this bomb has been perfected by Che Guevara to be shot from a rifle.

Same theoretical classrooms were operating in (Granja del Pueblo Hermanos Saiz)

(Saiz Brothers People Farm) under the direction of Major Franco, where the students attended classes. Franco, a very close confidential friend of Fidel Castro, also held the position of paymaster, handing out funds for the occasional expenses of the students. These latter were constantly reminded that a good revolutionary must be well indoctrinated in the Marxist-Leninist theories. Besides Major Franco, the following members of the Cuban Revolutionary Army acted as instructors: Rolando Lazaro Requeijo, Antonio Reina Jiménez and Teodoro Braunn. The Panamanians, under the direction of Jorge Ferreire, were subjected to a special rigorous course.

When the other students asked why this special treatment for the Panamanians, they were informed that the group from Panama were being prepared to act as saboteurs in the Panama Canal Zone.

In order to maintain their appearances as tourists, the students returned to the point of their departure, the Havana Riviera Hotel. While there, they told everyone who asked that they had been visiting the interior of the island on a tourist jaunt. The students in the hotel made contact with delegations of Czechs, Russians, and Red Chinese, who were introduced to them as "technicians." The guerrilla students had little contact with these visitors from the Iron Curtain because they remained aloof and unfriendly, limiting their encounters to more social amenities.

On completing the course, the Brazilian students were told that they had passed the course with exceptional qualifications and as a premium for this achievement they would be given the honor of an informal meeting with Fidel Castro in the Cienega de Zapats, where they were taken in Fidel's personal helicopter. Castro congratulated them on the splendid results they obtained from the course, relating some of his own experiences as a guerrilla fighter and entered into the discussion of the political scene in Latin America. He exhorted them not to be deceived by apparent measures of agrarian reform, such as those proposed by Janio Quadros, of Brazil, but to continue fighting for revolutionary and radical reforms.

The majority of the trained guerrillas returned to their respective countries on August 20, 1961 arriving on the 21st or 22d. The plane that was to take the Brazilians, Argentines and Paraguayans, was over-filled because some visitors—not "guerrilla students"—also had taken passage on that plane. For this reason, those who had less urgent needs to return, remained another 2 days in Havana, as tourists, leaving on a second Cuban plane on August 22. This plane also transported the Uruguayan delegation. The plane returned via Port of Spain, reaching Sao Paulo on August 23. The Brazilians who landed on this occasion were arrested by the police, charged with carrying subversive propaganda. But they were set free together with the propaganda on the same day.

After the resignation of Janio Quadros in August 1961, and the absence of a subsequent revolution, Fidel Castro decided that he should give massive financial support to the Peasants Leagues, transforming the revolutionary sector of the leagues into a liaison agent for the Brazilian revolution in the same manner as his group had acted for the Cuban revolution. In the meanwhile, Julião would continue his preaching that the leagues constituted an organization whose objective was to better the status of the peasants. In this interim, the major part of Cuban money poured in for the organization of guerrilla fighters. Julião and Morsis decided to adopt the following measures to give shape to the leagues:

1. To enlarge the general headquarters of the leagues in Recife, at 216 Respiolo Street. These headquarters consist of the following personnel:

Francisco Julião: Honorary president.

Maria Ceares Barreto Novais: Secretary (also consulting attorney in the Economic Department of SUDENE).

Jonas Alburquerque Sosa.

José Severino Cunha.

Dzacy Megalhaes Florencio: Treasurer (Recife attorney and member of the state committee of the Communist Party of Pernambuco).

Emmanuel Egberto de Araujo.

Rivadavis Braz de Oliveira: One of the group trained in the guerrilla warfare course in Managua, Cuba.

Luis Serafín los Santos.

2. Initiation of the establishment of Peasants Leagues Councils in several states of Brazil. In various regions, Julião procured and obtained the support of ex-student leaders. In 1961, the leader of the Deliberative Council of the Peasant Leagues, was Tarzan de Castro, 25 years of age, who had formerly presided over the Brazilian Union of High School Students (U.B.E.S.). Jarbes Miranda de Santana, ex-president of the U.B.E.S. was made head of the Deliberative Council of the Leagues in 1961.

3. Formation of a movement to serve as the convert sector through which recruits for guerrilla training was conducted. This organization was known as Movimiento Revolucionario Triadentes (MRT) (Triadentes Revolutionary Movement). The two principal recruiting officers of the MRT were Clodomir Morais and Joaquín Ferrairs Filho. Both had attended the guerrilla course in Managua, Cuba. Later the MRT was transferred to the offices of La Liga, the official newspaper of the Peasants Leagues, directed by Julião, and managing director, Antonio Avertano. La Liga leases the buildings 1001 and 1002, situated at No. 15 Alcino Guanabera Street.

4. Julião established an agency in Rio de Janeiro in order to maintain contact with the Cuban Embassy. Regina Coelho de Alburquerque and Nives Borges do Brazil, were in charge of the agency. Regina Coelho's apartment in Avenida Rainhe Elizabeth No. 587, became a frequent meeting place for the leagues as well as a nightly stopover for members of the league who were traveling. Regina Coelho was the recipient of all correspondence and verbal messages of representatives arriving in Rio de Janeiro. She immediately contacted Nives Borges do Brazil passing on all information received; on the other hand Nives Borges contacted a member of the Cuban Embassy, usually the Third Secretary, Ana Sermiento, who was informed of the matter in question.

In December 1961, Nives Borges do Brazil left for Cuba in order to receive special instruction in clandestine activities, in preparation for becoming the intermediary between the leagues and the Cuban Embassy. Notwithstanding the extreme caution exercised by the personnel of the Cuban Embassy to separate Regina and use Nives as intermediary, at times Regina was invited to participate in receptions and other social functions given by Embassy personnel. Besides representatives of other Embassies of the Communist bloc, such as Ludwick Nekar of the Czech Embassy, were occasional visitors to Regina's apartment, generally for the purpose of meeting Julião and Morais. These two, during a certain period, frequently spent the night in Regina's apartment; later, fearing that their activities might be under scrutiny, Julião changed his temporary residence in Rio for the home of Osny Duarte Ferreirs, Magistrate of the Court of Appeals.

5. Morais began the supervision of the purchase of a number of farms in which guerrilla training could be held. In each one of these farms, Morais placed a director who was responsible for this training. In October 1962, six separate locations existed in Coiss, Moranhöa, Matto Grosso, Estado de Bahia, Rio, and Rio Grande do Sul. During the previous year, at least two other farms were closed down. One in Matto Grosso, and the other in Parana. At the end of 1961, the director of the Disnapolis Farm in the State of Goiss, was Amaro Luiz de Carvalho, known by the name of "Palmeira," member of the Brazilian Communist Party of Pernambuco.

Later, this farm was turned over to Carlos Montalrroyo. The Farm of Naranhäo was directed by Carvalho through his assistant Cleto da Conta Campolo Neto. The farm in Parana was directed by Diniz Cabrel Filho, another longtime member of the U.B.E.S. who joined the leagues. The farm at Rio Grande do Sul was under the supervision of Adamastar Antonio Bonilla, Secretary of the State Committee of the Brazilian Communist Party of Rio Grande do Sul.

6. Morais continued in his purpose to recruit candidates for guerrilla instructors selecting from them a group which was to be sent to Cuba for intensified training. In a general way, the procedure covering the trip to this group was similar to that of the first group of the Peasant Leagues trained in Managua, Cuba. The candidate traveled to Cuba as a delegate from Brazil to one of the many Cuban anniversaries. Frequently he stayed at one of the best hotels in Havana, visited the city for several days as a tourist, and then began his training in Havana itself or in nearby surroundings. After approximately 1 or 2 months training, the candidate returned and began to put into practice in one of the farms belonging to the leagues, the new technique just learned.

Morais and Ferreira attempted to evaluate each candidate before final acceptance and providing training. Before being invited to join the leagues, the candidate was usually subjected to a test on several questions to be answered, such as:

Do you believe in a social revolution for Brazil?

Would you swear to dedicate yourself, even at the expense of your own life, to the success of your objective?

Have you any other interests which would interfere with the bringing about reforms for your country?

Do you consider it advantageous in the event of having to take part in guerrilla warfare in order to introduce these reforms in Brazil?

On November 8, 1961, Josquín Hernándes Armas, new Cuban Ambassador in Brazil, presented his credentials to President Goulart. Already at this time, the Ambassador was aware that his government was giving support to the guerrilla groups of the leagues.

On December 8, 1961, when the major number of the farms were being opened, the translation by Mauricio Grabais, of Che Guevara's book, "The War of Guerrillas," was published. This book became the basic manual for all guerrilla activities undertaken in the farms belonging to the leagues.

On December 27, 1961, Alexina Line Crespo de Paula, the wife of Julião and her two children left Brazil for an extended trip to Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, Red China, and North Korea. Alexina acted as messenger for the leagues, which she had frequently done in Brazil. On this trip she spoke to Mao Tse-tung, giving him information on conditions existing in Brazil, all of this mission was confided to her by Morais. Alexina told Mao that the leagues counted on the support of many high ranking officers of the army; that the leagues were in possession of arms, munitions and money necessary to explode a violent revolution. When Alexina returned from China and related what she had told Mao to various members of the leagues, her statements caused a great feeling of animosity against Morais among

leaders of the leagues. In the opinion of these dissatisfied leaders, the optimism of Morais had cost them valuable financial support from Red China.

In January 1962, the Brazilian Army discovered that arms, manufactured in Czechoslovakia were being introduced into the country for distribution, possibly among the Peasant Leagues.

On the 22d of April, Julião issued a statement of his convictions in his "Declaration de Ouro Preto," in which he said that the Brazilians should aspire toward giving their lives for the creation of a new society, which he said would be "like the dawn."

On April 30, 1962, the Communists Jaos Amazonas de Sosa Pedroso and Mauricio Grabois arrived in Havana to participate ostensibly in the celebration of Labor Day, but this was only a pretext to cover their real objectives. They both attended the guerrilla course. In the middle of August 1962, two more Communists, Carlos Danielli and Angelo Arroyo arrived in Cuba to take the same course.

At the end of May 1962, Pedro Mota de Barros, another member of the leagues, who accompanied Morais to the Cuban training camp in Managua, left Brazil on a trip to establish links between Julião and other Communists revolutionaries throughout Latin America, Mota de Barros visited Chile, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela, where he met with revolutionaries who had trained with him in Cuba. In several interviews he asked them what type of support they could give to the leagues and what could the leagues give to them.

In the beginning of July 1962, the farm in Parana was closed after one of the men who had been trained in Cuba, was mortally wounded by local farmers. The victim was 19-year-old Antonio Thiago Filho. Upon learning of this assassination, Morais instructed the leaders of the farm to bury the young man and to close the farm, without giving the news of his death for publication.

In August 1962, the revolutionary plot of the Peasant Leagues began to appear. The first incident took place in Pernambuco when Joel Arruda Camara and Manuel Tertuliano, brother of Julião, and 12 other members of the leagues were arrested by the Brazilian Fourth Army. When arrested, they had in their possession documents revealing guerrilla operations plans prepared against rural properties located in nearly 30 municipal districts of Pernambuco. Julião reacted by stating that the imprisonment and the documents were part of a lie created by reactionaries against the leagues, and sent a telegram to President Goulart, protesting the Army's action.

The second public manifestation took place in August when Rivadavia Bras de Olivera, the same person who attended the training course in Managua, together with Atausipa Alves de Lima and José Bartolomeu de Souza, were served with a prison warrant in an office belonging to the leagues in Rio de Janeiro, situated on 496 Russel Street, apartment 803, which had been rented by Paulo Bezerra de Andrade, and employee of the newspaper A Lig, official organ of the Peasant Leagues. On that occasion a large quantity of Communist propaganda was found in the office.

The third manifestation of this revolutionary plot was the discovery of one of the farms of the leagues in Dianopolis, in the State of Goies on November 23, 1962. Guerrilla operation plans again were seized.

Temporary imprisonment was decreed against 26 members of the leagues by Judge Moreira Marquez. Among these were Clodomir dos Santos Morais, Amaro Luiz de Carvalho and Joaquin Ferriers Filho, all of whom had been trained in Managua, Cuba. Besides these, another training companion was included, Clovis José Estevez de Souze.

The fourth manifestation was the imprisonment of Clodomir dos Santos Morais, Celia Lima and José Francisco da Silva on December 13, 1962. Clodomir was arrested while transporting a shipment of arms to members of the leagues; he carried a visiting card of Antale Chardin, chief of the consular section of the Soviet Union Embassy on which Chadrin had written a note apologizing for failing to keep an appointment with Julião. Celia Lima, who had been traveling companion of Morais for some time, was more than just a companion. Morais had included her in his guerrilla activities, giving her the supervision of what she called School of Revolutionary Development, situated in a house in the northern zone of Rio de Janeiro, where courses ranging from ideological indoctrination to sabotage were held.

The fifth and most recent manifestation of the guerrilla activities is the contents of the documents found in the wreckage of the Varig plane which crashed near Lima, Peru, on November 27, 1962. The documents will explain many of the leagues' problems, in the development of their guerilla capacity as well as their overall program.

Beginning in 1962, many of the leagues' leaders commenced complaining about the activities of Morais, accusing him of dedicating more importance to his own interests than to those of the leagues; of not concerning himself with the welfare of the leagues' members, and what is even more important, of diverting funds given by the Cuban Government for promoting guerrilla activities, for his own personal use.

During the development of the Peasants Leagues, the Cuban Embassy in Rio de Janeiro, constantly directed their activities. The official of the Cuban Embassy, principally responsible for the operations of the leagues, was Miguel Brugueras del Valle, in reality a member of the Cuban Secret Service in Brazil, acting under the pretext of his post of cultural counselor of the Cuban Embassy. At times, Brugueras had two other assistants—"cultural attachés," Felix Pita and Arturo Garcia Rodriguez. They maintained constant contact with Morais and occasionally with Julião. Haroldo Hall, representative of "Prensa Latina" in Rio de Janeiro, also helped Brugueras in his contact with the leagues. Brugueras directed the Cuban subversive operations which involved Brazilian Communist organizations, through the mediation of such well-known Communists as Mullis Bandsire, Joëo Amazonas and Maurico Grabios. In July 1962 Brugueras accompanied a group of Brazilians on a trip to Cuba to attend the celebration of the 26th of July anniversary. On August 24, 1962, Brugueras accompanied the Cuban Ambassador, Josquin Hernándes Armas, to Goisnis, where the Ambassador addressed the law school. On this occasion, Brugueras met with Tarsan de Castro, head of the Deliberative Council of the Peasants Leagues of Goise. This meeting between Brugueras and Castro is referred to in one of the documents found in the wreckage of the plane which crashed in Lima. Brugueras and Tarsan maintained frequent meetings to discuss the actions of Morais, with which they were not in accord. Later, they continued their frequent meetings to discuss the disagreements occurring in the leagues during the last 6 months of 1962. Brugueras wrote two letters to his chief (Petronio) in the Cuban Government in 1962, explaining the then existing conditions in the leagues, signing them with his pseudonym, "Gerardo." Brugueras gave the two dispatches, with a copy of a letter in which he complained of the actions of Clodomiro Morais to the postal messenger, Raúl Capero Bonilla, who headed the Cuban delegation in the recent Congress of the FAO, held in the Copacabana Palace Hotel, shortly before the delegation departed on their ill-fated journey. These dispatches have been recovered, the material referred to showing subversion in Brazil has been summarized in the press. Brazil frantically tried to cover up the dispatch report and to keep it secret because it documents Communist activities in Brazil.

NOT EVEN THE REDS FORESAW THEIR RISE TO POWER

(By Louis R. Stein)

RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL.—Brazilian Communists wield more power today than they would have dreamed of when President Joao Goulart took office a year and one-half ago.

The man most responsible for giving a leg up to the Communists is the President himself.

Sr. Goulart has named numerous Communists and fellow traveling nationalists to key administration jobs and facilitated election of Communist slates in labor unions formerly controlled by more conservative leaders.

Yet anyone in Brazil will tell you the President is not a Communist.

The 15-man Cabinet contains three notorious Marxists: Hermes Lima, Foreign Minister; Joa Mangabeira, Justice and Interior Minister, and Almino Afonso, Labor Minister. Two doubtfuls in the Cabinet are Celso Furtado, Minister for Planning who was a Communist in his youth, and Jose Ermirio de Moraes, millionaire industrialist who financed the election campaign of Miguel Arraes, Communist governor of the northeastern State of Pernambuco.

DECLARED

Raul Riff, Sr. Goulart's press secretary, is a self-declared Communist. Evandro Linse Silva, director of the presidential secretariat, is closely linked with the Communists.

The most important labor organization taken over by the Communists since Sr. Goulart's inauguration is the National Industrial Workers Confederation which unites most industrial unions in the country.

Sr. Goulart personally intervened in the last CNTI election on behalf of the Communist-backed slate led by Dante Pelecani.

Sr. Goulart named Francisco Mangabeira, an extreme leftwing nationalist son of the Justice Minister, to be president of Petrobras, the Government oil monopoly. Petrobras is the largest single firm in Brazil.

"Watermelons" (green outside, red inside), a term used here to describe fellow travelers, hold many lesser posts in the Government.

NO VETS

Congress has no control over composition of the Cabinet or choice of government agency directors. It can summon ministers to give an accounting but cannot veto nominations.

Sr. Goulart's Brazilian Labor Party has assisted election of Communists to Congress. Communist Party leader Luis Carlos Prestes says the current Congress contains 17 Communists. Most ran with PTB backing.

There were only 16 Communists in the Federal Legislature at the time the Party was outlawed in 1948. Sr. Prestes, then a senator, was among those who lost his mandate. The Party still is officially illegal but operates openly without interference.

It is feared in democratic circles here that Sr. Goulart is riding a tiger. Leftist forces around him could cause considerable trouble and possibly destroy his austerity program if they decided to actively oppose it.

Finance Minister Francisco San Tiago Dantas, now in the United States for money talks, has already run up against leftist criticism which, for the nonce, is being held in check by Sr. Goulart.

All efforts to bar Commmuists from the armed forces and Government jobs have been thwarted.

The latest attempt was a bill written by Social Democratic Party (PSD) Deputy Mendes de Morais. It was killed in committee.

NAMELESS

Sr. Prestes said this month that since the Cuban revolution Communists sympathizers have increased six-fold in Brazil.

The Prestes' estimate may be high, there is no denying that there are more Communist sympathizers in Brazil today than ever before.

And, if Sr. Prestes had spoken the whole truth he would have added that the bulk of the new strength yearns for revolt instead of a silent revolution through subversive infiltration.

The mellowed chief of the bloody 1935 revolution now professes to believe the Communists can eventually bring off a bloodless coup in Brazil.

Sr. Prestes wrote the 1958 party manifesto laying down a new nationalistic, anti-American policy to bring the party into line with Nikita Khrushchev's program of subversion as opposed to revolution.

The new line split the party and fostered the formation of several deviationist groups. The strongest of these is led by veterans Joao Amazonas and Mauricio Grabois.

Their weekly newspaper Classe Operaria gives extensive play to Chinese communism and ignores Russia except to criticize the Kremlin. So does the weekly Politica Operaria, published by the Frente Operaria, another splinter group.

The Chinese and Castroites are flooding the country with propaganda. Castro portraits unfailingly appear at student rallies and meetings of the revolutionary rural leagues, led by self-proclaimed Marxist Deputy Francisco Julião.

In his latest comment on the subject Sr. Julião said, "The only way out for the oppressed masses is armed struggle."

No one in Brazil could hope to mount a successful coup without control of the armed forces.

The Communists know this. Leftwing nationalist officers also appear to realize it.

Hence, both groups are courting the noncommissioned officers.

Sr. Julião flatly stated recently that "we expect to carry out our revolution with the help of the sergeants in the armed forces."

BRASS

The importance of the noncoms as an emerging new power within the armed forces was stressed recently by the presence of high brass sitting down front at a noncommissioned officers meeting.

On hand were: Admiral Pedro Araujo Suzano, navy minister; Brig. Reynaldo de Carvalho, air minister; Gen. Osvino Ferreira Alves, first army commander; Admiral Candido Aragao, marine corps commander.

The generals applauded political speeches by noncoms who criticized Congress and the courts. The military code actually prohibits any person in uniform from making political statements.

All the officers present were leftwing nationalist supporters of President Goulart. Fellow officers call Admiral Aragao a Communist while General Alves proclaimed at a public gathering that he and fellow traveling Labor Minister Afonso "have the same ideology."

Several sergeants were elected last October to state assemblies with nationalist and Communist backing and one was sent to the Federal House of Deputies.

Although the electoral laws require that they resign from the service before they may be seated they are fighting in the courts to retain their military status while serving as congressmen.

BRAZILIAN ENVOY GIVING EXPLANATION

Brazil's Ambassador Roberto Campos today said his hour-long talk with Under Secretary of State George W. Ball yesterday had "helped to clarify unwarranted misunderstandings" of a U.S. charge that Communists had infiltrated the government of President Joao Goulart.

But the Brazilian envoy sternly warned that "one should be extremely careful in making these accusations."

The controversy has cast a shadow over a visiting mission's efforts to get U.S. aid for Brazil's 3-year multimillion-dollar economic reconstruction program.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FROM COMMUNIST YUGOSLAVIA AND POLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 I brought to the attention of the House the fact that our President has not taken the action which section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act clearly requires him to take. Section 231 requires that the President shall withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from Communist Yugoslavia and Poland and require that the products of these countries be dutiable at the same full duty rates as the other Communist countries. Although this is a matter of principle more than anything else, I want the House to understand that it is not just a demand for action based on legality alone, but that the factual situation is such that serious injury is being caused to domestic industries because of the failure of the President to act in accordance with the explicit requirement of the statute.

There are two rolled zinc plants in Indiana. One is located in Greencastle and the other in Muncie. These plants manufacture zinc sheet and zinc strip. There is substantial production of zinc strip by these plants. Formerly there was substantial production of zinc sheet but imports now have ruined the zinc sheet business in this country. In 1962 more than half of the imports of zinc sheet were of Yugoslavian origin. These foreign zinc sheet imports had an average declared foreign value in 1962 of only 12.1 cents per pound—less than the price which my constituents must pay for the metal from which to manufacture zinc strip and zinc sheet. In 1952 imports of zinc sheet represented a quantity equivalent to only 1 percent of domestic industry production. For 1962 zinc sheet imports represented a quantity equivalent to 48 percent of domestic industry production. I am presenting zinc sheet import statistics and not zinc strip import statistics because the Bureau of the Census only collects data on zinc sheet imports. Zinc strip imports are in a category with a number of other products even though interestingly enough, zinc strip production is many times that of zinc sheet.

Employees in rolled zinc plants in my State, I am pleased to say, are well paid. Their wages are more than eight times the wages paid in metal industries in Communist Yugoslavia. With a situation such as this, combined with the fact that the raw material in the United States costs more than the declared Yugoslav value of the finished manufactured product, it is no wonder that domestic zinc sheet manufacturers virtually have been put out of business and that domestic zinc strip manufacturers probably will suffer the same fate if the President does not act at once to require Communist Yugoslav products to be assessed the same full-duty rates as the other Communist countries.

Under the circumstances, I ask you, why does not the President act? Even if the law were discretionary and he only had authority to act to assist an American industry confronted with ruinous import competition from Communist Yugoslavia, you would think he would act. But this is not a discretionary matter. The law clearly requires that the President shall take this action. He has not acted, and he has given no indication of when he is going to act. This is one of the greatest affronts Congress has ever received from a President. A law is passed which the President signs, and then he does not act as the law specifically provides that he shall act.

New, let us be completely fair about the matter and see if there is any basis for the President failing to act. In 1951 in the Trade Agreements Extension Act the same language was used to require the President to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from countries which are members of the world Communist movement. This involved 13 countries and yet President Truman was able to complete action and issue the necessary directives within 2 months—August 3, 1951, Proclamation No. 2935, 16 Federal Register 7635, and 16 Federal Register 7637. You see, most-favored-nation treatment was not withdrawn from Yugoslavia and Poland at that time because it was determined that these countries, while Communist countries, were not members of the world Communist movement but instead, so-called independent Communist countries—an interesting refinement and distinction.

Because of this distinction and the fact that most-favored-nation treatment was not withdrawn from Yugoslavia and Poland under the 1951 act, it was necessary to include an additional provision in the 1962 act which directed that most-favored-nation treatment be withdrawn from any Communist country irrespective of whether or not the country is a member of the world Communist movement.

Five months have now elapsed since the effective date of the law. Only two countries are involved and yet the President has not acted. President Truman

was able to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from 13 countries within a 2-month period, but President Kennedy has been unable to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from only 2 Communist countries in 5 months.

Are we Members of Congress going to do nothing while the President disregards the explicit requirement of the law and American industries are being ruined by import competition from Communist countries?

Zinc strip produced in the United States

	Production (in tons)	Sales		Exports (in tons)	Average number of employees	Man-hours expended	Average hourly pay to employees	Approximate fringe cost per paid hour	Average total hourly labor cost	Labor cost as percent of cost of finished product	Dollars of profit (loss) on these items
		(A) Tonnage	(B) Dollars								
1959	32,364	32,221	10,773,634	1,052	242	459,716	$2.37	$0.48	$2.85	14.55	$505,347
1960	30,843	30,433	10,823,882	637	228	392,573	2.44	.49	2.93	14.63	(73,197)
1961	31,902	31,890	11,028,920	761	236	407,691	2.47	.51	2.98	13.70	(98,273)
1962	33,924	34,056	11,635,416	1,016	220	405,171	2.56	.54	3.10	13.67	116,920

Source: Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association.

Zinc sheet produced in the United States

	Production (in tons)	Sales		Exports (in tons)	Average number of employees	Man-hours expended	Average hourly pay to employees	Approximate fringe cost per paid hour	Average total hourly labor cost	Labor cost as percent of cost of finished product	Dollars of profit (loss) on these items
		(A) Tonnage	(B) Dollars								
1952	6,930	6,864	4,281,164	299	349	635,493	$1.71	$0.18	$1.89	21.98	$52,571
1953	6,881	6,700	4,098,844	449	334	655,710	1.81	.24	2.05	28.85	205,229
1954	6,129	6,101	3,671,196	292	320	587,668	1.85	.30	2.15	30.55	160,057
1955	6,583	6,442	4,118,618	339	320	642,008	1.90	.30	2.20	28.53	126,104
1956	5,888	6,013	4,063,219	367	315	612,658	2.03	.33	2.36	29.72	6,350
1957	4,640	4,596	3,367,451	335	276	511,653	2.11	.37	2.48	32.90	63,408
1958	4,214	4,175	3,024,755	294	259	428,353	2.21	.40	2.61	34.62	37,774
1959	3,825	3,756	2,849,939	221	245	430,992	2.26	.46	2.72	36.68	(130,826)
1960	3,356	3,276	2,575,121	224	223	380,767	2.30	.48	2.78	33.65	(251,348)
1961	2,647	2,933	2,194,504	164	188	279,641	2.36	.54	2.90	32.66	(421,886)
1962	2,699	2,752	2,026,750	172	157	279,478	2.43	.62	3.05	33.70	(357,641)

Source: Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association.

Zinc sheets—Imports by volume and value, average value of imports in terms of cents per pound and imports as percentage of domestic production

Year	Imports		Average foreign value of imports (cents per pound)	Imports by volume as percent of domestic production
	Tons	Dollars		
1952	47	23,557	25.0	1
1953	196	76,751	19.5	3
1954	259	88,010	17.0	4
1955	431	148,389	17.2	7
1956	450	170,416	18.9	8
1957	732	244,722	16.7	16
1958	823	262,324	15.9	19
1959	950	310,855	16.3	25
1960	904	301,667	16.6	27
1961	1,177	350,200	14.9	44
1962	1,298	363,916	14.0	48

Source: Imports by tons and dollar value are as reported by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce Commodity Classification 6559000 except that for the years 1952 through 1958 they have been revised in accordance with the findings of the U.S. Tariff Commission in Report on Zinc Sheet—Escape Clause Investigation No. 81, dated January 1960, table 12. Other data as computed by Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association. Excludes quantities erroneously reported as having been entered from Canada.

1962 zinc sheet imports—quantity, value, and average foreign value by country of origin in terms of cents per pound

	Belgium	Japan	Netherlands	West Germany	United Kingdom	Yugoslavia
Quantity (pounds)	235,638	1,788	223,011	541,395	42,557	1,552,513
Value	$35,250	$626	$33,559	$99,585	$7,300	$187,596
Average value (cents)	14.9	35.0	15.0	18.4	17.1	12.1

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Zinc sheet imports by country of origin

[In tons]

	Yugoslavia	West Germany	Belgium	Netherlands	United Kingdom
1956	----------	323	43	75	----------
1957	236	314	78	103	----------
1958	267	361	112	141	17
1959	222	450	113	155	6
1960	411	251	92	58	5
1961	769	244	67	92	5
1962	776	271	118	111	21

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. First, I would like to say that I am completely in agreement with the fine statement the gentleman from Indiana is making, because I know he is well aware I represent the community of Greencastle, Ind., that has one of these zinc mills. I know firsthand of the tremendous damage, the tremendous loss of employment and business which has resulted from interfering foreign imports of zinc. I want to commend the gentleman for the wonderful job he is doing in explaining this to the Congress, and I certainly hope that as a result of his efforts here today and of the astute remarks he is making that the administration will bring in a directive to grant relief to a very worthwhile industry in this country.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. I also wish to commend the gentleman for bringing this information out. I would like to ask him a couple of questions.

First, is this zinc that is being imported into the United States from Communist Yugoslavia identified in any way so the purchaser of this zinc plate in this country can identify it as being manufactured in a Communist country?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. To the best of my knowledge, let me say to the gentleman, I think not.

Mr. STINSON. So a consumer in this country could possibly buy this zinc sheet on the open market in the United States without any knowledge of its having been manufactured in a Communist country.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. To the best of my knowledge I am sure that is correct.

Mr. STINSON. Another question if the gentleman will permit: Is it possible that the industry manufacturing this zinc sheet in Yugoslavia is subsidized by the American taxpayers through the foreign aid program?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am very sorry I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I do not have that information.

Mr. STINSON. The fact that the United States has given something over $2 billion in aid to various foreign constituencies and economies, it is just possible that some of it went to establish the zinc sheet industry in Yugoslavia, and that our own aid is being used against American workers in this country.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman and can only say I think that is entirely possible.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman for the presentation of these facts here today. The imports of zinc are having a very seriously damaging effect, as the gentleman has pointed out, upon our American economy and upon American employment; and I sincerely hope that these remarks will serve to bring to those charged with the responsibility in this respect the need for direct and immediate remedial action.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. As a very knowledgeable member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I am very sure the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] is aware of the impact of these importations, and I am very hopeful that through his support and that of my other colleagues in the House we will be able to bring this forcefully enough to the attention of the President that he can take action.

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 24, 1963, marked an historic milestone in the long and proud history of the State of North Carolina. Three hundred years ago yesterday King Charles II of England issued a charter at his royal court in Westminster, conveying to eight of his close friends and supporters a vast tract of land in North America. The grant extended southward from present-day Virginia to Florida, which was then a Spanish possession, and from the Atlantic Ocean to the South Seas, or Pacific Ocean.

Over his royal seal King Charles officially designated the territory conveyed in the charter as "Carolina." March 24, 1963, therefore, marked the 300th anniversary of the founding of the modern State of North Carolina.

The people of North Carolina take pride in the history and the accomplishments of our great State. They are fully aware of the fact that our State existed long before there was a United States of America. They are proud of the tremendous progress the State has made in industry and in the arts and sciences during the past 300 years.

To make appropriate plans to commemorate the tercentenary of North Carolina, the general assembly of the State established the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission in 1959. Distinguished North Carolinians from every part of the State are serving on the commission. Under the direction of the commission pageants, plays, and historical observances are being held this year over North Carolina to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State.

Mr. Speaker, out of the vast tract of land designated "Carolina" on March 24, 1663, by King Charles II, 14 great States of the Union, wholly or in part, were subsequently created. In view of this fact, the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission felt that the observance of the 300th anniversary of North Carolina was an event of significance, not only to North Carolina, but to the other States of the Union and to foreign nations as well. To place the tercentenary, therefore, in its proper perspective, the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission requested the North Carolina delegation in the Congress to sponsor legislation to create a Federal North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I was pleased to introduce the House bill creating the Commission. The Commission consists of 15 members, 4 of whom are Members of the Senate and 4 of whom are Members of the House of Representatives. In addition, seven members have been appointed to the Commission by the President of the United States.

I have long felt that the magnificent story of the founding of America and the growth of its democratic institutions has largely been a story as yet untold. God has surely blessed the efforts of our forefathers to found a new order in America based on the dignity of man. We have grown to be the most powerful nation in the world, and our voice commands attention in the councils of the great.

As we have made material progress I am afraid we have failed to give enough attention to the wonderful and inspiring history of our Nation. In our zeal to build a new order of material wealth we have overlooked, to a great extent, some of the basic lessons to be learned from our illustrious past.

I sincerely believe that if we are to maintain our position of greatness and if we are to reach the fulfillment of the grand design bequeathed to us by our forefathers, we must rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles and ideals of our forefathers. In short, Mr. Speaker, we must again study and learn to appreciate the history of our Nation.

The venerable poet, historian, and philosopher, Carl Sandburg, has said:

> If America forgets where she came from, if the people lose sight of what brought them along, if she listens to the deniers and mockers, then will begin rot and dissolution.

The citizens of North Carolina are well aware of the truth of Mr. Sandburg's statement. Thus, in this year of the 300th anniversary of our great State, they are rededicating themselves to the eternal principles upon which their free society was founded.

For a moment let us examine the events that led up to the founding of Carolina. It is a remarkable page in history. On January 30, 1649, King Charles I of England was beheaded. There followed a period of great upheaval and political unrest in the country. England was without a king. Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector, ruled the land as a virtual dictator.

With the death of Cromwell in 1658 the English people called to the throne Charles II, the son of the beheaded Charles I. On the 28th of May, 1660, his 30th birthday, Charles II entered London.

During the despotic rule of Oliver Cromwell in our mother country, King Charles II had been forced to live in France. Penniless and with few friends, he had eked out a meager existence. On the restoration of the monarchy, therefore, Charles II was understandably generous to those who had supported him with money and who had espoused his cause in England during his exile.

To eight men who had been his strongest supporters and who had done the most for his restoration to the English throne, Charles II gave the Carolina grant of land on March 24, 1663.

These eight men, known in history as the Eight Lords Proprietors of North Carolina, were distinguished Englishmen. Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, was Lord High Chancellor of England. George Monck, Duke of Albemarle, was Master of the King's Horse and Captain General of all his forces. William, Lord Craven, had been a great friend of Charles II's father. John, Lord Berkeley, had supported Charles I and had joined the royal family in exile. Sir George Carteret was Vice Chamberlain of the King's household. Sir William Berkeley, as Governor of Virginia, had persuaded his colony to stand by Charles II, even though he was in exile. Sir John Colleton had supported the royal cause in the Barbados. Anthony Ashley Cooper was Chancellor of the Exchequer and subsequently was created the Earl of Shaftesbury.

The Eight Lords Proprietors, of course, were not aware of the extent of the vast property they acquired in the New World through the generosity of Charles II. In 1585 an unsuccessful attempt had been made by Sir Walter Raleigh to establish an English settlement on Roanoke Island, N.C. This was 20 years before the settlement of the Virginia Jamestown Colony and more than three decades prior to the founding of the Plymouth Colony.

When the Carolina Charter of 1663 was given to the Proprietors, North Carolina had approximately 2,000 European inhabitants. Most of these had filtered into Carolina from the Virginia colony. The ill-fated Sir Walter Raleigh Colony, founded in 1585 on Roanoke Island, had disappeared from the face of the earth. The fate of the 117 members of the colony still remains a mystery.

The Charter of 1663 described Carolina as "not yet cultivated or planted and only inhabited by some barbarous people who have no knowledge of Almighty God." The charter, however, extended to the people then in Carolina and to the future citizens of the colony all of the rights and privileges that Englishmen had inherited in the centuries since Magna Carta.

The Lords Proprietors were required:

To ordain, make, enact, and under their seals to publish any laws whatsoever, either appertaining to the public state of the said province or the private utility of particular persons, according to their best discretion of, and with the advice, assent, and approbation of the freemen of the said province, or of the greater part of them, or of their delegates or deputies; whom, for enacting of the said laws, when and as often as need shall require, we will that the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; and their heirs, shall, from time to time, assemble, in such manner and form as to them shall seem best.

At another point in the charter King Charles said that the people of Carolina as his subjects:

Should enjoy, give, sell, alien, and bequeath; as likewise, all liberties, franchises, and privileges of this our Kingdom of England and of our dominions aforesaid, may freely and quietly have, possess, and enjoy as our liege people born within the same, without the let, molestation, vexation, trouble, or grievance of us, our heirs and successors; any statute, act, ordinance, or provision to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, it will be seen, that North Carolina was founded upon the principle of representative government and that the rights of Englishmen were guaranteed to Carolinians. For 300 years the citizens of the State have cultivated their free institutions. The people of North Carolina have always been jealous of their rights and privileges as free citizens.

Even the Lords Proprietors were well aware of the independent nature of North Carolinians. A few years after Carolina was founded the Proprietors said plaintively in a message directed to Carolinians that they were "a people that neither understood your [their] own nor regarded our—the Proprietors'—interests."

Approximately 6 months after the Lords Proprietors received their charter from King Charles one of their number, Sir William Berkeley, Governor of Virginia, was given the authority to exercise the powers of government in Albermarle, the only portion of Carolina settled at that time. Sir William Berkeley, in turn, appointed William Drummond, "a sober Scotch gentleman of good repute" in 1664 as Governor.

In 1665 the first formal plan of government for Carolina was adopted pursuant to the charter. It is known as the Concessions and Agreement of 1665. Under the Concessions, a popular assembly was created which had much broader powers than were actually required by the Proprietors' charter.

The Concessions and Agreement of 1665 was, in turn, succeeded by the Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina in 1669. This plan of government was known as the "Grand Model." It was not as successful an instrument of government as the Concessions. The colony was plagued by what has been described as "many and various commotions, disorders and irregularities."

Although there was friction and turmoil in the Carolina Colony, it made great advancement under the Proprietors. Tobacco, the "bewitching vegetable," as it was called then, was widely used as the currency of the colony.

The proprietary government of North Carolina lasted until the Carolina Charter was surrendered to the English Crown in 1729. In that year North Carolina became a royal colony and so remained until it threw off the English yoke and assumed its position as a sovereign State in the American Union.

Mr. Speaker, this is the inspiring story of the founding of representative government in North Carolina. From the approximately 2,000 people who inhabited Carolina in 1663 we have grown to a great State stretching from the Atlantic Ocean to the highest crest of the Appalachian mountains and embracing within our borders nearly 5 million citizens engaged in industry, commerce, and the arts and sciences.

The motto of our great State is "To Be, Rather Than To Seem." We have fulfilled the meaning of this motto in every respect. The history of North Carolina has been carved by men of vision and faith in the American ideal.

As the people of our State pause this year to mark the 300th anniversary of the Carolina Charter which gave birth to their free society, they will take renewed faith in the great principles which have enabled North Carolina to reach a position of eminence among the States of the Union. In developing an understanding of the glorious past of North Carolina, and indeed of the founding of liberty in the New World, our people will be better prepared to face the trials of the present and the uncertainties of the future.

It is my hope that our sister States will join with North Carolina in this proud moment in her long history. May the 300th anniversary of Carolina be a spark which will rekindle a desire on the part of every American to learn more of the heritage of their Nation and by so doing become better citizens.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay the gentleman from North Carolina the highest tribute I know for delivering here this morning a historical paper that calls to the attention of America the great occasion that is taking place in the State of North Carolina in this tercentenary event.

Mr. Speaker, in 1584 and 1585, the first and second efforts of Sir Walter Raleigh to settle the New World were made on Roanoke Island, North Carolina. At that time the entire area was christened "Virginia" in honor of England's virgin Queen Elizabeth. The third expedition, due to trials and tribulations of the second, moved on to the deep waters of the Chesapeake and settled at Jamestown.

This occasion is particularly significant to me because it is in the district that I have the honor to represent that the first vestiges of permanent colonization took place in the Carolinas. The charter that we commemorate today was the first to provide for the beginning of religious tolerance in the area encompassed by the grant.

It is this tolerance and the Charter's concepts of freedom of thought, that have been handed down through the centuries and have helped make this country what it is today.

The fact that the first effort by the English to colonize the United States occurred in what is now North Carolina is well known. What is less known is that in Edenton, N.C., and Bath, N.C., we find the first permanent North Carolina settlements that stimulated the migration which swept across the State and to the south. Just yesterday tercentenary exercises were held at old St. Thomas Church at Bath, N.C. The communion service at this church was given by Queen Anne. Other historical homes and buildings of the community were open. It was here that the first library in Carolina was established.

On April 6 in Edenton, N.C., the Post Office Department will issue a commemorative stamp that honors the Carolina Charter. There is some question as to whether the first post office in the area encompassed by the grant was in Edenton or Bath, N.C., but the question does not take away in any respect the privilege that is Edenton's in being the focal point for the issuance of this commemorative stamp, that is of significance to all America and particularly to the North Carolinians.

It is right and proper that this 300th anniversary observance should extend far beyond the boundaries of the district I represent, for each part of the State has played a part in the development of the area covered by the grant. It is also fitting and proper that the observance of this 300th anniversary should extend to the schools, the colleges, and the universities, to cultural projects and religious programs, and in effect to all the peoples of the State, for each is concerned with the events of the first century of the colony's history and the provisions for the above that were written in the charter.

One of the great traditions of North Carolina has been the fact that progress has been made through the cooperation of all its peoples. This is why it is quite fitting that no specific city or area be designated as the focal point for the celebration of this 300th anniversary.

Because it is a statewide project of interest to all the State's peoples, it is best that the programs which are being conducted are done at a local level and centered upon local personalities, sites, or events of significance during the early history of the colony, and the entire area is full of great historic events that had bearing on the eventual founding of the independence and the freedom of the peoples of America who exist today.

I am proud that the real history of the development of North Carolina began in the district I have the honor to represent, and the first English-speaking child was born on Roanoke Island, which is now part of Dare County, N.C., and that a drama has been held at Fort Raleigh for 20 years or more portraying that first effort to settle the New World. However,

it pleases me that this is a tercentenary celebration that reaches all parts of the State—the Albemarle, the Pamlico, the Cape Fear, the Piedmont, and the Blue Ridge. For it was people who came through from the eastern part of the country and from the eastern seaboard that made the march across our country that caused our country to grow. They banded themselves together and went into the forest and conquered the wild and laid the foundation so that men could live today in freedom and in comfort and enjoy their respective ways of life.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I congratulate my distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for introducing the resolution that commemorates this great occasion and for arranging these proceedings today so that we might speak about this tercentenary celebration.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] for his splendid remarks, and I would join him in emphasizing that on April 6 at Edenton, N.C., the Carolina tercentenary commemorative stamp which the gentleman has mentioned will go on sale for the first time. I understand there is a great public interest in this outstanding event.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, may I commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for bringing to the attention of this body this historical event. The word "tercentenary" is a large word. The tercentenary celebration in North Carolina calls for large plans throughout our State to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the founding of North Carolina. Visitors to North Carolina this year will find a wide variety of attractions to make their stay a memorable one. Throughout the State local groups and communities are scheduling programs of varying type and degree, which usually will be centered on local personalities, sites, and events of significance during the early history of our State and our colony. As an example, on June 27 through the 29, the people of Watauga County and the town of Boone, which is situated in the beautiful Blue Ridge Mountains of North Carolina, will join in these commemorative events. An outstanding program and appropriate events are being planned including the opening presentation of the 1963 edition of "Horn in the West," which is a superlative outdoor drama. This part of the State is of particular significance because 200 years ago that famous frontiersman and explorer, Daniel Boone, first crossed the Blue Ridge to open up the western part of our country. In this program at Boone, which is named for this great explorer, there will be events to commemorate his great achievements. A wagon train will be sent across the original route that he took to cross the Blue Ridge and to open up our great West.

I was particularly interested, Mr. Speaker, in the remarks of my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] concerning the historical significance of these events in North Carolina and the importance that they have even today in the history of our country. You know history shows us that many civilizations have risen and have fallen and history also shows us that these civilizations have built many monuments to materialism, usually under a dictatorship-type of government.

It also shows us that these monuments have rotted and decayed. They leave their silent remains as proof to us that these civilizations failed. Why did they fail? It is because human freedom was not the basis for their existence.

I am certainly glad to see that our educational institutions are taking part in this great celebration that we are planning and are having in North Carolina and that the young people and all of the people today can be made aware of the past history not only of our State but also of our country as a whole. Through these and other events, let us rededicate ourselves to the continuation of liberty and freedom in America.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank my colleague for his participation in this discussion and assure him that the people of North Carolina are aware of the activities planned in his congressional district in the Watauga County area, particularly.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished friend and colleague from North Carolina for being the author of this resolution which provides for the celebration of this significant historical event in our State.

North Carolina is rich in history and tradition; it has a great heritage. It has a greater heritage, I might say quite vainly, if you want to call it that, quite vainly, than any State I know of. I think it is significant for us to keep in mind that this charter that was issued 300 years ago yesterday embraced the grant area that it did. As has already been mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] and by the distinguished gentleman from the First Congressional District [Mr. BONNER], and our friend from the Blue Ridge area of North Carolina, it started at what would be now the northern boundary of Virginia and extended southward to what is now the northern boundary of Florida. That is a great expanse and area, and then from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, embracing today 14 or perhaps 15 of our finest States in our union of States.

It is significant to me that just in 1949 after many years of search, North Carolinians were able to locate the original charter. They found it in the hands of a bookseller or merchant in England, in London, to be more precise. Funds were forthwith raised to purchase this historic document to bring it back to North Carolina where it is now housed in our archives of history at our capitol at Raleigh. Here it is seen visually and studied by literally hundreds of thousands of people every year, not only people from North Carolina but people from all the States that are embraced in this total grant covering some 14 States of our Union.

It is significant to me that in this so-called statewide celebration, historic as it is, it was deemed advisable to keep it at the lower level, the level of the community where the people themselves reside, the grassroots, where they can get inspiration from what took place 300 years ago when the forebears of the present generation had the drive and the initiative to move westward to what is now our Pacific coast.

To me it is a very great event. We share with all the people in this great area our pride that the gentleman must have [Mr. WHITENER], a member of this Commission, and the others in North Carolina, who have meant so much in bringing this to the attention not only of the North Carolinians but to people everywhere.

I commend the gentlemen from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL and Mr. BONNER], and the other members of the North Carolina delegation, and others who will offer for the RECORD their statement and thinking along this line.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from the Seventh District for his contribution. I take note of his reference to what may be derived today from the lessons of the past. I known that the gentleman comes from one of the leading tobacco districts of America. I am sure in his section of the State the people will take great interest in the fact that the first known crop control program in the history of the world, I suppose, was proposed for Carolina territory.

In 1666, Gov. William Drummond, of North Carolina, met at St. Mary's the first capital of Maryland, with representatives of Virginia and Maryland to investigate the possibility of controlling tobacco prices. The plan called for a temporary suspension of tobacco planting which would result in a tobacco shortage. The shortage, they hoped, would in turn increase the price paid for the tobacco crop. The Carolina Legislative Assembly was willing to impose the controls, but the plan failed of adoption because Lord Baltimore, the proprietor of Maryland, refused to go along with the agreement.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleagues in paying honor to North Carolina on the 300th anniversary of the North Carolina Charter, issued in 1663.

This document, on display in the North Carolina Hall of History at Raleigh, was issued on March 24, 1663, by King Charles II, of England, to eight loyal supporters whose assistance helped the King regain the English throne.

The original area granted to these eight lord proprietors would dwarf North Carolina's present size. The area was so immense it extended southward from Virginia to Florida and from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, or

"South Seas," as the Pacific was known in those early days.

By 1763—100 years after issuance of the charter—the colony's population had grown to approximately 200,000 persons and the settlement had extended westward to the Blue Ridge Mountains.

It should be pointed out that North Carolina did not officially become North Carolina until December 7, 1710, when the area then referred to only as Carolina was divided into North and South Carolina.

I wish to take this occasion to pay particular tribute to the North Carolina Tercentenary Commission for the outstanding contribution it has made in calling to the attention of North Carolinians the importance of this 300th anniversary in our history and heritage.

One hundred years ago, we were in the midst of the War between the States and little time was available to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Carolina Charter. Two hundred years ago, the French and Indian War was drawing to a close and few stopped to look back over the previous 100 years.

This makes it even more fitting that we should pause this year to commemorate North Carolina's 300th year as a unit of government.

As a closing thought, I would state that the last 300 years have been years of progress for North Carolina so that its future today is bright and promising. We are proud of our history and are proud to be one of the 50 States which, collectively, make America what it is today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, March 24, will mark the 300th anniversary of the Carolina Charter of 1663. The grant was issued by King Charles II of England to eight prominent military and political leaders of the time whose help had been indispensable to him. It embraced an immense territory: all the land between the 36th parallel of latitude on the north and the 31st parallel on the south, and stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. This tremendous tract included not only the present-day States of North and South Carolina, but also all or part of a number of States of our country.

Although the charter of 1663 was not the first, nor the last, patent affecting the modern Carolinas to be issued by English sovereigns, it was the most significant because it put the new colony on a permanent footing and added yet another brick to the structure of our American heritage. For this charter qualified the vast powers of the lords proprietors, as its beneficiaries were called, to "enact any laws whatsoever pertaining to the public state of the said Providence, or to the private utility of particular persons," by making such laws subject to the "advice, consent, and approbation of the freemen of the said Providence, or the greater part of them, or of their delegates or deputies" who were required to be assembled from time to time.

The 87th Congress by its Public Law 437 provided for the establishment of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans for the observance of this most significant occasion. The Federal Government has also put its stamp of approval on the event, literally, by arranging for the issuance next month of a commemorative postage stamp honoring the tercentenary of the Carolina Charter of 1663.

I am sure that I voice the sentiments of the House when I extend felicitations to the present-day beneficiaries of the Carolina Charter of 1663, and express confidence that the principles of freedom and justice which it conveyed to our land will continue to flourish and be strengthened in the decades and generations that lie ahead.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to join with our distinguished Speaker, the members of the delegation in this House from North Carolina, and with the people of the great State of North Carolina in calling the attention of the entire Nation to the tercentenary celebration of the Charter to the Lords Proprietors of Carolina by King Charles II on March 24, 1663.

Certainly, the granting of the Carolina Charter ranks among events of primary historical importance to this Nation. From these vast tracts of territory, a large segment of this Nation has been formed. From the people it has produced have come a succession of leaders who have helped to fashion the detailed architecture of our democracy and its social and economic institutions. Surely these leaders and the people who sent them forth have added to the strength, prosperity, and wisdom of the Nation.

Again, let me express the assurance that all Americans celebrate with you and that their interest will be proved when they join with Carolinians this summer in attending the festivals and ceremonies that are being planned to mark this historic occasion.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, by appointment from you on January 31, 1963, I have the honor to serve as a member of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission, established by joint Senate and House resolutions, enacted into Public Law 437 of the 87th Congress. The House division of the tercentenary celebration commission, under the able chairmanship of my North Carolina colleague, the Honorable BASIL WHITENER, works in cooperation with the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission, created by the General Assembly of North Carolina.

The purpose of the State and Federal Commissions is to assist in developing plans for the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the granting of the Carolina Charter by King Charles II to the eight Lords Proprietors. The territorial scope of the charter was tremendous, running southward from Virginia to Florida and west to the Pacific Ocean. I believe even my colleagues from the Lone Star State will admit that this is nearly as big as the State of Texas.

But even more significant than its territorial dimensions were the guarantees contained in the charter to the settlers within the boundaries to form a government of freemen with the rights enjoyed by Englishmen under English laws. Thus the shadow of the Magna Charta was extended, through the Carolina Charter, to the shores of the New World.

The impact of this guarantee of political freedom was reflected in the first General Assembly of North Carolina in 1665 and in the several constitutions which were to follow. And so we feel that in Carolina was the genesis of those democratic ideals which have become the cornerstone of our great country and which, please God, will continue to motivate our national life.

The formal opening of the tercentenary celebration occurred in January of this year at the Governor's mansion in Raleigh. The occasion was highlighted by an immense birthday cake, shaped like the U.S. map, bearing 300 candles, which Governor Sanford handily extinguished in four mighty blows.

There are many more events to follow in our observance of the granting of the Carolina Charter of 1663, for when anything of such import becomes 300 years old, it calls for a statewide celebration. These events will call into play all our State resources in the cultural arts, and they are many. Long before the National Capital became concerned about the preservation and enhancement of our national cultural heritage, the State of North Carolina was quietly going about its business of encouraging the arts—through many channels: the State Literary and Historical Society, which every year holds a "culture week" in our State capital of Raleigh; the North Carolina Symphony Orchestra, widely renowned; the Carolina Playmakers at Chapel Hill and the Little Theater movement throughout the State; the State Art Gallery, the finest, say some, south of Washington, and many other university and private art galleries; our grassroots opera company; and our impressive galaxy of writers in all areas of the written word.

If we appear too fulsome in praise of our State today, Mr. Speaker, we are but carrying out the injunction of the late Dr. R. D. W. Connor, of North Carolina, a historian of note and the first Archivist of the United States, who said:

> A people who have not the pride to record their history will not long have the virtue to make history that is worth recording.

In connection with our tercentenary celebration, we are very much gratified that the Post Office Department will issue a 5-cent commemorative stamp, depicting the first page of the Carolina Charter against a background of red velvet. The stamp was unveiled by Postmaster General J. Edward Day at ceremonies held here in the Capitol on February 28. First-day sale of the stamp will take place on April 6 in Edenton, N.C., one of the early settlements of the State which even today retains much of its colonial atmosphere.

We extend to our colleagues in the Congress a cordial invitation to visit North Carolina, either for the first day of issue of this stamp or for some of the subsequent celebrations which will be held in this tercentenary year from Murphy to Manteo.

Come down and drive over our fine highways which unwind like silver ribbons from the mountains to the sea. Visit Mount Mitchell, the highest peak east of the Rockies; visit Roanoke Island, birthplace of Virginia Dare, the first white child born in America; see Kill Devil Hill, where the first flight of a power-driven airplane was made by the Wright Brothers; and by all means visit our capital city of Raleigh, with its brandnew State House and its beautiful old Capitol Building of classic Greek design. And while there do not fail to visit the Hall of History, a component of the State Department of Archives and History, where you may see the selfsame charter we are talking about today, for North Carolina owns the charter, one of the most rare and interesting documents of the world.

Although I have referred to our State cultural activities and interests, let me assure you that we Tar Heels are really as plain as old shoes. The Old North State was not settled by the aristocracy but by plain people. So along with our culture, come down and enjoy our corn pone and chittlin's, our coon hunts and fish fries, breathe our fresh mountain air, sniff our sea coast medley of smells; play our splendid sandhills golf courses; go deep-sea fishing off our coast; see our rolling, industrialized Piedmont where my own district is located and where you will find many colleges and universities, including the University of North Carolina, the first State university to open its doors to students, and Duke University, as well as famous-name textile, furniture, and tobacco factories, famed battlegrounds, and the finest people in the world.

In short, do just about whatever you enjoy doing. You name it, for we believe we have it.

And so, in the vernacular of some sections of our State, let me extend this invitation, which in North Carolina is unsurpassed in neighborliness and enthusiasm: "Y'all come."

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, March 24, 1963, marks the 300th anniversary of the granting of the Carolina Charter of 1663, and in commemoration of that great historical event, the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission, established by the North Carolina General Assembly, has planned appropriate observances throughout 1963.

The original charter itself is preserved in North Carolina's Hall of History in Raleigh, where it is carefully encased in such a way as to protect it while still making it available for page-by-page inspection. It is one of only six of the original charters so preserved.

A number of significant programs and ceremonies are planned for the entire year. Some have already been held and others are scheduled. The U.S. Post Office Department has approved the issuance of a special commemorative stamp for this occasion and was recently unveiled in the Capitol by Postmaster General Day. The stamp will be placed on sale for the first time at Edenton, N.C., on April 6.

Texans and Alaskans who like to boast of the size of their respective States might note that the original Carolina Charter established a land grant to eight men extending from coast to coast in a strip bordered roughly to the north by what is now the present-day border of Virginia, and to the south by what is now Florida.

To those interested in colonial history, 1963 is the ideal year to visit North Carolina, as local groups will be sponsoring various programs throughout the entire year in observance of the tercentennial of the charter, and colonial history will be highlighted throughout the entire State.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in congratulating the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission upon the valuable and lasting service it has rendered, and will doubtless continue to render throughout its existence, to the great State of North Carolina by bringing into better focus and emphasizing the early history of our State. I would also commend the hundreds of others who are assisting in a variety of ways to publicize and dramatize our colonial history and to make a memorable success of the celebration of Carolina's 300th year.

North Carolina is justly proud of the part it has taken in the founding and building of the greatest nation on earth. No country in the world has ever started so humbly and achieved so much in so short a period as America. It did not happen by chance.

As we celebrate Carolina's tercentennial in song, pageant, documentary, narrative and otherwise, I sincerely hope that all North Carolinians will be constantly mindful, or at least often reminded, of the character and spirit of the men and women of 300 years ago who undertook the building of a State in a strange, desolate and wild region. The events which marked the development and progress of colonial Carolina are of immense historical interest, of course, but we of modern North Carolina should find something more than mere interest in the spirit and attiude of the people in whose lives and activities our State had its beginning. We should find inspiration and a challenge.

Three hundred years ago, Carolina was not merely an underdeveloped area, as we understand and so often use that term today, but was an undeveloped raw wilderness. Early Carolinians had no indulgent and benevolent government upon which to lean and depend for their needs from the cradle to the grave; there were no public welfare programs, no government lending agencies, and no foreign aid programs. But they had something of far greater worth, the qualities of character and spirit that underlie all individual and State stability and progress. They actively sought a way of life which they knew beforehand would bring them face to face with dangers, obstacles, barriers, and challenges unnumbered and unknown.

What kind of people were they? What possessed them? They were proud, independent, and self-reliant; their undertakings and accomplishments under hardship conditions required great personal courage, initiative, stamina, and determination. They were willing to work, strive, venture, and sacrifice much in the hope and belief that the future would bring large returns. But they did not know that it would—they ventured much. Most of the natural obstacles they encountered have now been removed and we in modern North Carolina have no occasion to test our mettle against the forces and challenges which the early Carolinians met. Even so, while we celebrate the 300th anniversary of Carolina's first charter, it is in the best of order to ask ourselves a couple of questions: How do we of today compare with them in the qualities of self-reliance, fighting spirit, personal courage, initiative, general strength of character, and urge for individual and collective freedom? Do we as willingly and courageously meet the challenges and responsibilities of modern life as they met those of a far more difficult period?

In this tercentenary year, let us celebrate and glory in the achievements of those early Carolinians who broke the ground and laid the foundation for our great State. But let us be constantly reminded that the glory is theirs, not ours, and that all of our narratives and pageants will not add one whit to the significance and worth of their struggles and accomplishments. As we celebrate, then, let us also pause and take stock of ourselves with the view of honestly determining whether we individually and collectively possess those qualities of character and spirit that would prompt, urge, and enable us, if such were possible, to stand in their stead and duplicate their feats. A negative finding will be cause for concern because real progress in an individual or in a State involves intangibles which are neither seen nor measured by material standards.

In substance, all recorded history is an account of how individuals and nations have met and dealt with the challenges and responsibilities of their times. Other peoples, as well before as since 1663, have taken ignominious flight before challenge and responsibility, having neither the will nor the courage to assume the posture of men and take on the responsibilities essential to the creation and development of a stable system of free government. Such peoples abound in the world today.

I believe the qualities of character and spirit essential to the establishment of a stable system of free government are the same today as they were 300 years ago or 3,000 years ago and as they will be 300 years hence. And I believe that the maintenance of such a system is more difficult than its establishment.

It is suggested from time to time that the so-called underdeveloped countries of the world can eventually be stabilized economically and politically by giving them economic, military and technical aid. I do not agree. Such aids may temporarily serve an apparently good purpose but they will never imbue the people of these countries with the character and spirit which moves and drives individuals and peoples to fight for the privilege of assuming responsibility. Freedom grows out of the assumption of responsibility; it has no other source. To personally or collectively face up to

the challenges of responsibility is the price of freedom.

Little more than 100 years after the charter of 1663, Carolinians joined in a war and fought and died for the privilege of assuming the responsibilities of independence and self-government. I wish that the people of all the restless and underdeveloped countries of the world today could be taught and made to understand and take unto themselves the lessons that may be learned from the example of early Carolina. Let us remember them, too. Our system is established; so let us look to its maintenance.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, March 24, 1963, marked the 300th anniversary of the granting of the Carolina Charter by King Charles II of England. We North Carolinians proudly trace our American heritage to this historic document.

When the charter was granted, North Carolina as we know it today is estimated to have contained but 2,000 people. They had emigrated to a wild, unexplored, undeveloped wilderness seeking religious and political freedom and an opportunity to improve their economic status. From this humble beginning, North Carolina has grown to the point where our State now contains over 4½ million people.

We are all rightfully proud of the advances our State has made in agriculture, industry, education and the arts during three centuries of progress. The emphasis in North Carolina today is on industrial expansion and the improvement of our educational facilities, in short, on the future. This is well and good because no civilization can progress by resting on its oars and reliving the past. But as the French poet Lamartine said, "History teaches everything, even the future."

So I think it is important that in the year 1963, which marks the 300th anniversary of the granting of the charter from which comes North Carolina as we know it today, the attention of the people of our State and the Nation should be focused on some of the lessons to be learned from the past. Our forefathers brought representative government to this land and they earned their freedom by a great outpouring of blood, sweat, and tears. Many of us take this heritage too lightly. We can all glibly recite the things we feel we have a right to expect from our country but many fail to realize that there is a corresponding obligation. The North Carolina General Assembly in 1959 established the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission and the commission is planning a series of festivals and ceremonies designed to refresh the memories of our people about some of the significant events in our State's great history.

A cordial invitation is extended to our fellow citizens from the other States of the Union, and to friends from abroad, to visit North Carolina during this tercentenary year. They will find that North Carolina indeed has a glorious past and a bright and promising future.

The Congress of the United States recognized the importance of this anniversary by creating a North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission composed of four Members of the Senate, four Members of the House, and seven members appointed by the President of the United States. I am very proud to serve as a member on that Commission by appointment of the Speaker of the House.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject on which I just spoke.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

GERMANS MAKING NASSER MISSILES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of this House to developments involving the Federal Republic of West Germany and the United Arab Republic, with respect to the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction, that I regard as a grave threat to peace and stability in the Near East.

These events indicate a need by our Government for closer scrutiny of West Germany's role in NATO.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the active collaboration of German scientists and German industries in the efforts of Colonel Nasser, dictator of the United Arab Republic, to perfect rockets with radiological and bacteriological warheads for use in the destruction of Israel and other countries in Nasser's aggressive designs on his neighbors.

In justifying the nefarious work of German scientists and technicians, authorities at Bonn are trying to hide behind a cloak of spurious legalism all too reminiscent of the "laws" of the Nazi era under which Germans perpetrated horrendous deeds and later said they "were only doing their duty."

German morality may now be reasonably questioned at the very time we hear demands from Bonn for stronger influence in NATO and nuclear weaponry. Instead of contributing a fair share to the peaceful development of developing countries in cooperation with the United States—and I must stress the prosperity of German economy—some Germans are irresponsibly seeking to grow even more prosperous as merchants of death catering to the treacherous Colonel Nasser.

Bonn has as much governmental responsibility to keep radiological and German rockets out of Egyptian hands as the United States has to prevent its citizens and industries from doing similar work for Castro Cuba, which, incidentally, is a good friend of Nasserite Egypt.

I wish to direct attention to the following authoritative news reports pertaining to the situation I have described.

FOUR HUNDRED GERMANS MAKING NASSER MISSILE

(By Antony Terry)

BONN, March 23.—In Egypt's closely guarded missile center Project 333, near Cairo, nearly 400 German scientists and technicians, most of them from the wartime German V–2 missile center at Penemunde, are working on the first Egyptian-made rocket missile with warheads containing radioactive materials designed for President Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Details of this work have been known to Bonn authorities for some time and have caused some concern here.

Israeli anxiety over the military effects of Egyptian rocket development on the power balance in the Mideast at a time when talks on federation of Egypt, Syria and Iraq are getting underway has led to the recent "underground war" by Israel agents in West Germany.

Their aim has been to buy off or scare off German experts engaged on this rocket work.

Though their efforts have been widespread and, according to some German sources, as efficiently organized as Eichmann kidnapping commandos, they have met with only moderate success.

VANISHED MYSTERIOUSLY

One of the West Germans who vanished mysteriously last September is Heinz Krug, a former insurance clerk who ran a firm with headquarters in Munich, whose job was to purchase materials and technical equipment in Europe for Egypt's missile research and construction.

After the war and before joining the Egyptians, Krug was a member of the German research physics under West Germany's best known missile expert, Prof. Eugen Saenger, who was among the first to advise Nasser on his rocket program. Saenger is reported to have received a $5.6 million fee for himself and his German team. Saenger was persuaded to return to West Germany and is now teaching in West Berlin.

West German authorities believed for a while that after Krug vanished and left his family in Munich that he had defected to Israel. When he disappeared, he was said to be in the company of "an Egyptian visitor" and information since received from Cairo showed that documents this man was carrying were forgeries.

But West German intelligence has since received hints that Krug, who was more a businessman than a scientist, may after all have been wanted by the Egyptians—for having tried to doublecross and sell information on his purchasing group to the Israelis.

TAKEN BY TWO OTHERS

Krug's place has since been taken by two other German scientists who normally work in Egypt. One is Paul Gercke, the electronics missiles guidance expert whose 25-year-old daughter, Heidi, is alleged by the Swiss authorities to have been pressured by two Israeli agents who were arrested by the Swiss police earlier this month after they had tried to get her father to join the Israelis. Bonn security authorities have been watching rival activities of Israeli and Egyptian agents in their competition for West German missile experts with growing anxiety. The Bonn constitution gives every West German citizen nominal right to work where and for whom he chooses and the Bonn Government claims it has no power to direct labor or stop the German scientists and technicians from selling their specialist knowledge to the highest bidder.

UNREPENTANT NAZIS

Nevertheless, it is known that the hard core of the German scientific colony in Egypt are unrepentant Nazis, many of whom fled there after the war with avowed aim of helping the Arab world with scientific know-how

to continue the fight against the Jews. In addition to Israeli protests, the Egyptian Government has also been flooding the West German security authorities recently with details of the alleged activities of Israeli commanders in West Germany who are trying to intimidate the German rocket experts.

Egyptians, for instance, provided Bonn with full details of passports accidentally left behind by three men who fled after alleged shooting up of another rocket and electronics expert, Hans Kleinwechter, who was on visit to Loerrach near the Swiss-German border a month ago. Egyptians showed that passports were forged and in names of persons living in Egypt at the time of the incident in prison there.

REAL TARGET

Egyptians also showed that official signatures on passports were forgeries. Throughout the story runs the name of Professor Saenger, West Germany's most prominent rocket expert, who was employed by the French Government after the war and for whom many of the German rocket missile team have worked, including both missing Krug and near-assassination victim, Hans Kleinwechter, as well as Gercke who was involved in the Swiss arrests incident this month. A prominent figure in the Egyptian atomic missile team in Cairo is known by West Germans to be Prof. Wolfang Pilz, another Saenger man who during the last war was on Wernher von Braun's staff in Peenemünde research station designing the V–1 flying bombs and now heads the German missile research team in Cairo.

Pilz was the real target of one of the mysterious powerful bombs which exploded on being opened in Cairo and killed five persons. The parcel bomb and letter, which also exploded destroying an eye of Pilz's secretary, was posted in Hamburg and police there are trying to trace who posted it. One major success for the Israeli efforts to sabotage Project 333 has been Austrian Prof. Otto Joklik who was a member of President Nasser's missile research group in Cairo. Joklik one of two men arrested by Swiss police, alleges that while in Cairo he discovered Egyptian plans to use radioactive materials in warheads of new rocket missiles and was so shocked by the discovery that he refused to continue work and offered his help to Israelis. Since leaving Cairo, he has appealed to other Austrian and German scientists working there to follow him.

[Usually reliable sources in Cairo say Swiss, Italians, and Spaniards as well as Germans are employed on jet aircraft and rocket research in the United Arab Republic, according to the Associated Press.

[They said Germans engaged in rocket research are believed to number no more than 10 and that none is engaged in rocket production.

[A spokesman for the West German Embassy in Cairo said he felt an estimate that 400 Germans are working on secret U.A.R. projects is exaggerated. Other sources put the figure in excess of 250.

[Some West German experts live in closely guarded apartment buildings in Cairo. Others have homes in the suburbs.]

A-THREAT TO ISRAEL BEGAN IN 1954 WHEN GERMANS ARRIVED IN EGYPT

TEL AVIV, March 23.—The affair of the German atomic scientists in Egypt, which Israelis see as a growing threat to their survival as a nation, all started 9 years ago, when the Arab-Israeli border warfare was nearing its peak.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser, then new to office, was seeking new allies against Israel. He concluded an arms deal with the Soviet Union, and his representatives also began enlisting likely Germans.

The first group of West German technicians arrived in Egypt in 1954. They helped to establish an iron and steel plant—now producing 300,000 tons annually. A growing stream of German scientists has followed them during the past 2 years.

According to Israeli information, they now number almost 500, and have succeeded in laying the foundations of Egypt's heavy industry and war plant. These items include the construction of an atomic reactor plant for the production of heavy water, a jet aircraft factory, rocket and missile installations and bacteriological and poison gas warheads.

Prof. Otto Bahn is said to be engaged on the construction of a nuclear reactor with a planned capacity of 120,000 kilowatts. When completed, this will be considerably bigger than Israel's Negev reactor and will be the largest in the Middle East. Its plutonium production will only theoretically enable Egypt to produce atomic bombs.

The rocket installations, which he considered the most menacing aspect of the German contribution, are believed to be situated in Helouan.

Concern over the Egyptian rocket development program has increased considerably since the launching of four Egyptian rockets last August—the Al Zafir (Victor) of 180 miles range and the Al Kahir (Conqueror) of 360 miles. Commenting on these launchings, President Nasser then said they were capable of reaching "just south of Beirut"—thus including Israel's entire territory.

In an interview on the Israeli radio this week, Eugen Saenger, who once headed the German rocket team in Egypt, expressed his willingness to work for other countries including Israel. He also said that President Nasser would not be able to launch military rockets within the near future due to a number of technical reasons.

Two particular problems are hindering the rocket program, Israelis believe. The first is the question of accurately guiding the rockets. The other problem is what warheads the rockets should carry.

According to an Austrian who worked in Egypt and has since been arrested in Switzerland as an Israeli spy, the Egyptians are experimenting with genocidal weapons, including so-called death rays, biological and bacteriological warfare and poison gas.

It is feared that German scientists also are trying to help the Egyptians develop a cobalt warhead. A cobalt bomb would scatter radioactive particles over large areas: this also falls into the prohibited weapons category.

Some light on possible ties between the Bonn Government and Egypt's rocket development program are disclosed in a letter written by Sanger's Stuttgart lawyer, Adolph Karch, to a correspondent of a German press agency.

It pointed out that "the Egyptian Government undertook to put at the full disposal of the German Federal Republic all the results of the (rocket) development works and, as the occasion arises, to also put at German disposal the Egyptian ground installations and launching pads for such German experiments as could not be carried out in the Federal Republic."

The original of this letter, dated August 14, 1962, has been shown to this reporter.

The Knesset (Israeli Parliament) this week proclaimed that "the German people cannot absolve itself of responsibility for the continuation of this vile work." The resolution also said: "It is the duty of the German Government to put an immediate end to this dangerous activity of its citizens and to take all steps required to prevent this cooperation with the Egyptian Government."

Alvin Rosenfeld, correspondent for New York Herald Tribune, reported from Jerusalem:

"This week's session of the Israeli Knesset was in fact sitting in judgment on Premier Ben-Gurion's policy of conciliation with postwar Germany, according to the influential and respected Israeli newspaper Haaretz.

"This and other bitter editorial comment in the wake of the Knesset resolution appeared to reflect a deep public resentment of Germany's position and a revival of the old wounds and memories of the Nazi period. It seemed clear that Ben-Gurion's policy had suffered at least a psychological defeat which may postpone full Israel-German reconciliation.

"The Knesset session had been forced upon a reluctant government by the opposition. The overwhelmingly approved Knesset resolution was more strongly worded than the government's official statement delivered in Parliament.

"The liberal nonparty Haaretz, known for its staid responsible views, noted with surprise that Ben-Gurion was not at the Knesset session—he is officially on vacation—and said the Premier had good reasons for not appearing. Ben-Gurion's pro-German policy had once been acceptable to the Israeli public, Haaretz said, 'but he went too far in his belief that in Western Germany we could find an anchor in all storms.' "

GERMANS BUILDING ROCKETS FOR NASSER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have given careful attention to the reports of the last several days concerning the German role in the development of rockets, reportedly with radiological and bacteriological warheads, by the United Arab Republic.

President Nasser of the United Arab Republic openly proclaims that he is developing a powerful arsenal of military rockets for the destruction of Israel. There can be no doubt in the minds of the many German scientists and technicians, bearing valid German passports, who are in Egypt perfecting these rockets, that the weapons are intended for the completion of Adolph Hitler's goal, the mass murder of the Jewish people. Nor can the German industries exporting parts and equipment for rockets and weapons systems have any reasonable doubts of the use intended by Nasser.

Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude that West Germany has defaulted on a grave moral responsibility by permitting Germans and German interests to help Nasser effectuate his aim to destroy those escapees from German barbarism who now reside in Israel. This is definitely not a technical or legalistic issue of what the Bonn Government can or cannot do to influence its scientists or industrialists.

What this is, Mr. Speaker, is a test of the German conscience and the pious professions of sorrow over the murder of 6 million human beings merely because of their religion. I refer, of course, to the Jewish people whose survivors are seeking to rehabilitate themselves in the democratic new State of Israel.

I might note that Israel is sending its scientists and technicians abroad to help the new countries of Africa and Asia. But they, unlike the Germans in Egypt, are bringing medical skills to heal the sick and agricultural skills to feed the hungry and construction skills to shelter

the homeless. I cannot understand how any civilized German scientist can go to Egypt, in view of the events from 1933 to 1945, to build vicious bacteria warheads or warheads using radioactive waste materials or any kind of rocket at all.

Bonn could quickly enough find applicable laws and authority to prevent German scientists from going into East Germany and building the same kind of dreadful weapons. Yet the zealous and efficient German technicians and scientists, unrepentant Nazis among them, are now working with the Soviet-trained and Soviet-equipped Egyptian military force.

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked by the blindness of the West German authorities to the humanitarian aspect involved and blindness to the desire of civilized people for peace and stability in the Near East, and even German blindness—or defiance—to President Kennedy's policy against proliferation to small nations of mass destructive weapon systems.

The time may have come, Mr. Speaker, for us to more carefully observe the alleged maturity of West Germany as a leader of NATO, a nation which wants to be entrusted with more say on use of thermonuclear weapons that may seal the fate of all humanity.

I have made known my deep concern to the Department of State on these matters and will continue to observe developments. I am certain many other Members share my hope that the West German Government will assert the stature of a truly new Germany by terminating this dangerous foolishness in Egypt.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE CREATIVE ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, among the Nation's leading supporters of Federal recognition and programs in the arts and humanities is President Barnaby C. Keeney, of Brown University, who has this to say on the subject:

> It has seemed to me for a long time that it would be well if we had a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities to perform a function similar to that of the National Science Foundation, which has benefited the country greatly. There is no question but that advancements in science and technology have a greater immediate utility in the international and national situation in which we exist today. On the other hand, the whole shape of our lives in the future, and our whole attitude toward life will be strongly formed by our achievements of lack thereof in the arts and humanities.

The American Council of Learned Societies has also shown great interest in this subject, and published in its newsletter of November 1962, a most interesting article by Gustavo O. Arlt, president, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States. President Arlt quoted from the Seaborg report, the important policy statement issued on November 15, 1960, by the President's Science Advisory Committee, which I should like to call to your attention at this time:

> Much of this basic argument for the strengthening of American science applies equally to other fields of learning. While this report centers on the needs of science, we repudiate emphatically any notion that scientific research and scientific education are the only kinds of learning that matter to America. The responsibility of the Committee is limited to scientific matters, but obviously a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science alone. Even in the interests of science itself it is essential to give full value and support to the other great branches of man's artistic, literary, and scholarly activity. The advancement of science must not be accomplished by the impoverishment of anything else, and the life of the mind in our society has needs which are not limited by the particular concerns which belong to this Committee and this report.
>
> We do not, in this report, attempt to consider what direct responsibility and interest the Government has for strengthening basic research and graduate education outside the sciences. This is a subject which deserves careful attention, but it is beyond our mission. What we can say, however, is what earlier reports of this Committee have regularly emphasized, that neither the Government nor the universities should conduct the support of scientific work in such a way as to weaken the capacity of American education to meet its responsibilities in other areas. The costs of scientific progress must not be paid by diverting resources from other great fields of study which have their own urgent need for growth.

This statement was signed by a panel of the country's leading scientists, including Alan T. Waterman, immediate past director of the National Science Foundation, Glen T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, George W. Beadle, president of the University of Chicago, Roger Revelle, director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, and others.

I am introducing a bill today to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments. This measure would also expand the present activities of the National Science Foundation to include the arts and the humanities.

I include as part of my remarks the article by Gustave O. Arlt, president of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States which was published in the November 1962, newsletter of the American Council of Learned Societies.

Also, as part of my remarks I include a speech by W. McNeil Lowry before the Association of Graduate Schools which was published in a recent issue of the Art Journal of the College Art Association.

Mr. Lowry is director of the Ford Foundation program in the humanities and the arts. His speech was delivered at the meeting of the Association of Graduate Schools which took place in New Orleans, October 24, 1961. It is a very important and highly significant speech.

The former Federal Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin, has said:

> The need for superior attainment in the sciences to guarantee our national security in the face of grave international crises has long been recognized by most Americans. There is an equal need for superior attainment on a very broad scale in the arts and humanities if Americans generally are to gain a full understanding of their rich cultural heritage and a genuine commitment to their ideals of individual freedom and human dignity. Only with such understanding and such commitment on the part of all of its citizens will this Nation have the resources in personal and public creativeness and courage to meet successfully the continuing international struggle between freedom and tyranny.

In conclusion I include the text of my bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, and to expand the activities and programs of the National Science Foundation to include the arts and the humanities.

The above-mentioned material follows:

A NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION? [1]

(By Gustave O. Arlt)

On July 17, 1962, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, arose in the House of Representatives and began a lengthy speech with the following words:

"Mr. Speaker, there is a pressing need today for Federal legislation that will build up nationwide support for the arts and humanities, on a basis comparable to the support that is provided in other areas, such as science and technology. Progress in the arts and humanities is essential to true national strength."

These are strange words, indeed, to be heard in the Halls of Congress. Fifteen years ago they would have been branded as subversive. Only 3 years ago they would have been called incompatible with, even adverse to, the national interest. That they could be spoken in 1962 in the introduction of a bill in support of the humanities and the arts indicates a remarkable change in the attitude of Congress toward American higher education.

There was a time, not so very long ago, when universities and colleges financed their own teaching and research, when professors expected no subsidies in support of their creative work, and when graduate students were grateful for a small stipend for teaching or for grading papers. No one had heard of a research grant, let alone a contract. A Guggenheim fellowship represented the pinnacle of the hopes and aspirations of the dedicated scholar. And this condition prevailed more or less in all departments and disciplines in the university. The chemist and the philosopher, the physicist and the art historian—all were supported equally well and equally badly. As a result, academic society was homogeneous and virtually classless, for where no one is rich no one is poor.

This academic homogeneity extended down into and pervaded the graduate student body. The student in languages had no reason to cast envious eyes at his colleague in biology because one had as good and as poor a chance at a small fellowship as the other, and when they received their degrees they had equal prospects of a poorly paid instructorship. As a result there were no status problems and academic excellence rather than field of study constituted the badge of distinction.

---

[1] This article is also scheduled to appear in the December 1962 issue of the Journal of Higher Education.

This classless utopia came to an abrupt end about 1940 when the Federal Government discovered that the natural scientist had something to offer that the Nation badly needed. Almost overnight the universities became purveyors of scientific expertise and the Government became their best, perhaps only customer. Before the end of the war, hundreds of scientists in scores of universities, along with thousands of their students were subsidized to perform research in physics, chemistry, and the biological sciences.

But this was only the beginning. The Nation had become science-conscious and its leaders were not about to let the universities relapse into their comfortable prewar torpor. The establishment of the National Science Foundation was inevitable and it was only surprising that its budget for the first year was a mere $3.5 million. By 1961, of course, this meager budget had risen to $261.7 million, and in fiscal 1963, the National Science Foundation aims to spend $360,800,000. But even these impressive figures are dwarfed by the sums disbursed through the National Institutes of Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. These various agencies between them support some 12,000 to 15,000 predoctoral and postdoctoral students annually by nonduty fellowships and traineeships. In addition, an estimated 20,000 to 25,000 graduate students in the sciences and engineering hold research assistantships paid from Federal funds.

It hardly seems necessary to document what is now called the imbalance between the natural sciences and the humanities, but a few comments and conclusions from recent studies are pertinent. Both Bernard Berelson in "Graduate Education in the United States" and James A. Davis in "Stipends and Spouses" have made use of the same NORC survey of graduate student finances. This survey is somewhat misleading for our purposes since it does not differentiate between Federal support and subvention from other sources. It tends, therefore, to obscure the full extent of the imbalance. Nevertheless, Berelson concludes that "the sciences, including engineering, are at a clear advantage over other fields" (p. 149). Davis, whose entire book is devoted to graduate student financing, is naturally much more specific. He says, "In every comparison, natural science students are more likely to have high aid than social science and humanities students" (p. 62). "Over-all, natural science students have a marked advantage over their colleagues in the social sciences and humanities. Seventy-nine percent have some sort of stipend, as contrasted with about 60 percent in social science and humanities, and in every subcategory their stipend holding is higher. The extreme is in research assistantships. One out of five natural science students is an RA compared with one out of nine students in social science and one out of a hundred in humanities" (p. 60).

On the faculty level the contrast is, if anything, even more marked. In 1961, the National Science Foundation alone awarded 611 fellowships to persons of faculty rank (postdoctoral, senior postdoctoral, and science faculty). The figures for NIH, AEC, and NASA are generally comparable. In the humanities fields, on the other hand, postdoctoral and other faculty awards are virtually nonexistent, with the exception, of course, of Fulbright and a few other specialized awards that are available to all fields."

No one intended, of course, to relegate the humanities and the arts to an existence in obscurity and poverty and, in a sense, they were not so relegated. They were actually no poorer and no more obscure than they had been in the prescience era. They had become poor and obscure only by contrast with their affluent and distinguished neighbors. But relative poverty and obscurity are as painful as though they were absolute. And even in Academia, much as it hurts to admit it, affluence and public recognition bring with them enhanced academic status. (Of the 60 graduate deans in the land-grant universities, 47 are in the natural sciences, 8 in the social sciences, and 5 in humanities.) At any rate, there is no question that the financial imbalance has brought about a status imbalance in our universities, both on the faculty and graduate student levels, that constitutes a very real threat to higher education.

As one of the results, the number of students entering graduate study in the humanities fields is declining and there are some indications that their quality is deteriorating. In the past 5 years the production of Ph. D.'s in the humanities, arts, and social sciences has not kept pace with the overall increase in all fields nor with the needs of the colleges. In some areas, as for example history, the supply is already critically short of the demand.

Ever since the early 1950's the educational associations, the universities and colleges and the U.S. Office of Education have tried to secure legislation that would help to restore some sort of balance in the lopsided academic world. In 1958 they almost succeeded. In that year the Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act which was designed to stimulate advanced study and research and particularly to expedite and improve the training of college teachers. Under its various titles it provides for graduate fellowships, student loans, summer language institutes, subsidies for courses in critical languages, and for experimental programs in new educational media, including television. For the humanities and the arts, title IV, the graduate fellowship program, seemed to offer the greatest hope, since it provided 1,500 3-year fellowships without any apparent restriction by field of study. And, indeed, in the first year approximately 32 percent of these fellowships were awarded in the arts and humanities fields and 26 percent in the social sciences. But as soon as the lists of awards were published the Congress wanted to know what possible relation to national defense could be claimed for folklore, art history, and ancient languages. When the awards for the second year were to be made, the House Committee on Labor and Education drew up a sharp directive forbidding fellowship awards in fields that had no direct connection with national defense, and specifically naming ancient languages, literatures, and history; arts, folklore, music, philosophy, and religion. No protests availed and the tabu against the arts and humanities still stands. No awards in the prohibited fields were made last year nor will any be made this year.

But perhaps this is a very good thing. For since this drastic congressional directive, a swelling chorus of voices has been raised on behalf of substantial aid to the arts and humanities as well as of those social sciences that are not recognized by the National Science Foundation. Some of the voices came from expected sources: the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools, the presidents of many liberal arts colleges. But some came from unexpected sources and were therefore all the more welcome. On November 15, 1960, the President's Science Advisory Committee issued an important policy statement which has since become known as the Seaborg report. Its introduction includes the following significant paragraphs:

"Much of this basic argument for the strengthening of American science applies equally to other fields of learning. While this report centers on the needs of science, we repudiate emphatically any notion that scientific research and scientific education are the only kinds of learning that matter to America. The responsibility of the Committee is limited to scientific matters, but obviously a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science alone. Even in the interests of science itself it is essential to give full value and support to the other great branches of man's artistic, literary, and scholarly activity. The advancement of science must not be accomplished by the impoverishment of anything else, and the life of the mind in our society has needs which are not limited by the particular concerns which belong to this Committee and this report.

We do not, in this report, attempt to consider what direct responsibility and interest the Government has for strengthening basic research and graduate education outside the sciences. This is a subject which deserves careful attention, but it is beyond our mission. What we can say, however, is what earlier reports of this Committee have regularly emphasized, that neither the Government nor the universities should conduct the support of scientific work in such a way as to weaken the capacity of American education to meet its responsibilities in other areas. The costs of scientific progress must not be paid by diverting resources from other great fields of study which have their own urgent need for growth."

And this statement is signed by a panel of the country's leading scientists, including Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, Glen T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, George W. Beadle, President of the University of Chicago, Roger Revelle, Director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanograph, and others.

On December 15, 1961, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, said in a speech before the Council of Graduate Schools that he believed the time was ripe for legislation in support of the arts and humanities and that he would wish personally to introduce such a bill in the 88th Congress. He has further evinced his continuing interest, suggesting preparatory steps to be taken. At the same meeting, Dr. Robert M. Lumiansky, provost of Tulane University, proposed the establishment of a national humanities foundation, specifically defining the term "humanities" to include the fine arts and certain of the social sciences.[2]

In the past 6 months, interest in Federal aid to the humanities has been building up rapidly and there are indications that a favorable climate is developing in the Congress. Various formats have been suggested, three of which seem to be gathering more support than others. The first is the establishment of a national humanities foundation, patterned after the highly successful National Science Foundation. The latter is a unique cross between a private foundation and a Federal agency which has the dual function of setting science policy and of supporting basic research and education. It is governed by a 24-member National Science Board, appointed by the President for 6-year terms, plus a director. The national humanities foundation would be similarly organized and governed and it would support, besides the humanities and the arts, those social sciences which are not included under the National Science Foundation.

The second program proposes the expansion of the National Science Foundation into something like a national arts, letters, and science foundation, with at least two governing boards and perhaps a coordinating body. This type of organization is favored by some Members of Congress who are disturbed over the growing number of agencies disbursing Federal funds for education. Representative EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, for example, has pointed out that the current

[2] ACLS Newsletter, vol. XIII, No. 1 (January 1962).

Federal outlay for 689 education programs is $2 billion, administered by 40 separate agencies. "This," she complains, "makes it impossible for any Member of Congress to know what is going on."

A third proposal is the establishment of a bureau or an institute within the Office of Education, charged with the specific support of the arts and humanities. This would place the ultimate control of the activity in the hands of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This proposal naturally has the support of the Commissioner of Education, and probably of the administration, but it might not find much favor in Congress and it would not satisfy the Council of Graduate Schools.

On April 17, 1962, the executive committee of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States voted unanimously to support the first of the three proposals, that is, the establishment of a national humanities foundation. As a second choice, it would reluctantly support a national arts, letters, and science foundation, but it would accept a bureau of an institute in the Office of Education only as a last desperate resort if all else failed. A fourth proposal to meet the situation by amending and expanding the National Defense Education Act received no support whatever.

Early this year, Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY of Rhode Island drafted a bill for support to the arts and humanities which he introduced in Congress on July 17, 1962. He calls it the Cultural Development Act of 1962 and it is carried on the House docket as H.R. 12560, a bill to establish a national institute of the arts and humanities.

This institute is to be located in the United States Office of Education and is to consist of a Federal advisory council on arts and humanities and a director and staff. It is authorized and directed to conduct studies and develop recommendations for national policy in the encouragement of the arts and humanities; to support research, surveys, demonstrations, or experimental projects designed to advance the arts and humanities through contracts with or grants to State and other public agencies, institutions of higher education, or other nonprofit agencies; to provide through the award of graduate fellowships or traineeships to individuals or through arrangements by contract or grant with institutions of higher education for the conduct of institutes or seminars for the training of teaching, technical, and administrative personnel needed to promote the advancement of the arts and humanities.

The Federal Advisory Council on Arts and Humanities shall consist of 24 members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for terms of 6 years each. They shall be persons eminent in the education in or practice of the arts and letters; they shall be selected solely on the basis of distinction; and they shall be broadly representative of the artistic and cultural interests encompassed by the act. And finally, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to employ a Director of the Institute and a staff of not more than 20 professional and technical persons to carry out the functions of the Institute.

It is apparent that Mr. FOGARTY, in outlining the format of his Institute, has drawn freely from the sucessful model of the National Science Foundation. Like the latter, his plan also provides for a 24-member Federal Advisory Committee plus a Director and staff. The chief difference here is that the Science Board is appointed by the President, while the Arts and Humanities Board is to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Moreover, the functions of the two organizations are similarly defined as far as the differences between their fields permit. This, of course, is all to the good; it is always sensible to follow a sucessful pattern.

Since the bill was introduced so late in the year it obviously could not expect action by the 87th Congress; nevertheless its introduction has served a very good purpose. It gives the learned societies and the educational associations an opportunity to clarify their thinking on the type of organization they wish to support and it gives them time to build up nationwide interest. Mr. FOGARTY has indicated that the does not insist upon the format now provided by his bill but is quite ready to alter it to meet the needs and the wishes of those concerned. He says, very reasonably, that he wants to provide the kind of support that the humanities and the arts need in a form acceptable to them and to the Congress.

So far, this account has been nothing more than a dry, objective report of the present efforts to provide Federal financial support for the humanities. This reporter, however, whose academic life was dedicated to language and literature, cannot refrain from adding an editorializing conclusion. He need hardly begin by saying that the realm of the spirit in the life of an individual, of the Nation, and of the world is of equal importance with the realm of science. Nor need it be said that the Nation and the world today need spiritual, ethical, and esthetic leadership at least as sorely as they need scientific leadership. Granted that we need scientific leadership to survive, we need spiritual leadership to make survival worthwhile. There was a time when these sentences were axioms. Perhaps they still are today.

A great deal has been written in the last two decades about the ailing humanities but there is little agreement on the nature of the ailment. The only certainty is that the humanities have been relegated to a place of secondary importance, not only in the world at large but unhappily also in the academic world. Our teachers and scholars have gradually accepted this inferior position and, as the strong grew stronger, the weak grew weaker. And today we suffer not so much from financial impoverishment as from status impoverishment. No one can deny the crying need for financial support of our scholarly and creative activities but no one can be so pragmatic as to believe that money alone is the panacea for all our ills.

What we need is reassurance of the validity of what we study and teach and practice. What we need is public recognition of the importance of the humanities and the arts to our system of higher education, to national welfare, and to the life of the individual. This means restoration of the principle of universality and indivisibility of learning. It means equal availability of opportunity accorded to all disciplines—not necessarily equal dollar support. It means, therefore, the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, parallel in structure, administration, and status to the National Science Foundation. Or it means the establishment of a National Arts, Letters, and Science Foundation, dedicated to the support of the entire edifice of higher education on an equal and impartial basis. Anything short of the establishment of one or the other of these agencies would not constitute restoration of balance and equality of discipline. An Institute or a Bureau or a Division in the Office of Education—no matter how much money it might disburse—would only serve to accentuate the status distinction between the natural sciences and the humanities and deepen the schism in higher education. The healing of the schism is the gravest problem that we face today.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE CREATIVE ARTS

(By W. McNeil Lowry)

(The following discussion on the university and the creative arts was prepared for an audience of graduate deans under conditions noted in the first two paragraphs of the text. It is admittedly one sided: I had suggested to the Association of Graduate Schools that a professor of drama, music, or the visual arts be given a hearing on the same program. The AGS urged me to take the role of prosecutor, with the promise that its committee on policies would keep the subject on its agenda and afford opportunities for rebuttal. I am confident that readers of the Art Journal will take up the debate and thus help to clarify many of the issues involved in university training in the arts—W.M.L.)

I hope I have the sympathy of every member here who has read the report of your committee on policies in graduate education. When the committee in that report reaches the problems of higher education in the creative arts, it says:

"The facts of what has occurred are not fully available, however; nor, we believe, is there widespread understanding of the national conditions in the arts which have led to the present trends.

"The committee recommends no action by AGS on the subject. Instead, it has invited Dr. W. McNeil Lowry of the Ford Foundation, who has long been concerned with the state of the creative arts in the United States, to discuss with us 'The University and the Creative Arts.'"

So I am on the spot. You are too, of course, for at the very least your committee has given me a clean slate upon which to write, and though I recommended it they were unable to associate with me upon this program a member of an arts faculty who might really know something about the problem from the inside. Furthermore, if I remember my academic politics, few fine arts, music, or theater professors ever become graduate deans, so there may be none in the audience who will feel like talking back.

My own dilemma remains the more acute, nevertheless, because there are too many ways to begin in analyzing the place of the creative arts in higher education and the impact upon the arts of what the universities do about them. Let us stipulate at the outset that the limit to what I can do today is to raise provocative questions, in the conviction that your committee on policies will keep the subject on its agenda for 2 or 3 years at least. To cover any ground at all, I can not even leave everything I say in the form of questions, and at times I shall have to appear dogmatic without, I hope, being so.

We could spend a great deal of time on the historical developments which have led deans of graduate schools to concern themselves with the relevance of education in the creative arts to the objectives of a university, but for the most profitable discussion the historical background must be treated in summary fashion. In the early days of the Republic private tutors were the source of education in music and the visual arts, creative writing was a thin adjunct of formal education, and only elocution had a remote connection with the theater arts. In 1804 a society of artists and their friends formed the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts. Its original purpose was the professional instruction of painters, sculptors, and graphic artists, but it was thought necessary to collect works of art from the past in order to guide potential artists, and regular training in the history of art was launched. (It is at least worth noting that most of our oldest American museums in the same way grew out of independent art schools.)

It was not until the days of Charles Eliot Norton that history and interpretation of the fine arts became a really proper subject for concentration in those private institutions of higher learning that had their roots in the classics. Until then painting and sculpture (and music too) had been treated as sketchy backgrounds to history. Even in

the second and third decades of this century, the students of Paul Sachs at the Fogg were chiefly young men who were destined to take over the museum directorships of the country, for which, as one of them said to me recently, their qualifications were "70 percent social and 30 percent professional." By 1934 a special study of the subject showed that the history of art was well entrenched as a major discipline in both private and public universities, and every college had art appreciation and at least one course in art history. Today's graduate student in the fine arts only rarely trains for curatorial work in a museum. He finds in college or university teaching more sustained opportunities for his own scholarship, higher pay, and more fringe benefits than our financially hard-pressed museums can offer him.

The 1934 study to which I referred also showed that not only the history and appreciation but the practice of art had invaded the universities. Led by the public institutions, the universities had started a process which was less conscious than gravitational but which since 1934 has had a profound impact upon the future of the independent art school and upon art and the artists as well. By 1950 rising costs of operation in the independent professional schools were sharpened by an increasing loss of student tuitions. It was now possible to major in painting or sculpture in State supported universities with lower tuitions, and more important, one could gain a regionally accredited college degree while doing so. Many parents who had only mild enthusiasm for their son's or daughter's desire to become an artist insisted that he or she at least gain the passport to a marketable vocation like teaching. Independent art schools in the past decade have faced a bitter struggle for survival. Many have not survived, many have joined the opposite camp and merged with nearby colleges or universities in their programs, a few have taken leadership in gaining regional accreditation without sacrificing too many professional studio requirements, and only a very few have maintained intact a tradition that was always Spartan financially anyway.

As the universities increased their offerings in studio practice, the professional teacher was joined by the professional artist, first as an artist in residence and then as a regular member of the faculty. The principal economic base of the contemporary American painter and sculptor today, even among the top rank, is university and college teaching. In many ways these men were interlopers upon Olympus so far as historians of art were concerned, and in the early 1950's fine arts deans of the Midwestern State universities had to lead a revolt in the College Art Association to give the practice of art and its practitioners greater recognition within the fraternity. When the president of a small liberal arts college became the president of Harvard, he asked whether Harvard students too should not have some of the liberalizing benefit of aesthetic practice, and there followed a report on visual instruction at Harvard University which still can engender heat between disciples of the künstgeschichte and those who believe that students should be allowed to play with colors on canvas, if only as a sort of extracurricula activity.

I can myself attest to the liveliness of the controversies occasioned by the university's assumption of professional art instruction as a legitimate part of its curriculum. For 4 years in our program in the Ford Foundation we discussed with art historians, museum directors, artists, independent art school heads, and representatives of teachers colleges the need and timeliness of a national study of higher education in the visual arts. Our ultimate aim was to see such a study made under the most objective conditions, with the interests of the artist, the museum director, and the independent art school head as firmly maintained as the interests of the historian of art. Success, as always, came in personal terms, meaning in this case the breadth and judgment of the study's director, and 6 days ago we announced a grant of $180,000 to the College Art Association for an independent study to be led by Andrew Ritchie, director of the Yale University Art Galleries and formerly curator of painting at the Museum of Modern Art and director of the Albright Gallery in Buffalo. Two years from now you and I should know a great deal more about what is going on in your institutions in at least the visual aspects of the creative arts.

Among the many things we already know is that the normal course requirements for a liberal education and even the minimal concentration on technical practice, when put together in a university required more than 4 years and hence a new kind of degree, the master of fine arts. In a few institutions the doctorate itself has been modified to include a program that consists not primarily of history and theory but practice in art.

And the process I have sketched for the visual arts has been paralleled in music, the drama, and creative writing. Independent drama schools, never very strong in the United States, as well as the much stronger music conservatories have generally decayed as the universities, nominally at least, have taken over some of their functions. As your committee on policies has said in its summary:

"Since the 19th century, a steady migration to the campuses has occurred of types of instruction that formerly took place largely in independent schools and institutes. Training in the creative arts has joined this procession. Academic institutions now increasingly perform functions that formerly fell chiefly to independent drama schools, art institutes, music conservatories, and other forums of personal instruction not associated with educational institutions of more general purpose. [And] modern universities seem increasingly to be expected to offer instruction in the creative arts beyond the bachelor's degree."

So much for what has happened. Its implications range far more widely and intricately than we shall have time to discuss today, but the most important of these are, I think, clear, as is their relevance to your own responsibilities. Before coming to analyze the implications, however, I must digress for a moment to sharpen the frame of reference. There are some ways in which the arts are involved with university education which create no problems either for the objectives of a university or the state of the arts in the American society. But the professors of drama, music, and the visual arts for various reasons are on the defensive in many ways, and it is necessary for any critic to say what he is not talking about as well as what he is.

Let me state, therefore, that in analyzing the condition your committee has noted I am not concerned with university education in esthetics or in the history and theory of music, painting, sculpture, architecture, drama, the dance, or any other of the creative arts. Perhaps it is necessary to say this because we can recall that in the generations shortly preceding ours even the literatures written in contemporary tongues were not considered proper subjects for scholarship, particularly of the advanced sort prescribed for graduate students. Twenty years ago I myself was a witness to a tiny change in this fashion when I became the first student in a very large graduate department ever to have the privilege (if that is the word) of writing a dissertation on a living author.

At any rate, I am assuming in this discussion that neither the undergraduate nor the graduate deans in the universities you represent have any special problems from the inclusion in the curriculum of musicology, theater history, the philosophy of art, the history of painting, and other such courses. This is, I take it, what we all mean when we include the fine arts, music, and drama in the humanities, whether we are talking about liberal education for the undergraduate or whether we are trying to get more of society's money into the support of doctoral and postdoctoral scholarship. As some of you know, in the Ford Foundation's support of humanistic scholarship through either the postdoctoral fellowships offered by the American Council of Learned Societies or our subsidies to new material published by university presses, we have tried to stress the importance to the humanities of musicology, art history, theater history, and aesthetics generally.

There is another large area I should like to except from the discussion, and this is harder to do because in one way it can be thought of as the crux of the whole matter. Throughout history institutions of formal education, primary, secondary, or higher, have generally afforded some opportunities for students with a taste for the arts to express this taste in peripheral or informal ways. It was only in our own century that one of these ways became the course in so-called appreciation of art, a curricular practice hard to defend unless such courses are taken in addition to a full and formal schedule. It has always seemed to me that the appreciation of literature, for example, can best come through a fairly rigorous course in literature, and similarly for the other arts. The more traditional ways—chamber music societies, the opportunity to participate in a dramatic performance without regard to courses in acting, literary clubs—all help to enrich the experience of young people living together in an educational community. I think this rather large and general view was what actually motivated President Pusey when he asked whether formal art history and the existence of the Fogg Museum really gave the Harvard undergraduate all the benefits of the visual arts as a means to the liberal education of the individual.

But these two digressions into which I have wandered forcibly bring us back to the subject of the university and the creative arts. The objective of undergraduate education in the humanities, I assume, is the liberal education of the individual; the objective of graduate education in these disciplines is the training of scholars competent to grasp a whole corpus of systematic knowledge and subject it to philosophical analysis. What is the relevance, to either of these objectives, of training in the techniques of painting, acting, directing, dancing, instrumentation, musical composition, creative writing, or any other branch of artistic creation? Can such training, given the objectives of a university, be offered under what are known as "professional" standards? If it cannot, what importance should the university attach to it? If it can, what are the problems to the university of adapting professional training in the arts to its other, more primary objectives?

If we look back at the historical timetable by which the university expanded its role in the creative arts, we find an almost exact coincidence with the growth in the American society of the vague idea that "the a-r-t-s are somehow good for people." Some of us have long hoped that the sources of money in the United States, private or public, individual or corporate, would find a greater share for the professional arts. That greater share for the arts is actually becoming visible, though by no means as yet proportionate to the importance of the arts in any society. But largely it is becoming available to the amateur artist, rather than the professional. So-called cultural centers are on the drawing

boards in many U.S. communities; somehow in our country businessmen or municipal and State officials appear to think that art begins with real estate. But by far the greatest number of these centers have no professional performing groups as components; many of them are to be built by State funds and will use State university budgets as the financing vehicle. It seems that we are to have the audience before we are to have the creators and performers.

Whence does this audience come? It is my belief that it has come largely from the increase in the proportion of our population that has been university trained. The whole phenomenon of that segment of our theater known as off-Broadway is supported, for better or worse, by an audience that has been educated in colleges and universities. Abstract expressionism is kept alive, critically and otherwise, by allied interests. The most consistent proportion of ticket buyers (though not of patrons) of the Metropolitan Opera is found among the physicians, very few of whom, I imagine, ever had courses either in singing, in musical composition, or even in the history of opera. Some of the richest and most varied concert programs outside our largest cities are supported in State university communities. And there are numerous other examples to be cited.

They all would seem to support the idea that the arts are somehow good for people, and given the nature of our democratic and laissez-faire economic society this evolution within it is undoubtedly a necessary step in the development of cultural resources. But it antedates (by how long a period we can only guess) any realization that it is the highly talented and professionally trained artist on whom all depends; it lacks as yet, in short, discrimination as to what the arts are really about. And if I have given the university the bulk of the credit for providing a new audience for the arts in the United States, I feel I must also give it a strong share of the blame for the lack of discrimination visible in that audience.

How did all this come about? I think, to put it bluntly, the university has been having it both ways. It says on the one hand that its function is the liberal education of the individual, and exposure to the creative arts is merely one avenue toward that end. It acts on the other hand as if it were training young people for vocations, and not merely the vocations of scholar or teacher of the arts but the vocation of the professional artist per se. Let me illustrate what I mean generally from two contrasting art fields, one in performance and the other in creation.

The best equipped theaters in the United States are not those in which professional actors appear but those maintained by the universities. The drama is quite legitimately an important vehicle for liberal education, and this is what university administrators say when forced to defend the existence of both the theater and the theater department. It is not the university's function to train professional actors and directors—historians of the drama, of the theater, and of stagecraft, yes, but not performing artists per se. So far, so good. But in the catalog are course sequences not only in theater history or dramatic literature but in acting, directing, technical direction, costuming, even in theater management. And the university, through its accreditation to grant degrees if not through its tuition, competes with the few remaining independent drama schools for the student who thinks he wants to make the theater a career. Such a student will be expected, of course, to take many other subjects in fields he would not have time in which to concern himself if he were apprenticing as an actor in a resident company or would not be required to take in a professional drama school. From these subjects he is expected to receive the balance of the liberal education for which the university intends him. But if his university career is the only training as an actor the young person either expects or knows how to obtain, then for him this is his professional training. It goes on, generally, in a well-equipped theater, but also generally with amateur directors and amateur acting ensembles, and if criticized at all, criticized again by amateurs. He is told by the professors that academic theater stands for the classical, cultural, or avant garde theater, in contrast to Broadway, which is commerce, though with its large budgets and a few great stars Broadway may now and then produce a work of art. He is told that university productions are often "better than Broadway." But in any event, the young actor normally is led to believe that there is nothing in the American theater between academic theater and Broadway; this is the choice given to him; and he leaves the university to beat a path to New York or Los Angeles, where he joins hundreds of other young actors who have been similarly indoctrinated. The fact that he still has not had a professional apprenticeship, and that this is all he is ready for, is ignored. To the theater professor who stays behind, there is always the consolation that if the young actor does not make his way into the professional theater, he has had a liberal education and that is the university's objective anyway. Since, as you must realize, the opportunities for serious actors in spoken dramas are steadily being curtailed on Broadway, the supply of frustrated young academic theater products becomes greater and greater.

I ask your indulgence to quote at length from the analysis of a talented academic theater director, Prof. James H. Clancy of Stanford University. He is talking about a recent opportunity he had to test in Europe Giraudoux' hyperbole that theater is "the only form of a nation's spiritual and artistic education." I quote:

"But unfortunately this is not the sense in which the word 'education' is applied to much of the 'theater in the school' with which I am most familiar [in the United States]. Here the word has been used variously, but most frequently to make palatable the fact that art was neither the possibility nor the aim. This frightened and furtive use of the word 'education' resulted not only from technical incompetence [and helped perpetuate it] but also from faintness of heart and spiritual debility. One of its results has been to produce a strange dichotomy in many of the institutions of higher learning that profess the dramatic arts. On one side tend to be the 'researchers.' Their results may be useful in the theater when and if the artist finds a meaning for them, but they are material to the artist in the same category as any other material. In this sense the theater will possibly find more use for an intensive study of Pepys' diaries than of a calendar of the production at Drury Lane in the last half of the 18th century—although the latter is apt to be considered, mistakenly, more directly the provenance of the department of dramatic art.

"On the other side of this uneasy dichotomy are the 'practical' theater men who, sure of the myopia of their colleagues on the 'research' side, are not troubled by their own astigmatism. Sensing the artistic unlikelihood of the Drury Lane Calendar they remove themselves scornfully from such 'ivory tower' considerations, forgetting, if they ever knew, that the ivory tower and its dreams are an important and necessary extension of reality, and not a substitute for it. Caught in their centripetal activities of box office, billing, and good, clean entertainment, they soon come to regard the construction of a flat as more important than its function [poor Gordon Craig, he didn't know how to stand 'em up in Moscow] and that the values of a play can be best judged by the number of people who can be cajoled or chivied into attending its performances. Working in an institution such as the theater which is fortunately still primitive mechanically, the educational theater is fast developing a large group of extremely competent men who are 'practical'—about the major matters of unimportance.

"One thing, it seems to me, the college or university is eminently fitted to do for the education of the artist: serve as the source of what I can only think to call chronological integration. The university has traditionally served as a repository of the past, a place where the experiences of past generations are sifted, analyzed, and interpreted. Social pressures outside the academy, plus the political pressures of world events, tend to prevent the contemporary artist from becoming a racial or geographical segregationist, but the university can be a major aid in preventing him from developing into a chronological segregationist, producing a gauche and baseless form of 'art moderne' that serves only to express his dissociation from the streams of humanity. This does not mean, God knows, that the academic theater should persist in archeological reconstructions of presumed theatrical methods of the past. The academy rightfully preserves the past only when it constantly interprets in light of the present: it maintains the past by demonstrating its imminence. It helps create the future by demonstrating its continuance."

Let me turn now from the performing to the creative arts. In my introduction I sketched the process by which economic and popularizing forces turned hundreds of would-be painters and sculptors from the independent art schools to the universities. The burgeoning of university curriculums in the practice of painting and sculpture since 1950 has coincided with the supremacy of a particular artistic style—call it action painting, the New York School of Abstract Expressionism, or whatever your favorite term may be. For good or bad, this style in painting particularly lends itself to intellectual and technical imitation even by those young artists who have not had 2 or 3 years of rigid grounding in drawing and design. The result is that we now have a new academic style that has spread throughout college and university studios almost without check. A couple of years ago I was examining student paintings submitted from a variety of institutions as a part of the requirements for admission to an independent art school that will not take candidates before their junior year in college. "You know," the instructor said to me, "each time I leave the room and come back, I couldn't for the life of me prove that all these paintings weren't the work of the same person."

Another result of great importance to all of us whose first interest is in the professional arts, is the effect upon the painter or sculptor who has been brought into the university to teach his craft. This is a subject I hear about all the time in the running conversations we keep up with artists. A few enjoy teaching as a second vocation and believe their own creativity does not suffer from it. Some enjoy teaching while believing their own work does suffer. The great majority endure teaching as a means of livelihood, suffer the fact that there may be only two or three students a year in whom they glimpse any potentialities of talent, agonize over that portion of their own creative quotient which ends in the canvases of amateurs, and yearn for the unlikely year when some agency like the Ford Foundation may permit them simply to paint. Unanimously, even including those who believe their own creativity does not suffer from teaching, the artists to whom I have talked are bitter about the fact that their students are handed to them in groups and they have no voice in screening or selecting them.

One of the first sculptors of his generation chose to go without a regular livelihood when he came to the United States 14 years ago rather than teach students he himself could not select. He was merely more courageous or more optimistic than his colleagues, who are probably equally dedicated to the old atelier system in which social democracy was not allowed to excuse the total absence of talent.

I think you will by now have foreseen my first conclusion: The university has largely taken over the functions of professional training in the arts but in the main has sacrificed professional standards in doing so. The absence of discrimination has proceeded partly from the strong popularizing currents already at work in the society outside the campuses, and partly from the university's original objective, the liberal education of numerous individuals drawn from an affluent democracy.

You may be somewhat more surprised at my second conclusion: The trend is irreversible. The future of professional training in the arts depends, first, upon a radical shift in the university atmosphere surrounding students considered potential artists, and second, upon the provision of postgraduate opportunities for professional apprenticeship removed from an academic environment.

My final conclusion is a mixture of pessimism and optimism: The requisite shift in the university environment for the arts will be achieved only under great difficulties, if at all. Opportunities exist for new forms of cooperation between the university and professional institutions in the arts, provided the university will regard the arts as important and give financial support to the cooperative mechanisms that must be established.

I shall proceed to elaborate on the last two conclusions and to single out the implications for the university graduate school.

As Director of the Ford Foundation in Humanities and the Arts, it has been my privilege since 1957 to study not only the trends in the arts but the ways in which the arts are now or can be financially supported. It is as a result of this latter study that I am convinced we can not reverse the migration to the campuses of all forms of training that formerly took place under independent auspices. There are still many individual patrons of the arts, despite the income tax, but the motives of many of these are largely social and they like to support buildings or performances. Many of them also like to support education, but they think of education in terms of schools and colleges. Organized donors, such as corporations, put education first in their philanthropies, though they still, as you know, do not give the maximum allowed by law. The proportion they give the arts again chiefly reflects the social interests of individual patrons in the arts. The foundations grant much more money through universities and colleges than through the professional arts. When Government bodies come into the act, which in this country is rare, they too act either for public institutions in the arts or for the interests of the schoolchildren.

Academic deans coping with deficit financing in their annual budgets may not make the best audience to which to say it, but the fact is that so far as artistic training is concerned the universities have the money. The retiring president of Indiana University has often said that the State institution in our generation has taken over the regional role in the arts once played by the German princeling and later by the German stadt. He was not thinking merely of training the would-be artists, either. He was thinking of providing Indiana communities with musical and dramatic performances and with art exhibits, both professional and student. But if we think only of training in the creative arts, the future is clear. An enterprising academic theater director in Texas runs a repertory theater in a $1 million building in Dallas with M.A. candidates at Baylor University in Waco. The same illustration emphasizes another reason why individual and organized donors prefer to support the amateur artist in universities. It is safer to give money to people like yourselves and the institutions you represent, and though the donor may get less of the beautiful he gets at least as much of the good and the true.

In short, I think you and I were probably in agreement before I started that except for a few institutes and conservatories that may (and only may) survive our generation, except for a peculiar art like ballet in which the practitioners are already too old if they wait until college age, the university of the future will get the first crack at most potential artists. My question today, and it goes first to your undergraduate deans, is whether the university can change the environment on one part of its campus while holding its traditional atmosphere on another. It does not help to say you have done so on the agricultural campus or in the physical education school. The requisite atmosphere for professional training in the arts is somewhat more subtle than that in the dairy barns or in the locker rooms.

What is that atmosphere? It is easier to describe it than to analyze it. I have met it frequently in the 50-odd cities I have visited, often three or four times, in my personal fieldwork in the arts. I have encountered it most often in two otherwise quite unrelated institutions—the independent school of art and the resident theater company. Even at first blush, the independent art school looks different from the university art department, and not because the models in the latter place generally wear halters and shorts. And the resident theater's atmosphere, contrasted to that of the academic, is not merely a product of its physical inadequacies. (It may interest you to know that the capsule report of the European drama training expert, Michel St. Denis, after his first trip outside New York, was of the amateur work going on in wonderful university theater plants and the truly professional work going on in a few cramped cubbyholes.)

No, the Spartan effect one detects in professional environments is not merely physical, though that situation is general. It has much to do with the drive or fanaticism or whatever of the person who has made his choice, and will eschew anything else—money, the elite identification of a university degree, even health—to develop the talent he hopes he has. It comes also from the pride of doing for oneself, of making ends meet, of giving society what it will pay for even if what it pays is inadequate to sustain a normal life, of working in the midst of a fraternity that will show the same fanaticisms and abnegations. It comes from the endless time, time, time spent on doing one thing, only one thing, and then starting all over again. It comes, finally, from the acceptance of such distortion as a way of life, a way of life, you will note, that is in some ways completely antithetical to the ideal objective of a liberal and humane education. Some of the most professional, the most talented, and the most mature artists I have met lack either the time or the capacity to sort out a decent personal life from the endless hours of their artistic concentration. Only a rare heredity or early environment and not, I am afraid, a very good education, has given some of these artists a humanity that separates them from the talented bums in their midst.

I shall waive the question whether you even want this sort of atmosphere on your campuses, and go instead to whether you can have it if you want it. The best answer is, I do not know. But despite that, there are some implications more obvious than others. The most obvious is that if the university is going to allow the student's distorted concentration on hardnosed doing and redoing it, it cannot also require of him all the courses in humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences that are even minimally thought to constitute a liberal education. The university can, of course, stretch out the years to be applied, as it has done in the MFA. But there is a limit to that adjustment. I have already noted that the ballet dancer, starting at 9 years to train her body as her artistic instrument, knows she must forego the university completely, at least if the potentiality of a professional career still seems good by the time she is 18. There is a real question whether under professional conditions an actor, even if he spent 5 years in college, could leave more than 2 hours a weekday in those 5 years for anything but rehearsal or performance. It is not an accident that the university now probably does a better job in training the musician than in training other artists. Historically there have been so many branches of the musical art required of a training musician that the universities have allowed more concentration in that program. And secondly, the most technical accomplishments of a musician are more easily tested than those of an actor, a writer, a director, or even (these days) a painter. But again it can be argued, as the musicologist, Paul Henry Lang has done, that "pseudo-scholarship is the fateful consequence of the indiscriminate mixing of university with conservatory." (Lang was commenting at the time on the University of Michigan's announcement of a doctoral program in piano.)

Another obvious implication of my general argument is that neither the professors of the creative arts nor the students can be selected for a professional curriculum and atmosphere according to the patterns now employed in universities. No one has found the litmus paper that can make a positive or a negative test for artistic talent, or even for artistic drive, which would help us almost as much in this context. But drives can be isolated for identification if certain choices are forced. Roughly 80 percent of the university students now concentrating in one of the creative arts have chosen to major in art education; they are insuring their ability to have a second vocation if the first fails. For four-fifths of the students, then, I would be so dogmatic as to say no special atmosphere, no distorted concentration need be attempted. By all means excuse them from none of the normal requirements of a liberal education. Let them hunger for the true. Their hunger for the arts is not fanatical enough. They are not, as Brooks Atkinson once said about talented theater directors, hopefully crazy. I would recommend that the universities screen creative arts students twice: once by their own choices, as I have indicated, and again by the choice of the individual teacher after the student has had a term or a year of the distorted concentration for which I am groping to find other words.

Selection of the directors for a truly professional training in the arts will be difficult. But in one stroke, the university will have a wider field of talented artists from which to choose if the reform I have just recommended is taken and the teacher is allowed to have his atelier of potential talents by his own selection. I think this principle from the training of painters and sculptors should be extended to performing artists and to composers and to writers, as indeed for the last named it has already been in many universities. Another obvious corollary is that the man who is trained to teach theater history is not necessarily qualified to direct a play, any more than the historian of arts is qualified to teach painting or sculpture.

The concentration of courses and the selection of students and faculty, though difficult, are probably more feasible than the creation of that intangible atmosphere

of professionalism to which I referred a few moments ago. I do not want to be misunderstood; I am not suggesting that the universities simply borrow outright the curriculums and atmosphere of independent institutes and conservatories; I am certainly not suggesting that these independent institutions have done a perfect job in the professional education of the artist. They have not, and today they cannot, because already they have found themselves unable to compete with the universities in the salaries and tenure and fringe benefits of faculty. When I cited the atmosphere of the independent art school and the resident theater company, I was citing an intangible spirit and not model institutions for training. How to translate this spirit into a very different location is problematical. Yet undoubtedly the spirit is a product of motive and procedure, to a large extent, and the changes to which I have already alluded may help produce it. To face the necessary distortion of the primary objective of a university, to reflect that distortion in a highly concentrated curriculum, to open that curriculum only to the students with the most fanatical drives, to give to the artist-professor responsibility for testing both the drives and the talents—these motives and procedures may go part way toward producing a professional atmosphere. That is as strong as I can put it confidently.

There is one other possibility, again by analogy. Wherever Spartan restrictions are logical and natural, they should be applied to the whole enterprise of professional training in the arts. Nothing so much as the raw need to survive pares a resident theater or other institution in the arts to the essentials of professionalism or makes it a better place for hard-nosed apprenticeship. It is fortunate that universities by and large have well-equipped theaters and concert halls, and fairly adequate painting and music studios. It is still possible, perhaps, to emphasize repeatedly that what goes on inside is of prime importance and real estate of only secondary. One of the most influential of all theater departments has flourished for years in shockingly inadequate quarters.

I said earlier that the future of professional training in the arts depends, first, upon a radical shift in the university atmosphere surrounding students considered potential artists and, second, upon the provision of opportunities for professional apprenticeship through nonacademic persons or institutions.

Most of these opportunities, I believe, will be found only when the student is ready to leave his undergraduate career. Not all of them, however. At the University of Utah, for example, mature professional actors are mixed with each student dramatic production. Indiana, Minnesota, Catholic University, and others give graduate and sometimes undergraduate students experience in the trials of the touring theatrical company. Minnesota hopes that Tyrone Guthrie will use some of its student actors in small parts at the new repertory theater going up in Minneapois. And so forth.

In the past 3 years a few universities have been groping toward other developments in the arts, You are all conscious of the festival seasons and seminars involving professional artists on the campus; it would be difficult to assay the lasting impact of these on undergraduates training in the arts. A more important innovation is the idea of maintaining on the campus a professional resident theater company as a cultural resource on a footing with the library. Only the Extension Division of the University of California at Los Angeles has to date pulled it off satisfactorily, and there the secret was actually the long mailing lists of southern Californians addicted to any kind of adult education. Princeton University's experience was instructive, for good and for bad. With the McCarter Theater a white elephant on its hands, Princeton decided it would have two short seasons in the performing arts including the theater. But the university did not want to put much money into the enterprise, so its original plan was to give the professional director and actors 4½ days to rehearse each play. I had occasion to point out that Princeton would not start off a new science laboratory in that fashion and expect the result to reflect the institution's own standards. But as the agenda before us today suggests, the universities are still groping for new patterns in the arts, and I am sure we are all sympathetic to the attempt Princeton is making. Harvard did not have a white elephant, and through the generosity of an alumnus built its own new and challenging theater. To date, however, so far I have learned, this theater is destined as another extracurricular home for the undergraduate.

If they will move in still more unorthodox fashion, the universities can build many more cooperative mechanisms for students who are graduating or have become postgraduates. Our own program in the Ford Foundation affords illustrations; I shall cite two in contrasting fields. Young composers, most of them holding advanced degrees, are selected to write music directly for performance by high school orchestras and choral groups. You are no doubt aware that young composers generally must write for their filing cases rather than for performance, and you may not be too old to recall that the repertoire of even the best high school musical organization is deficient in contemporary music. The other example is the so-called theater communications group, which among other aims, will attempt to point out to both the most talented undergraduate actors and their professors where the young actors may get a year-round professional apprenticeship instead of going off to beat the streets of New York and Los Angeles.

The field for new modes of cooperation between the universities and artistic groups in the same or more distant communities in 1961 appears very wide. I say this rather confidently because my mail and my fieldwork bring me new ideas for such cooperation almost daily. I am even more confident that these artistic groups expect either the universities or the foundations to support such mechanisms, and they are realistic enough to know that a national foundation does not expect to give widespread support to local activities. Theatrical and musical organizations want your students as paid audiences; they will take the best of them as paid apprentices if you will put up the money, and if you want to give them graduate credit for such apprenticeships, that is all right too. Museums want to join with you in the training and retention of curators and directors (as is already being done in half a dozen places), but again they want you to find the money for this.

As administrators in important and complex institutions, you, of course, are most conscious of the fact that raising the funds for existing activities is already a difficult undertaking. But I presume we are talking of the future, too. And I believe that in addition to the trends your Committee on Policies has noted, there is an inevitable trend toward a greater sharing of both your facilities and your funds by community institutions in the arts, particularly and most extensively when your funds come from the taxpayers of your States.

The choice you make in this decade may be crucial for the arts, because already the universities have drifted along with the society in the perpetuation of the amateur and of the imitator. It would be very discouraging to think that your efforts and your financial resources, like most of those being utilized in other quarters, could be expended toward a greater and greater popularization of standards. Whether you can make a home on your campus for what I have called distortion as a way of life, I do not know. If you cannot, I hope you will confine all your activities in the arts to historical and theoretical treatment.

When President Wall came to talk to me about this session, he said you would all be prepared for the fact that in addressing myself to the subject of "The University and the Creative Arts" I would have to speak largely without distinction between the undergraduate and graduate schools, and this is certainly what I have done. But I think whatever specific advice I have to give about graduate curriculums has already emerged from the contest. Just to recapitulate it, however—

Graduate schools, it seems to me, have two responsibilities for the creative arts. One is very old and one is very new. The very old one is to recognize the history, theory, and esthetics of the arts as legitimate subjects for scholarship and research on a par with any of the other humanistic disciplines. The very new responsibility is to support new forms of cooperation between the university and truly professional institutions in the arts, however small or financially pressed such institutions may be. The training resulting from such cooperation will largely go on outside the campus; it will be unorthodox; it will have to be extemporized; but it will not be any less integral a part of the university than many of the scientific and other institutes which you all have tucked away here and there. Whether you will give graduate degrees for such training, and which degrees, I am not prepared at the moment to argue.

Unless and until such new forms can be developed, however, I would not want, if I were a graduate dean, to give either credits or degrees to technical (as distinguished from historical) proficiency in the arts beyond the first year. Under present conditions, the best service you can perform for the potential artist is to throw him out. If he is more interested in the shadow than the substance, in pretense than in intensity, he will readily find his enclave somewhere else anyway. And if he just should happen to be an artist, he will begin his long and painful education. No play was ever more dramatic, no musical composition more evocative, no novel truer to the imagination merely because its author was given a Ph. D. for creating it. And that is probably the safest thing I have said this afternoon.

H.R. 5140

A bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Cultural Development Act of 1963".

TITLE I—MISCELLANEOUS

Findings and purposes of Act

SEC. 101. (a) The Congress finds that the vitality, quality, and further development of the arts and humanities in the United States are matters of profound national interest, and that the preservation and extension of the Nation's cultural resources requires that the Federal Government provide appropriate encouragement and support to public and other nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, and associations engaged in education in, sponsorship of, or otherwise advancing, artistic and cultural interest and activity. The Congress also finds that the many Federal programs and

activities which involve, or which affect or are related to the arts and humanities should be assessed and evaluated in terms of their impact on American culture, and, insofar as it is practical, be coordinated and related to broad cultural needs and objectives.

(b) While the Congress strongly affirms that individual initiative and personal choice are the inviolable characteristics of American art and culture, it recognizes that government has a responsibility to help assure that conditions in our society encourage creativity. Increasing urbanization and population growth, greatly increased leisure time afforded by industrial and agricultural technology, early retirement, and extended lifespan and related factors have created an enormous need and opportunity for the pursuit and enjoyment of cultural interests. The failure of our society to meet this need and to exploit this opportunity would be a tragic blow to the general welfare of the American people.

(c) It is the purpose of this Act to provide a means by which the Federal Government can render effective assistance, in ways entirely appropriate for government, to efforts to encourage cultural development.

Assurance against Federal interference

SEC. 102. In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, or the administration or operation of any school or other non-Federal agency, institution, organization, or association.

Definitions

SEC. 103. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education;

(2) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(3) the term "State" means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia;

(4) the term "nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, or associations" means those organizations described in section 501 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and

(5) the term "art" or "arts" means both the performing and the nonperforming arts, including but not limited to music, painting, sculpture, architecture, drama, and the dance; the term "humanities" includes modern and ancient language and literature, history, and philosophy; the term "culture" or "cultural" is used more broadly to characterize the whole range of interests and activities that promote the enlightenment and refinement of the public in intellectual and esthetic matters.

Exemption from conflict-of-interest laws of members of Advisory Council

SEC. 104. (a) Any member of the Federal Advisory Council appointed under this Act, who is not a regular full-time employee of the United States, is hereby exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) The exemption granted by subsection (a) shall not extend—

(1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment, or

(2) during the period of such appointment, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter with which such person, during such period, is or was directly connected by reason of such appointment.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 105. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

TITLE II—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

SEC. 201. There is hereby established in the United States Office of Education a National Institute of Arts and Humanities (hereafter referred to as the "Institute"). The Institute shall consist of a Federal Advisory Council on Arts and Humanities (hereafter referred to as the "Council") and a Director and staff.

Functions of the Institute

SEC. 202. (a) The Institute is authorized and directed—

(1) to conduct studies and develop recommendations for national policy in the encouragement of the arts and humanities and in the advancement of culture;

(2) to support research, surveys, demonstrations, or experimental projects designed to advance the arts and humanities, including the evaluation of such activities, through contracts with or grants to State and other public agencies, institutions of higher education, or public or other nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, or associations;

(3) to promote and advance education in the arts and humanities by the production or commissioning, collection, and dissemination of films, records, tapes, reproductions, or printed matter suitable for use in courses or lectures in the arts conducted by schools, colleges, and universities, or other nonprofit institutions engaged in providing education in the arts and humanities;

(4) to maintain a central clearinghouse of information covering the various aspects of the arts and humanities in the United States, including activities of other Federal departments or agencies, and to make such information available to the public;

(5) to provide, through the award of graduate fellowships or traineeships to individuals (within the limits of such sums as the Congress may specifically appropriate for this purpose), or through arrangements (by contract or grant) with groups specified in paragraph (2) for the conduct of institutes or seminars, for the training of teaching, technical, and administrative personnel who, in the judgment of the Council, are in short supply and are most needed by educational and other cultural institutions and agencies to promote the advancement of the arts and humanities; and

(6) to render consultative and advisory services to other Federal departments and agencies, State and other public agencies, public and other nonprofit educational agencies and institutions, and other nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, or associations concerned with education in or advancement of the arts and humanities.

(b) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, the Institute shall place primary emphasis upon the educational aspects of the arts and humanities but it shall interpret "education" broadly so as to include all levels, conducted formally or informally by both public and private groups specified in paragraph (2) for the benefit of people of all ages.

(c) The Commissioner shall render an annual report to the Secretary for submission on or before the 15th day of January of each year to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Institute and making such recommendations as he may deem advisable. Such report shall include minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Council.

TITLE III—FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES

SEC. 301. (a) The Council shall consist of twenty-four members to be appointed without regard to the civil service laws by the Secretary, and of the Institute Director ex officio, and shall, as provided by this Act, advise the Commissioner in the exercise of the authority granted to the Institute by this Act, and advise the Secretary on national needs relating to the arts and humanities in the United States. The persons appointed as members (1) shall be eminent in the education in or the practice, performance, administration, criticism, or promotion of the arts, letters, or cultural interests of the United States; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of records of distinguished service; and (3) shall be so selected as to be broadly representative of the artistic and cultural interests encompassed by this Act.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Council (except that of the Director) shall be six years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of members first appointed after the date of enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the Secretary, eight at the end of two years, eight at the end of four years, and eight at the end of six years.

(c) The Secretary shall call the first meeting of the Council, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman. The Institute Director shall be secretary to the Council.

(d) The Council shall meet at least once annually and at such other times as requested by the Commissioner. A majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum, and each member shall be given reasonable notice in writing of the call of a meeting.

(e) The Chairman and the Vice Chairman shall be elected by the Council at the first meeting for a term of two years, and at every succeeding annual meeting occurring at the end of each such two-year term, except that a vacancy in either office may be filled by vote of the Council.

(f) The members of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each day engaged in the business of the Council pursuant to its authorization, and shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Authority of Commissioner

SEC. 302. In order to carry out the functions of the Institute, the Commissioner shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act (other than title IV), including but not limited to the authority—

(1) to prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary governing the manner of the Institute's operation and organization and personnel;

(2) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for the administration of this Act;

(3) to make grants or enter into contracts or other financial arrangements as authorized by title II, except that such grants, contracts, or other financial arrangements shall be limited to those recommended by the Council, or by a committee of members established by the Council for this purpose;

(4) to make advance, progress, and other payments in connection with contracts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529);

(5) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

(6) to receive and use funds donated by others, provided that such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used to further one or more of the general purposes of the Institute;

(7) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by law for persons serving without compensation;

(8) to employ such personnel as he may deem necessary to carry out the functions of the Institute under this Act, not to exceed twenty of which may be technical and professional persons including the Director of the Institute compensated at rates not to exceed $19,000 per annum without regard to the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949; and

(9) to delegate any of his functions under this act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

TITLE IV—FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION IN THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

SEC. 401. Section 3(a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) to promote and support activities, projects, and education in the arts and humanities in order to encourage and assist cultural development in the United States in conjunction with the programs provided in titles II and III of the Cultural Development Act of 1963."

SEC. 402. (a) Section 4(a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out "education, or public affairs" in clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "education, the arts and humanities, or public affairs";

(2) by striking out "scientific leaders" in clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "leaders in these fields"; and

(3) by striking out "other scientific or educational organizations" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "other organizations in the fields of science, the arts and humanities, and education".

(b) Section 7(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) A Division of the Arts and Humanities."

(c) The first sentence of section 9(a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "(except that in the case of the Division of the Arts and Humanities six of the members shall be eminent in the arts and humanities and five in other fields)".

(d) Section 9(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "research" and inserting in lieu thereof "activities".

(e) Section 10 of such Act is amended by inserting after "engineering, and other sciences" the following: ", and for study or work in the arts and humanities,".

(f) Section 11(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "such basic scientific research activities" and inserting in lieu thereof "such basic scientific research and other activities".

(g) Section 11(d) of such Act is amended by inserting after "scientific research" the following: "and other activities under this Act".

(h) Section 11(i) of such Act is amended by inserting after "scientific research" the following: "and other activities under this Act".

GREECE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here in this distinguished hall in the first week of spring in the year 1963. Each year at this time we celebrate the end of the long cold of winter, and the promise of the fine warmth of summer soon to come. It is a day of joy. But it is something else. It is the day on which we celebrate the freedom of a tiny nation. On a map of the world it is scarcely a dot, it is so minute. But on the great map of time and civilization it looms like a veritable Colossus, like a towering mountain of learning and culture. The sands of time may have many footprints, but the prints of this nation walk across all the Western World, and indeed all the Eastern World. It is the day we celebrate the freedom of the great nation of Greece.

The very name conjures up haunting memories.

There is the memory of art. We remember the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World, and among them the great statue of Zeus by Phideas, and the splendid temple of Artemis at Ephesus and the Colossus of Rhodes by Chares. We remember the splendor of the Doric, the Ionian, and Corinthian temples. From across 2,000 years the sculpture of ancient Greece reached its magic hand to form Michelangelo Buonarotti, and still haunts the beauty of Rodin today.

There is the memory of poetry. All of us have learned the wonders of epic poetry from Homer. All of us have encamped outside the walls of Troy with the avenging Greek Army; and all of us have wandered the world with Odysseus, with the distant memory of Penelope haunting the pages of these great books. We remember the odes of Pindar and the lyric poetry of Sappho.

We remember also the drama. There were the great and moving dramas of Aeschylus, with long forgotten death of Iphigenia still waiting to be avenged upon the head of Agamemnon. Sophocles is the one we most remember, with the enormity of the tragedies of Oedipus and Antigone still towering over the world today. And Euripides with Elektra. They are the great foundation stones of the drama, and so well were they written that when Rome turned to the drama, she achieved greatness only when she translated the Greeks, and even in the 20th century, the greatest of American dramatists, Eugene O'Neill, turned back to the Greeks to frame his own dramas, with Euripides and Sophocles walking anew in the pages of "Mourning Becomes Electra."

We remember the wars of Greece. We remember their strength when they stood against the tyranny of the Persians. We remember Thermopolae, and we remember Marathon.

"The mountains look on Marathon
And Marathon looks on the sea
And musing there an hour alone
I dreamed that Greece might still be free.
For, standing on the Persian's grave,
I could not deem myself a slave."

So spoke the poet Byron in "Don Juan," and so indeed speaks all the world when we read anew those tales of heroism, when a small nation stood against the power of an enormous empire.

We remember philosophy. We read again the works of Socrates, of Plato, of Aristotle. We walk through the grove of Academe with the men who came to be taunted, prodded by Socrates. We sit with Plato at the feet of Socrates, and we stand in awe before the ponderous mind of Aristotle. Their footsteps echo like distant thunder all through the history of Western philosophy, and for the great minds of each age, there is that moment when in desperation they turn again to the greatness of the Greeks.

We remember their politics. We stand in awe before the minds which first set up a system of government so similar to our own. We know that if these souls returned from the shades of the past, they could sit beside us in this very house, and could deliberate with us; indeed, would add new notes of wisdom to our deliberations.

These we remember, and these are only part of the greatness of Greece. I sat beside the Greek Orthodox Bishop Iakovos only a week ago when he was honored at a dinner in my district. After a long evening of moving speeches he rose solemnly, knowing that this would be an audience difficult to hold after all the other talks.

Ladies and gentlemen—

He said—

this is a great nation, with freedoms unheard of, especially freedom of speech. But for every privilege there is a price. Tonight the price of freedom of speech is patience.

I assure you, the audience was his, and listened to the wise words of a man who has been chosen president of the World Council of Churches.

Today we celebrate the freedom of this nation. For nearly 400 years Greece was a captive State in the Ottoman Empire but the seeds of freedom would not die and in the war for freedom from 1821 to 1829 Greece proved she had a right to stand among the nations of the modern world. In 1830 her freedom was guaranteed by the nations of the West.

There is a lesson in this for all of us. The freedom of Greece stood strong at the end of the Second World War when the power of communism sought to crush out the flame of freedom, but they fought with bullets and ballots and Greece is a free nation today.

The wisdom of Athens has prevailed over the power of Sparta. The love of liberty that burned brightly at Marathon still burns even brighter from the heights of the Acropolis today. When men look at the awesome brute power of Moscow standing upon the bodies of so many enslaved nations today, let them remember to ask, "Where is Sparta today?" And if Khrushchev is proud of

his name among the nations today, let him remember that we all remember Sophocles and Aristophanes, and Socrates, and Plato, and Aristotle, and Phidias, but who remembers the tyrants of Sparta?

Today we can all look with Byron at Marathon. Today we can celebrate the freedom of Greece, and if the course of history runs true, tomorrow we may celebrate the freedom of all the other oppressed nations of the world. In the strange course of history, in the not too distant future children may ask in puzzlement, "Who were Mao Tse-tung, and Stalin and Khrushchev?"

FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF *INDEPENDENCE* OF BYELORUSSIA

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 45th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Byelorussia. Like millions of other oppressed victims of Soviet colonialism, the people of Byelorussia today live in conditions near slavery behind the Iron Curtain. However, in coordination with representatives and spokesmen for other captive peoples, Americans of Byelorussian origin are maintaining the struggle for freedom of the land of their forefathers.

Therefore, this 45th anniversary of Byelorussian independence takes on additional significance since it serves as a reminder that the spirit of freedom continues to burn in the hearts of the people behind the Iron Curtain, and that the determination of all anti-Soviet peoples continues to be the fundamental weakness of the Soviet Union.

In comemmorating Byelorussian Independence, I join the other Members in encouraging them in their perseverance and hope for national independence through the principle of self-determination, and remind the brave Byelorussian people that they do have the sympathetic alinement of other captive nations who, in the cause of justice, must eventually triumph in their drive for political and economic liberty and freedom from the Soviet colonial yoke.

NATIONAL VISITOR AND STUDENT CENTER

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a "19-whereas" resolution that would lead to the development and construction of a National Visitor and Student Center in the District of Columbia.

Most of the whereases deal with the reason why we should have an adequate information center here in Washington, D.C., so that the millions of people who come here every year—and it is estimated that over 15 million people visit here each year—may have a better opportunity to benefit from seeing the memorials, the Capitol Building area, the Library of Congress, the Archives, the Art Gallery, and all the other things that can be seen here. This resolution calls for the creation of a committee of 20: 12 Members of Congress, 6 House Members and 6 Senators, to be appointed on a bipartisan basis; the Superintendent of National Capital Parks; the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission; the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District; the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; 2 distinguished citizens to be appointed by the President of the United States; and 2 members of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade.

This bill calls for the study of the feasibility and advisability of having such a center here in Washington, patterned after the one you can see in Williamsburg, where people may go, park their cars, go into an information center, be refreshed, and see a film demonstrating the historic role of this community.

As I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, my resolution proposes the appointment of a Commission which will carefully study and subsequently report to the Congress its conclusions respecting ways and means of effectively and relatively inexpensively educating the public, both at home and abroad, respecting American history, traditions, democratic processes and devotion to peace.

To be sure, the executive departments carry on some activities toward this objective. The Members of both Houses of the Congress give preferred attention to the subject in talking to their constituents and when speaking before many groups throughout the land. But it is clear that we have neglected to take advantage of the unequaled opportunity for influencing public opinion along these lines here in the Nation's Capital.

Almost 15 million people are now visiting Washington every year. This number included delegates to some 400 conventions, several hundred thousand students and an increasing number of visitors from other countries of the world.

Despite the fact that our National Capital contains a fabulous array of historical material and patriotic shrines as well as living demonstrations of democracy at work, there is no methodical and organized method for educating the millions of visitors concerning their existence and the lessons which can be learned in them.

In my opinion an appropriate designed and operated visitor center should be provided. The Park Service has recognized this need and made a small and very inadequate start by conducting a visitor center in the Old Haines Point Sea House. The residents, particularly the business people, see this need too and have included the outlines for such a center in their plans for revitalizing the central business district. It has also been suggested that the polo field in Potomac Park which provides ample space for parking of cars and sightseeing buses be converted into a visitor center.

My resolution does not contain any specifications respecting the solution to the shortcomings to which I have referred. Its preamble recites in detail existing needs and inadequacies and outlines in broad generalities the wisdom of establishing a vast educational program to create a true image of America in the minds of our millions of visitors.

NEWSLETTER FOR MINORITY STAFFING

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, several of our exceptional and capable freshman Members have already written with great clarity and forcefulness on the problem of minority staffing.

One of those, who has been most active in studying this problem and urging this remedial action, is Congressman ROBERT MCCLORY, of the 12th Congressional District from Illinois. His newsletter, dated March 7, in a few and well chosen words, clearly presents the need for more adequate minority staffing, and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues, thoughtful students on this subject, and members of the press:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN ROBERT MCCLORY REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

A great deal is being said and written these days about minority staffing. It is important for residents of the 12th Congressional District to become better acquainted with this issue and to understand how greater minority staffing can assist their Congressman.

In the first place, congressional committees are composed of majority and minority members. In the case of the Committee on Government Operations on which this writer serves, there are 19 Democratic Congressmen who make up the majority and 12 Republicans representing the minority. This 3-to-2 ratio is roughly that of the total House ratio of 258 Democrats to 177 Republicans.

Committee staffs which consist of lawyers, researchers, writers and other specialists of various types provide committees with the assistance they require in performing their tasks. This assistance consists of factual and legal research, bill drafting, preparing of analyses, summaries and reports, and many other detailed and necessary tasks. If minority members of a committee are to be served equally with the majority, it is essential that minority staff personnel should be provided in the same ratio as the total membership of the committee. For this reason, the Republican Conference (composed of all the Republican Members) urged that 40 percent of committee staffs should be named by the Republican (minority) members of the committee. The Democratic majority in the House opposed this move, and the Republi-

cans in their efforts to serve as an articulate opposition party have been obliged to rely on Democratic assurances that increased minority staff personnel will be furnished as required. While not an entirely satisfactory arrangement, this is a vastly improved situation.

Again, with respect to the writer's Committee on Government Operations (the so-called watchdog committee of the Congress), the majority has engaged 51 while the minority members have been allotted only 3 staff personnel. One can readily see that the staff ratio of 51 to 3 is completely out of line with the committee ratio of 19 to 12. Unless additional staff members are assigned to the Republican minority, there will be roughly three staff members for each Democratic Congressman on this committee, while four Republican Congressmen will have to share one of the minority staff members. In fairness, it must be pointed out that the staffs of some committees, such as the Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees, are essentially nonpartisan and strictly professional.

But the members of the Government Operations, Appropriations, Education and Labor, and other committees have vital responsibilities to draw attention to the weaknesses of the majority's position. How, for instance, can the minority of the Committee on Government Operations point out specific objections to the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration, the TVA, the executive department's improper management of the news, the Agriculture Department's abuses (responsible for the Billie Sol Estes scandal), foreign aid waste, etc., unless the minority has the staff with which to do its job? Without adequate staffs, the minority's investigations will result in whitewashes and inactivity in areas where close scrutiny and criticism should be provided.

Respect for and encouragement of the minority party are essential elements of our two-party system. Democrats as well as Republicans should support a vocal, constructive, and responsible minority. Adequate staffing for minority members is essential in performing this role.

FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, partially in response to the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] and secondly, as a matter of clarification of the on-again-off-again attitude of the President and his deficit spending programs, I would like to point out that Mr. Kennedy is running up a deficit at more than twice the rate of the Eisenhower administration. Not that I, in any form, approve of deficit spending under any administration, either Eisenhower or Kennedy or anyone else, but I find it rather amusing that the gentlemen would refer to the increased national debt under Mr. Eisenhower, when Mr. Kennedy will have, using the administration's own estimate for the fiscal year 1964, upped the national debt more in 3 years than Eisenhower did in 6 years.

Also, Mr. Kennedy will have spent money 30 percent faster in his first 3 years than Mr. Eisenhower did in his. In only 2 years, the Kennedy administration has added more new Federal employees than the Eisenhower administration did in 8 years.

At this point, I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Tribune which points out some very interesting and informative comparisons of the two administrations referred to:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 23, 1963]

A DEGREE OF FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

In his most recent plea for a tax cut without a cut in spending, President Kennedy asserted that such a program would offer a thrust to the economy "and also a degree of fiscal responsibility."

We note that Mr. Kennedy is withdrawing, by degrees, from his earlier contention that the tax program is fiscally responsible without qualifications. And well he might. Not even the most agile economic propagandist could devise a definition of fiscal responsibility which would cover everything put forward in its name by the New Frontier.

Last summer, for example, fiscal responsibility meant delaying a tax cut because a recession did not appear to be imminent. Today Mr. Kennedy's position is that "we don't believe there will be a recession this year" but that, nevertheless, "merely because our prospects look good in 1963, I would think it is all the more pressing for us to take action at this time."

In short, what was fiscally irresponsible last year has, for reasons which may have more to do with politics than economics, become fiscally responsible "to a degree."

In his campaign for the Presidency, Mr. Kennedy voiced firm opinions about fiscal responsibility. Here is what he said on November 4, 1960:

"I want to make it clear that * * * if I am elected President of the United States, we commit ourselves to a sound * * * fiscal and responsible monetary policy.

"From fiscal 1954 to fiscal 1960, the last 6 years, we increased the national debt by $21 billion. In the last 6 years, $21 billion.

"Never before in the history of the United States did any administration in peacetime have a deficit larger than this [the Eisenhower] administration in 1958, $12 billion. They would have had an increase in the debt of more than $10 billion except a Democratic Congress in the last 6 years cut the budget requests of the President of the United States by $10 billion.

"So if we are going to talk about fiscal responsibility; if we are going to talk about meeting our obligations; if we are going to talk about balanced budget; I want to look at the record.

"[The Eisenhower] administration [came to power] on a commitment to reduce Federal spending to $60 billion. It has never been close to $60 billion. They have spent 46 percent more than Harry Truman spent. They have added 106,000 new Federal employees, I think it's about time the people knew."

Very well, then, let's look at the record after 2 years of the Kennedy administration, which was likewise elected on a clear promise of fiscal responsibility.

In 3 years, using the administration's own estimate for the fiscal year 1964, Mr. Kennedy will have run up a cumulative deficit of $26 billion. In 3 years, $26 billion. This is more than double the Eisenhower rate. The Kennedy deficit for 1964, now pinned precariously at $11.9 billion, is almost certain to end up higher than the Eisenhower bellringer of 1958–59.

Mr. Kennedy will have spent money 30 percent faster in his first 3 years than Mr. Eisenhower did in his. And in only 2 years, the Kennedy administration has added more new Federal employees than the Eisenhower administration did in 8.

Mr. Kennedy cannot, with consistency, call his program fiscally responsible, even to a degree. It's time for Congress to do what Mr. Kennedy commended it for doing under Mr. Eisenhower: Cut the budget requests of the President and make certain that our fiscal policy is responsible—not by the wavering Kennedy definition, but by the definition of sensible economists and businessmen everywhere. It's time the people knew—and, fortunately, many of them already do.

GROSS MISMANAGEMENT IN MILITARY PROCUREMENT SELF-SABOTAGES U.S. MILITARY COMBAT READINESS

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1963, the Comptroller General issued a report on its study of the supply of repair parts needed for combat and combat-support vehicles of the U.S. Army. This General Accounting Office—GAO—review covered the years of 1958–62.

The management inefficiencies, neglect, and irresponsibility of the U.S. Army Logistics, Ordnance, and Materiel Commands seriously endanger our defensive and offensive military commands.

The operational deficiencies for the supply of vital repair parts for tanks, artillery, and other combat-support vehicles can be attributed to the Army Tank-Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

A partial checklist of Army installations showed the following out-of-combat-readiness vehicles due to lack of spare parts:

First. In Korea, many of our M–48 medium tanks, and other combat vehicles were out of commission due to lack of parts, some of which had been on order for more than a year.

Second. On December 2, 1960, our M–48 medium tanks were in need of 3,900 booster coil items that were in short supply, many of which were urgently needed in Korea.

Third. U.S. Army tanks and combat vehicles were out of combat readiness in the United States, Europe, Korea, Okinawa, and the Panama Canal Zone due to 994 unfilled orders for parts on December 2, 1960. Some of these parts orders had been on order for as long as 313 days.

Fourth. The lack of cylinders was putting many self-propelled artillery howitzers in Europe out of commission.

Fifth. In six Army installations in the United States, 600 tanks, artillery pieces, and combat-support vehicles were out of commission during 1960 and 1961 due to a short supply of repair parts.

Sixth. At Fort Bragg, N.C., 87 combat or combat-supply vehicles were not combat ready on March 8, 1960. Repair items had been on order for from 3 to 9 months.

In its thorough review of the Army Tank-Automotive Center, the GAO found

that, on June 30, 1961, that organization had 688 active items out of stock, 260 of which were identified as essential for combat purposes.

The Comptroller General cited three specific management deficiencies that were primarily responsible for the lack of repair parts:

First, delays in awarding contracts after procurement decisions were made; second, delays in determining whether to procure; and third, delays in determining needs for parts.

In his report to the Congress, the Comptroller General cautioned that his "review of unfilled orders disclosed a very serious condition. As of September 10, 1961, the ATAC had 15,662 orders outstanding for repair parts from Army installations throughout the world."

The Comptroller General's report cited an alarming number of instances which attested to the failure of this system to function properly:

> Lack of repair parts in the Army supply system contributed to the reduction in the combat readiness of certain of the Army's combat and combat-support vehicles. In addition, the lack of repair parts was the primary reason for the incurrence of unnecessary costs of over $500,000 during fiscal year 1961 by procurement of parts locally that are normally procured centrally at lower prices.

The GAO revealed that the Red River Arsenal, during fiscal year 1961, procured 184 repair parts for about $362,000. On the basis of unit prices paid for identical parts by ATAC on previous occasions, these parts should have cost only $249,000. The arsenal, therefore, paid $113,000, or 46 percent, more than ATAC would have paid for the same items through centralized procurement.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no excuse for the gross mismanagement that permeates our U.S. Army supply operations for vital parts needed to keep our tanks, artillery, and combat-supply vehicles in instant readiness. The revelations of the General Accounting Office constitute, in effect, a self-sabotage of our military capabilities.

Our Federal system of administrative management is in sore need of a major and complete reform. It lacks production objectives, production techniques, production accountability and responsibility.

Our management process encourages mismanagement and discourages efficiency and good management.

RUSSIA'S CZARIST DESPOTISM CRUSHED HUNGARY'S 1848 WAR OF INDEPENDENCE—RUSSIA'S SOVIET-COMMUNISM TOTALITARIANISM THREATENS ENTIRE FREE WORLD

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, I had the honor of addressing the United Hungarian Societies of Cleveland, Ohio, on the occasion of the 115th Anniversary of Hungary's 1848 War of Independence.

It was my privilege at that time to pay tribute to Hungary's great leader and patriot, Louis Kossuth.

The following is a quote from a speech delivered by Kossuth in Cleveland, Ohio, on February 3, 1852:

> Yours is a mighty republic, destined to enforce the law of nations, upon which rests the delivery of the world from an all-overwhelming despotism.

By "overwhelming despotism," Kossuth was specifically referring to the then ruling Russian Czarist Government. The Soviet-Communist depotism that we have today is both an extension and an expansion of the czarist tyranny. Kossuth was truly prophetic. The United States is confronted with an all-overwhelming threat led and directed against us by the Russian Soviet-Communist Party and government.

My address before the United Hungarian Societies of Cleveland follows:

Mr. President, Andrew Dono, reverend and, respected members of the clergy; the distinguished mayor, Ralph S. Locher, honored guests; my esteemed fellow Americans of Hungarian ancestry, I appear before you today with a deep sense of attachment by personal and ancestral ties.

We share a common Hungarian inheritance of moralities, of political ideals, of culture, of language.

We share an appreciation of the gay and, at times, sad emotional harmonies of Magyar music.

We have a common acceptance of those highest moralities of the Christian-Judaic religions and our Western civilization.

There is implanted in our Hungarian background an abiding faith and love for one's fellow man.

That greatest Hungarian, Louis Kossuth, has inculcated in every Hungarian some of those political ideals upon which this great country was founded.

That is why I am especially grateful to you for your kind invitation to meet with you, my Hungarian kinsmen.

I extend to this distinguished Hungarian community my respects and offer you my good wishes.

My compatriots, we, each of us, share a deep sadness on this commemoration of Hungary's war of independence of 1848.

That was was a struggle between tyranny and freedom.

It was not a new struggle.

That clash has occurred in every generation since the beginning of recorded history.

One-hundred and fifteen years ago, the Hungarian war had for its objectives: Political home rule for Hungary; an equal political status in a dual monarchy; emancipation of Hungarian serfs and peasants; economic, social, and political reforms to raise the status of the peoples of both Hungary and Austria.

The war of 1848 was a revolution against the tyrannies resulting from the political absolutism of an aristocratic monarchy.

It is appropriate to recall the events of that period.

They are quite applicable to our own unrecognized struggle to maintain our freedom.

In the year of 1848, Europe was in a state of political fermentation.

The forces of liberty, of constitutional limitations upon government, of constitutional guarantees recognizing the sovereignty of the people, were reaching a crescendo.

These popular demands were the aftermath of the American and French Revolutions.

America has her Revolutionary War of 1775; Hungary has her Revolutionary War of 1848.

In our own war of independence, George Washington came to the fore and carried the cause of freedom to final fulfillment.

We, here today, are the beneficiaries of Washingtons personal abilities and devotion.

We are the legatees of man's greatest inheritance, freedom.

The testators are those heroic American soldiers and people who sacrificed 8 years of war to hand down to us our most precious inheritance.

Historians record the 1848 Hungarian war of independence as a failure.

They unanimously state that Kossuth's objectives and Hungary's cause were lost in that war.

That is not my interpretation of the events of that time.

It is not my evaluation of the life work of Louis Kossuth.

No one can possibly understand the casual relationship between the noble efforts of Louis Kossuth, the war of 1848, and subsequent events unless one fully understands and appreciates the "Father of the Hungarian Revolution," Louis Kossuth.

We are not gathered here today to commemorate a lost revolution or to pay our respects to the memory of the leader of a lost revolution.

The Hungarian ideals of independence in the war of 1848; the Kossuth principles of the brotherhood of man were not merely vainglorious, frustrated dreams.

The war of 1884 did result in the attainment of Kossuth's objectives in a very short time after 1848.

Kossuth's grand designs, his platforms, his objectives were fulfilled and came to pass due almost wholly to his political leadership; to his devotion to the cause of freedom; and to his sympathetic understanding for his fellow men.

These are some of the Kossuth reforms that came to fruition: Measures for the emancipation of serfs were enacted; freedom of the press was granted in both Austria and Hungary; flogging and corporal punishment were abolished.

The constitutional settlement in 1867, between Austria and Hungary, was effected. This settlement was based upon the Kossuth Hungarian Constitution of 1848.

Under the terms of the 1867 settlement, the dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary was created.

Power for concerted action within international and military spheres was centralized.

Austria and Hungary were each allotted equal, separate and autonomous powers in domestic affairs.

His crusade for orphanages, for hospitals, for mass education, for fiscal reforms, for economic growth, for industrialization, succeeded in bringing about an early realization of these sociological and economic goals.

Kossuth's character and political ideals were influenced and patterned, to a large degree, upon the life of George Washington.

As a youth, he attended that outstanding law academy at Sarospatok.

Part of his catechism at Sarospatok were these questions and answers:

"Who was the first man?"

The answer to that question was "George Washington."

"What form of government is the best?"

The answer to that question was "The Republican form of Government."

Although Louis Kossuth was the greatest Hungarian, he was also a great American—in his beliefs, in his heart.

Louis Kossuth was a profound philosopher, an eminent historian.

He was a humanitarian above all. His most profound conviction was the brotherhood of man.

He was equally humble, loyal and devoted to his associates, to the peasants, to his superiors in rank.

He was a masterful linguist. He had a remarkable command of a beautiful Shakespearean English.

In addition to his native Magyar language, he was fluent in Latin and German.

Louis Kossuth was an eloquent orator, a fervent inspirational crusader. Yet, he was never a demagog.

He was a strict moralist, a truly devout practitioner of Christian-Judaic moralities.

Kossuth was Hungary's first modern journalist. It was his editorship and his contributions that successfully established the Pesti Hirlap.

It is said that Kossuth was proud. That is true. But it was not an arrogant self-pride.

It was a pride in the principles he believed in.

He had a mind that was conscious of its own rectitude. He zealously protected the sanctity of his grand concepts, of his moralities, of his principles.

Louis Kossuth belongs not alone to the history of Hungary. His concepts are eternal. His work will live in the recording of world history.

My friends:

Father Kossuth still lives. He holds a special place of honor in our hearts.

He remains a symbol of those rare qualities that are so lacking today, that are so sorely needed by this Nation and the free world.

His brilliant concepts provide an answer, the only answer, to these forces that threaten our existence.

Effective countermeasures against the Soviet-Communist politico-military war against all freedom, against all free peoples cannot be founded upon compromise of fundamental principles.

Survival cannot be predicated upon policies of vacillation, conciliation, compromise, retreat, and surrender.

It is a sorrowful commentary to recall that the aspirations of the Hungarian people for freedom have been brutally crushed, bathed in Hungarian blood on three occasions by Russian despotism and totalitarianism.

On August 11, 1848, General Gorgey surrendered his Hungarian Army not to the Austrians, but to the Russian Field Marshal Paskiewitisch.

Hungary's desperate struggle for freedom was defeated not by its oppressor, Austria, but by the overwhelming military forces of Russia.

In the year 1919, Bela Kun overthrew Hungary's democratic government. He coldbloodedly murdered thousands of Hungary's leaders.

He imposed a Communist regime upon her people. He extinguished all Hungarian freedoms.

Bela Kun was a Moscow-trained murdering revolutionist. Bela Kun was the forerunner of Castro.

That revolution was conceived, planned and its execution directed out of Moscow. History repeated itself in Cuba.

It is most tragic that the State Department of the United States is so incapable of reading and understanding, and interpreting historical events.

It is only 6½ years ago, that these same Soviet-Communist murderers machine-gunned the children of Budapest, in October and November of 1956.

Again, the Russian Soviet-Communist despotism crushed Hungary's struggle for freedom by brutal bloody massacre.

The security of neither the Russian nor the Soviet nation was threatened on any one of these occasions. There was never a scintilla of legitimate justification for these shocking brutalities.

We must not allow time to soften or dim the atrocities of Budapest.

The sacrifices of the children, the women, the men of Hungary will have been in vain if we do not recognize the diabolical purposes behind these events.

These massacres of Hungarian people are a prolongation of a more than 400-year-old fixed obsession for aggressionist expansion—First under Russian czarist despotism and now under Soviet-Communist world totalitarianism.

The Nikita Khrushchev who ordered military mass murder attacks upon the Hungarian civilian population is the same Nikita Khrushchev who repeatedly threatens the evaporation of the American people, you and I, with 50- and 100-megaton nuclear bombs.

The Hungarian Freedom Crusade should serve as a reminder to each of us, every day, every hour, that the same diabolical forces seek our destruction too.

The United States happens to be only a few years further away, on Mr. Khrushchev's timetable.

Today, 1963, marks another anniversary that is of critical significance to we Americans.

It was in 1933, that this Nation gave diplomatic recognition to the Soviet.

The year 1933, marks the beginning of self-defeating policies toward the Soviet and world communism.

This year is the 30th year of our shameful, ruinous policies that are based upon self-deception.

We like to believe the myth that the inherent strength of freedom, the weakness of a tyrannical government assure the United States of victory in this deadly global power war.

Many people have laid down their lives to learn the contrary.

It is not ordained by anyone that freedom cannot be lost.

It is still true that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. We have lost all vigilance.

The most honest homage we can pay to those who died in Budapest is to recognize, and to admit that freemen can, and do, die in vain.

We have become corrupted by prejudices, by false images. Chastity of mind, the stark truth, is a prerequisite virtue for a free people.

A large segment of our intelligentsia, and of those teachers and news media who form and shape public opinion offer the theory that communism is only an ideology, another political philosophy, an alternative series of sociological and economic principles.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a completely false concept of the crises that confront us.

The sociological and economic theories of Karl Marx have been proven to be fallacious almost in toto.

We are not dealing with Marxist dialectics or ideology.

The Soviet-Communist world conspiracy is a system of world political-military power. It is the product not of Marx, but of that mad evil genius, Lenin.

This Moscow-directed worldwide campaign is a permanent international revolution played with the skillful advance planning of a chess game.

All military, economic, social, cultural, ideological resources are focused and concentrated upon world power politics.

Neither freedom, nor prosperity, nor materialism, nor patriotism, nor military strength offers security for this Nation.

We must learn that the survival of this Nation is dependent upon a combination and coordination of truth, power, policy, and will.

For an accurate assessment of the requirements for survival, this Nation and every other nation demands:

First. An accurate appraisal of its own strength and capacity.

Second. Assess correctly the power of the forces against it.

Third. Assess correctly the potential combination of actions the enemy may take.

Fourth. Plan correctly, and be ready to activate, political and other actions under foreseeable future circumstances.

We must, as a people, as a Nation, first establish our national aspirations and human values.

We are currently befuddled in vague, abstract gossip about freedom, survival and peace.

These concepts should be clarified and assigned their proper priorities.

A large segment of our population judges peace to be of supreme importance. They are the citizens who accept the pro-Communist slogan: "Peace at any price."

This attitude is reflected in our national policies, that too often materialize into appeasement, and the attempted bribery of the Communist-Soviet forces.

Another large segment of Americans consider survival to be all important. This spirit is exemplified by another pro-Communist slogan: "Better Red than dead."

These Americans have forgotten that survival without freedom is servitude.

It is heartening to know that there is a third segment of the American people. It is they who accept freedom as the indispensable ingredient of man's existence.

Human history is a record of man's struggle to be free. This Nation was founded, not upon concepts of survival or peace. It was founded upon the concept of human freedom.

In order to effectively bear the burden of our world responsibility, this Nation must reestablish freedom as the keystone of our national purpose. We must never forget that freedom is indispensable, survival is crucial, peace is desirable.

There are those, including Mr. Khrushchev, who maintain that this country must choose between freedom, survival, or peace. I do not believe that we must necessarily sacrifice any one of these objectives in order to preserve the others.

I am convinced that a realistic approach by this Nation, and our people, to the causes of the world crises would realize freedom, secure survival, and attain an enduring, true peace for all humanity.

My friends, the United States and the free world have completely failed to comprehend the magnitude, the scope, the weapons systems of the Soviet-Communist war.

It is a war of demoralization, disintegration, and destruction.

It is a relentless, unlimited war of indefinite duration.

It is a war of total enmity, to which our enemies are irrevocably committed.

It is a dual war.

One war is carried on by the more than 100 Communist parties, organized and operating in every nation on this globe. These parties recognize and serve under the leadership of Nikita Khrushchev as First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The second war is the one being waged by the Soviet and its satellite bloc of nations. This second war concentrates the total military, political, economic, diplomatic, and all other human resources upon the disintegration of the free world. Khrushchev is the commander in chief for both of these wars.

While the Soviet-Communist forces have been waging a unilateral campaign of political, military, economic, diplomatic, and psychomoral war, the United States has been waging a unilateral campaign for peace.

Our foreign policies, for the past 30 years, have completely failed to meet the realities and the practicalities of the Communist offensive.

Our foreign policies have not materially changed in the past 30 years.

There has not been one 5-year period in the past 30 years during which the Soviet Union has not become relatively stronger and the United States has not become relatively weaker.

We are losing the war for survival at an ever-accelerating pace.

Permit me to review some of the failures of our foreign policies that have contributed to our present critical posture:

First. For a period, we relied upon military superiority. Yet, our heaviest losses—the loss of middle Europe and China—were sustained between 1945 and 1950 when the United States had a clear military superiority.

Second. For a time, we relied upon military alliances. NATO and SEATO were not an effective answer. They are today rapidly disintegrating.

Third. The policy of massive retaliation is now only a memory.

Fourth. The United Nations is now recognized as no hindrance to Soviet-Communist subversions.

Fifth. Summit meetings and endless negotiations are an exercise in futility.

Sixth. Foreign aid, atoms for peace plans, international loans, disarmament negotiations, nuclear test bans have proven to be self-defeating.

As a people, we continue to be guilty of oversimplifications. We like to believe that there are easy, simple answers to our most complex international problems.

Let us remind you of some of these oversimplifications that have been peddled to our people.

First. The only missile we need is to distribute Sears, Roebuck catalogs around the world.

Second. The only trouble with the State Department is the failure of our diplomats to speak the language of the nation to which they are accredited to.

Third. Electrify all rural villages.

Fourth. Land reform.

Fifth. Get rid of all dictators—Cuba is an example.

These are samples of our simpleness and gullibility.

Ladies and gentlemen: It is my conviction that the steady decline of the U.S. power and prestige is backing us into the desperate alternatives of either:

Surrender or a preventive thermonuclear war.

Our present unrealistic foreign policies invite and encourage the horrors of either a nuclear war or a cleverly hidden continuation of retreat and eventual surrender.

But, my fellow Americans, there is a third alternative if we have the will to accept the realities of our situation.

The Nation and its people must first of all face up to the grim truth:

First. That the Soviet-Communist international conspiracy is dedicated to the destruction of all free nations and all free peoples.

Second. That the Soviet-led Communist conspiracy is waging a total war against the free world.

Third. That the United States is the No. 1 target of the Soviet-Communist campaign.

Fourth. That the Soviet-Communist forces are winning that world politicomilitary struggle and the United States and the free world are losing it.

Fifth. That we cannot win this struggle unless we recognize its existence, and arouse in our people a will to defend themselves, and to win this conflict.

Sixth. We cannot formulate effective policies to counter Communist-Soviet aggressions, guerrilla wars, and subversions until we identify our enemies, correctly appraise and locate the deployment of their forces.

Ladies and gentlemen; if we accept the need to give national and official recognition to the Soviet-Communist self-proclaimed and self-admitted campaign to destroy all free nations, there are two additional fundamental requirements that this Nation must accept and fulfill if we wish to survive.

The first requirement is that the United States restore a clear, preponderant military superiority over the Soviet-Communist forces.

We have permitted our military power to erode until the Soviet now has a relative parity of military firepower. This policy invites national and international suicide.

Our military superiority and firepower should be in a ratio of at least 1½ to 1 over the Soviet at all times.

We have the wealth, the economy to attain and to maintain this supremacy.

It is essential for our survival.

We must have sufficient military power to prevent a Khrushchev miscalculation of our will and ability to completely eradicate the Soviet Empire. Our first aim must be to avoid the inception of war and still attain our national and international objectives.

The second requirement is in the field of foreign policy.

We sorely need a complete reevaluation of our national goals, our foreign policies, our policymaking machinery.

There is a serious lack of orientation and coordination between our military capabilities and our foreign policies.

Our foreign policies, our economy, our military capabilities are interdependent and must support each other to attain our national objectives and aspirations.

The three successive fiascos of Cuba are a classic example of the complete lack of coordination between the President's Office, the National Security Council, the State Department, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

I refer, first, to our policies that aided Castro's overthrow of Batista when our officials were fully aware of the fact that he was a Soviet-Communist agent.

Second, I refer to the Bay of Pigs debacle—the most ill-conceived, misplanned, and mismanaged military fiasco in all history.

Third, I refer to the recent and present policies that encouraged and permitted the Soviet to convert Cuba into a military base that critically threatens our margin for survival.

Our present policy of halfhearted containment is ineffective and wholly inadequate to meet the Soviet-Communist challenge.

This Nation cannot continue in its present state of schizophrenia psychosis, its split personality and vacillations toward communism.

A military supremacy, combined with a firm, realistic foreign policy is the only hope for our survival.

It is the only hope for the liberation of Hungary and the captive nations.

The sacrifices of the Hungarian people upon the altar of freedom will not have been in vain, if we can remember that freedom is not free. It demands vigilance, courage, dedication, and sacrifice.

The moral principles upon which our freedom is founded are irreconciliable with totalitarianism. Freedom is not compromisable.

Communism is an absolute evil. It is not debatable.

The survival of this Nation, of the free world is not negotiable.

RHODE ISLAND CHARTER TERCENTENARY

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 300th anniversary of the Rhode Island Charter of 1663; I ask permission to revise and extend remarks in order that it may be printed in full in the RECORD.

Rhode Island was colonized by religious dissenters from Massachusetts, led by Roger Williams. For them he obtained a parliamentary charter in 1643 by which the colony was governed until the restoration of Charles II in 1660. As soon as the restoration had been officially proclaimed, John Clarke was sent to England as the deputy of the colonists in order to solicit a new charter. This was necessary since the charter of 1643 had been granted by parliamentary rather than by royal authority.

Clarke's petition to Charles II contained the following words which found their way into the charter, and are now inscribed on the south front of the Rhode Island Statehouse:

> Wherefore your petitioners have it much on their hearts (if they may be permitted) to hold forth a lively experiment, that a flourishing civill State may stand, yea, and best be maintained, and that among English spirits, with a full liberty in religious concernments.

The charter of 1663 was the first creation by British patent of a body politic. Previously, of course, corporations had been constituted within the realm for the government of colonial plantations; but now specific powers were granted for administering all the affairs of a colony within the colonial territory. And in its provision for representation of the freemen of the colony the charter was a major improvement on that granted to Massachusetts.

The colony was given its new name in the clause establishing it as a body politic:

> We create and make them a bodye politique or corporate, with the powers and privileges hereinafter mentioned. And accordingly * * * wee * * * doe ordeyne, constitute and declare, that they, the sayd (named persons and all subsequently admitted freemen) shall be * * * forever hereafter, a bodie corporate and politique, in fact and name, by the name of The Governor and Company of the English Collonie of Rhode-Island and Providence Plantation, in New-England, in America.

Then follow provisions relating to the Governor, Deputy Governor, and 10 assistants, for an annual general assembly with power to admit freemen, elect officers, and make laws:

> So as such laws, ordinances, and constitutions, so made, be not contrary and repugnant unto, but (as near as may be) agreeable to the laws of this our realm of England, considering the nature and constitution of the place and people there.

Provisions of the charter grant the power to establish courts, and to hold annual elections. The first officers are named. The power to bear arms is granted:

> And to use and exercise the law martiall in such cases only as occasion shall necessarily require.

There is to be no interference with fishery rights. There shall be freedom of migration from England. The inhabitants and their children are to have the rights of persons born in England. There shall be appeals to the Crown in controversies with other New England colonies, and there shall be freedom of movement among the colonies. This clause is of interest since it is the germ of the idea of what much later became the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States:

Itt shall be lawful to and for the inhabitants of sayd Collony of Providence Plantation, without let or molestation, to passe and repasse with freedom, into and through the rest of the English Colionies, upon their lawful and civill occasions, and to converse, and hold commerce and trade, with such of the inhabitants of our other English Collonies as shall bee willing to admit them thereunto, they behaveing themselves peaceably among them; any act, clause or sentence, in any of the sayd Collonies provided, or that shall bee provided, to the contrary in anywise notwithstanding.

And most important of all:

The government is to be held by the free and voluntary consent of all or the greater part of the free inhabitants.

By the charter of 1663 complete religious liberty was granted. This is the famous provision:

Noe person within the sayd colonye, at any tyme hereafter, shall bee any wise molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question, for any differences in opinione in matters of religion, and doe not actually disturb the civil peace of our sayd colony; but that all and everye person and persons may, from tyme to tyme, and at all tymes hereafter, freelye and fullye have and enjoye his and theire owne judgments and consciences, in matters of religious concernments * * * any lawe, statute, or clause, therein contayned, or to bee contayned, usage, of custome of this realme, to the contrary hereof, in any wise, notwithstanding.

Founded by those to whom freedom of conscience was more precious than life itself, Rhode Island, throughout its history, has preserved its proud heritage. At this time of celebration of the tercentenary of a famous charter, Rhode Islanders will honor the distinguished past of their State in its days as a colony by preserving in the present and in the future its tradition of freedom.

LUCAS, SAMUEL. CHARTERS OF THE OLD ENGLISH COLONIES IN AMERICA. LONDON, J. PARKER, 1850. JK49.L8.

RHODE ISLAND, GRANTED BY KING CHARLES II, IN THE FOURTEENTH YEAR OF HIS REIGN.

Charles the Second, by the grace of God, &c. To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting. Whereas we have been informed by the humble petition of our trusty and well beloved subjects John Clarke, on the behalf of Benjamin Arnold, William Brenton, William Codington, Nicholas Easton, William Boulston, John Porter, John Smith, Samuel Gorton, John Weekes, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, Gregory Dext·, John Cogeshall, Joseph Clarke, Randall Houlden, John Greene, John Roome, Samuel Wildbore, William Field, James Barker, Richard Tew, Thomas Harris, and William Dyre, and the rest of the purchasers, and free inhabitants of our island called Rhode Island, and the rest of the colony of Providence Plantations, in the Narraganset Bay, in New England in America, That they, pursuing with peace and loyal minds, their sober, serious, and religious intentions, of godly edifying themselves, and one another, in the holy Christian faith and worship as they were persuaded, together with the gaining over and conversion of the poor ignorant Indian natives, in those parts of America, to the sincere profession and obedience of the same faith and worship, did not only by the consent and good encouragement of our royal progenitors, transport themselves out of this kingdom of England into America; but also since their arrival there, after their first settlement amongst other our subjects in those parts, for the avoiding of discord, and those many evils which were likely to ensue upon those our subjects, not being able to bear in those remote parts their different apprehensions in religious concernments; and in pursuance of the aforesaid ends, did once again leave their desirable stations and habitations, and with excessive labour and travel, hazard, and charge, did transplant themselves into the midst of the Indian natives, who, as we are informed, are the most potent princes and people of all that country; whereby the good providence of God (from whom the plantations have taken their name) upon their labour and industry, they have not only been preserved to admiration, but have increased and prospered, and are seized and possessed, by purchase and consent of the said natives, to their full content, of such lands, islands, rivers, harbours, and roads, as are very convenient both for plantations, and also for building of ships, supply of pipe-staves, and other merchandize, and which lies very commodious in many respects for commerce, and to accommodate our southern plantations, and may much advance the trade of this our realm, and greatly enlarge the territories thereof; they having by near neighbourhood to, and friendly society with, the great body of the Narraganset Indians, given them encouragement, of their own accord, to subject themselves, their people and lands, unto us; whereby (as is hoped) there may, in time, by the blessing of God upon their endeavours, be laid a sure foundation of happiness to all America.

And whereas, in their humble address, they have freely declared, That it is much on their hearts (if they be permitted) to hold forth a lively experiment, that a most flourishing civil state may stand, and best be maintained, and that among our English subjects, with a full liberty in religious concernments, and that true piety, rightly grounded upon gospel principles, will give the best and greatest security to sovereignty, and will lay in the hearts of men the strongest obligations to true loyalty: now know ye, That we being willing to encourage the hopeful undertaking of our said loyal and loving subjects, and to secure them in the free exercise and enjoyment of all their civil and religious rights appertaining to them as our loving subjects; and to preserve unto them that liberty in the true Christian faith and worship of God, which they have sought with so much travel, and with peaceable minds and loyal subjection to our loyal progenitors, and ourselves, to enjoy: and because some of the people and inhabitants of the same colony cannot, in their private opinion, conform to the public exercise of religion, according to the liturgy, form, and ceremonies of the church of England, or take or subscribe the oaths and articles made and established in that behalf; and for that the same, by reason of the remote distances of those places, will, as we hope, be no breach of the unity and uniformity established in this nation, have therefore thought fit, and do hereby publish, grant, ordain, and declare, that our royal will and pleasure is—

That no person within the said colony, at any time hereafter, shall be any-wise molested, punished, disquited, or called in question, for any differences in opinion in matters of religion, and do not actually disturb the civil peace of our said colony; but that all and every person and persons may, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, freely and fully have and enjoy his and their own judgments and consciences, in matters of religious concernments, throughout the tract of land hereafter mentioned, they behaving themselves peaceably and quietly, and not using this liberty to licentiousness and profaneness, nor to the civil injury or outward disturbance of others, any law, statute, or clause therein contained, or to be contained, usage or custom of this realm, to the contrary hereof, in any wise notwithstanding. And that they may be in the better capacity to defend themselves in their just rights and liberties against all the enemies of the Christian faith, and others, in all respects, we have further thought fit, and at the humble petition of the persons aforesaid, are graciously pleased to declare, That they shall have and enjoy the benefit of our late act of indemnity, and free pardon, as the rest of our subjects in other our dominions and territories have; and to create and make them a body politic or corporate, with the powers or privileges hereinafter mentioned: and accordingly, our will and pleasure is, and of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, we have ordained, constituted, and declared, and by these presents, for us, our heirs, and successors, do ordain, constitute, and declare.

That they the said William Brenton, William Coddington, Nicholas Easton, Benedict Arnold, William Boulston, John Porter, Samuel Gorton, John Smith, John Weekes, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, Gregory Dexter, John Cogeshall, Joseph Clarke, Randall Houlden, John Greene, John Roome, William Dyre, Samuel Wildbore, Richard Tew, William Field, Thomas Harris, James Barker, Rainsborrow, Williams, and John Nickson, and all such others as are now, or hereafter shall be admitted, free of the company and society of our colony of Providence Plantations, in the Narraganset Bay, in New England, shall be, from time to time, and for ever hereafter, a body corporate and politic, in fact and name, by the name of the Governor and Company of the English Colony of Rhode Island, and Providence Plantations, in New England, in America; and that by the same name they and their successors shall and may have perpetual succession, and shall and may be persons able and capable in the law to sue and be sued, to plead and be impleaded, to answer and to be answered unto, to defend and to be defended, in all and singular suits, causes, quarrels, matters, actions, and things, of what kind or nature soever; and also to have, take, possess, acquire, and purchase lands, tenements, or hereditaments, or any goods or chattels, and the same to lease, grant, demise, alien, bargain, sell and dispose of, at their own will and pleasure, as other our liege people of this our realm of England, or any corporation or body politic within the same, may lawfully do; and further.

That they the said Governor and Company, and their successors, shall and may, for ever hereafter, have a common seal, to serve and use for all matters, causes, things, and affairs whatsoever, of them and their successors, and the same seal to alter, change, break, an make new from time to time, at their will and pleasure, as they shall think fit. And further, we will and ordain, and by these presents, for us, our heirs, and successors, do declare and appoint, That for the better ordering and managing of the affairs and business of the said company and their successors, there shall be one governor, one deputy governor, and ten assistants, to be from time to time constituted, elected, and chosen, out of the freemen of the said company, for the time being, in such manner and from as is hereafter in these presents expressed; which said officers shall apply themselves to take care for the best disposing and ordering of the general business and affairs of and concerning the lands and hereditaments herein aftermentioned to be

granted, and the plantation thereof, and the government of the people there. And for the better execution of our royal pleasure herein, we do for us, our heirs, and successors, assign, name, constitute, and appoint, the aforesaid Benedict Arnold to be the first and present governor of the said company, and the said William Brenton to be the deputy governor, and the said William Boulston, John Porter, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, John Smith, John Greene, John Cogeshall, James Barker, William Field, and Joseph Clarke, to be the ten present assistants of the said company, to continue in the said several offices respectively, until the first Wednesday which shall be in the month of May now next coming.

And further, we will, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do ordain and grant, That the governor of the said company, for the time being, or in his absence, by occasion of sickness, or otherwise, by his leave or permission, the deputy governor, for the time being, shall and may, from time to time, upon all occasions, give order for the assembling of the said company, and calling them together, to consult and advise of the business and affairs of the said company; and that for ever hereafter, twice in every year, that is to say, on every first Wednesday in the month of May, and on every last Wednesday in October, or oftener, in case it shall be requisite, the assistants, and such of the freemen of the said company, not exceeding six persons, for Newport, four persons for each of the respective towns of Providence, Portsmouth, and Warwick, and two persons for each other place, town or city, who shall be from time to time thereunto elected or deputed by the major part of the freemen of the respective places, towns or places for which they shall be so elected or deputed, shall have a general meeting or assembly, then and there to consult, advise and determine, in and about the affairs and business of the said company and plantations. And further, we do of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, give and grant unto the said governor and company of the English colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, in New England, in America, and their successors.

That the governor, or in his absence, or by his permission, the deputy governor of the said company, for the time being, the assistants, and such of the freemen of the said company as shall be so aforesaid elected or deputed, or so many of them as shall be present at such meeting or assembly, as aforesaid, shall be called the general assembly; and that they, or the greatest part of them then present, whereof the governor, or deputy governor, and six of the assistants at least, to be seven, shall have, and have hereby given and granted unto them, full power and authority, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, to appoint, alter, and change such days, times and places of meeting, and general assembly, as they shall think fit, and to chuse, nominate and appoint such and so many persons as they shall think fit, and shall be willing to accept the same, to be free of the said company and body politic and them into the same to admit, and to elect, and constitute such offices and officers, and to grant such needful commissions as they shall think fit and requisite, for ordering, managing, and dispatching of the affairs of the said governor and company, and their successors; and, from time to time, to make, ordain, constitute or repeal, such laws, statutes, orders and ordinances, forms and ceremonies of government and magistracy, as to them shall seem meet, for the good and welfare of the said company, and for the government and ordering of the lands and hereditaments herein after mentioned to be granted, and of the people that do, or at any time hereafter shall inhabit, or be within the same; so as such laws, ordinances, and constitutions, so made, be not contrary and repugnant unto, but, as near as may agreeable to the laws of this our realm of England considering the nature and constitution of the place and people there; and also to appoint, order and direct, erect and settle such places and courts of jurisdiction, for hearing and determining of all actions, cases, matters and things, happening within the said colony and plantation, and which shall be in dispute, and depending there, as they shall think fit; and also to distinguish and set forth the several names and titles, duties, powers, and limits, of each court, office and officer, superior and inferior; and also, to contrive and appoint such forms of oaths and attestations, not repugnant, but as near as may be agreeable as aforesaid to the laws and statutes of this our realm, as are convenient and requisite, with respect to the due administration of justice, and due execution and discharge of all offices and places of trust, by the persons that shall be therein concerned; and also to regulate and order the way and manner of all elections to offices and places of trust, and to prescribe, limit and distinguish the number and bounds of all places, towns and cities, with the limits and bounds herein after mentioned, and not herein particularly named, who have or shall have the power of electing and sending of freemen to the said general assembly; and also to order, direct and authorise, the imposing of lawful and reasonable fines; mulcts, imprisonments, and executing other punishments, pecuniary and corporal, upon offenders and delinquents, according to the course of other corporations, within this our kingdom of England; and again, to alter, revoke, annul or pardon, under their common seal, or otherwise, such fines, mulcts, imprisonments, sentences, judgments and condemnations, as shall be thought fit; and to direct, rule, order and dispose of all other matters and things, and particularly that which relates to the making of purchases of the native Indians, as to them shall seem meet.

Whereby our said people and inhabitants in the said plantations, may be so religiously, peaceably and civilly governed, as that by their good life, and orderly conversation, they may win and invite the native Indians of the country to the knowledge and obedience of the only true God and Saviour of mankind; willing, commanding and requiring, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, ordaining and appointing, that all such laws, statutes, orders and ordinances, instructions, impositions and directions, as shall be so made by the governor, deputy, assistants and freemen, or such number of them as aforesaid, and published in writing under their common seal, shall be carefully and duly observed, kept, performed and put in execution, according to the true intent and meaning of the same. And these our letters patents, or the duplicate or exemplification thereof, shall be to all and every such officers, superior or inferior, from time to time, for the putting of the same orders, laws, statutes, ordinances, instructions and directions, in due execution against us, our heirs and successors, a sufficient warrant and discharge. And further, our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby for us, our heirs and successors, establish and ordain, That yearly, once in the year for ever hereafter, namely, the aforesaid Wednesday in May, and at the town of Newport, or elsewhere if urgent occasion do require, the governor, deputy-governor, and assistants of the said company, and other officers of the said company, or such of them as the general assembly shall think fit, shall be in the said general court or assembly, to be held from that day or time, newly chosen for the year ensuing, by greater part of the said company for the time being, as shall be then and there present. And if it shall happen that the present governor, deputy-governor, and assistants, by these presents appointed, or any such as shall hereafter be newly chosen into their rooms, or any of them, or any other the officers of the said company, shall die, or be removed from his or their several offices or places, before the said general day of election (whom we do hereby declare for any misdemeanor or default, to be removeable by the governor, assistants and company, or such greater part of them, in any of the said public courts to be assembled, as aforesaid), that then, and in every such case, it shall and may be lawful to and for the said governor, deputy-governor, assistants and company aforesaid, or such greater part of them so to be assembled, as is aforesaid, in any of their assemblies, to proceed to a new election of one or more of their company, in the room or place, rooms or places, of such officer or officers so dying or removed, according to their directions.

And immediately upon and after such election or elections made of such governor, deputy-governor, assistant or assistants, or any other officer of the said company, in manner and form aforesaid, the authority, office and power, before given to the former governor, deputy-governor, and other officer and officers so removed, in whose stead and place new shall be chosen, shall, as to him and them, and every of them respectively, cease and determine: provided always, and our will and pleasure is, That as well such as are by these presents appointed to be the present governor, deputy-governor, and assistants of the said company, as those which shall succeed them, and all other officers to be appointed and chosen as aforesaid, shall, before the undertaking the execution of the said offices and places respectively, give their solemn engagement by oath or otherwise, for the due and faithful performance of their duties in their several offices and places, before such person or persons as are by these presents hereafter appointed to take and receive the same; (that is to say) the said Benedict Arnold, who is herein before nominated and appointed the present governor of the said company, shall give the aforesaid engagement before William Brenton, of any two of the said assistants of the said company, unto whom we do, by these presents, give full power and authority to require and receive the same; and the said William Brenton, who is hereby before nominated and appointed the present deputy governor of the said company, shall give the aforesaid engagement before the said Benedict Arnold, or any two of the assistants of the said company, unto whom we do, by these presents, give full power and authority to require and receive the same; and the said William Boulston, John Porter, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, John Smith, John Greene, John Coggeshall, James Barker, William Field, and Joseph Clarke, who are herein before nominated and appointed the present assistants of the company, shall give the said engagement to their offices and places respectively belonging, before the said Benedict Arnold and William Brenton, or one of them, to whom respectively we do hereby give full power and authority to require, administer or receive the same.

And further, our will and pleasure is, that all and every other future governor, or deputy governor, to be elected and chosen by virtue of these presents, shall give the said engagement before two or more of the said assistants of the said company for the time being, unto whom we do, by these presents, give full power and authority to require, administer or receive the same; and the said assistants, and every of them, and all and every other officer or officers, to be hereafter elected and chosen by virtue of these presents, from time to time, shall give the like engagements to their offices and places respectively belonging, before the governor, or deputy governor, for the time being; unto which said governor, or deputy governor, we do by these presents give full power and authority to require, administer, or receive the same accordingly. And we do likewise, for

us, our heirs and successors, give and grant unto the said governor and company, and their successors, by these presents, that for the more peaceable and orderly government of the said plantations, it shall and may be lawful for the governor, deputy governor, assistants, and all other officers and ministers, of the said company, in the administration of justice, and exercise of government, in the said plantations, to use, exercise, and put in execution, such methods, rules, orders, and directions, not being contrary and repugnant to the laws and statutes of this our realm, as has been heretofore given, used, and accustomed in such cases respectively, to be put in practice, until, at the next or some other general assembly, especial provision shall be made and ordained in the cases aforesaid. And we do further, for us, our heirs and successors, give and grant unto the said governor and company, and their successors, by these presents, that it shall and may be lawful to and for the said governor, or in his absence the deputy governor, and major part of the said assistants for the time being, at any time, when the said general assembly is not sitting, to nominate, appoint and constitute such and so many commanders, governors, and military officers, as to them shall seem requisite, for the leading, conducting, and training up the inhabitants of the said plantations in martial affairs, and for the defence and safeguard of the said plantations; and that it shall and may be lawful to and for all and every such commander, governor, and military officer, that shall be so as aforesaid, or by the governor, or in his absence the deputy-governor and six of the assistants, and major part of the freemen of the said company, present at any general assemblies, nominated, appointed and constituted, according to the tenor of his and their respective commissions and directions, to assemble, exercise in arms, marshal, array, and put in warlike posture, the inhabitants of the said colony, for their especial defence and safety; and to lead and conduct the said inhabitants, and to encounter, repulse, and resist by force of arms, as well by sea as by land, and also to kill, slay, and destroy, by all fitting ways, enterprizes, and means whatsoever, all and every such person or persons, as shall at any time hereafter attempt or enterprize the destruction, invasion, detriment, or annoyance of the said inhabitants or plantations; and to use and exercise the law martial, in such cases only as occasion shall necessarily require; and to take and surprize, by all ways and means whatsoever, all and every such person and persons, with their ship or ships, armour, ammunition, or other goods of such persons as shall in hostile manner invade or attempt the defeating of the said plantation, or the hurt of the said company and inhabitants; and upon just causes to invade and destroy the natives, Indians, or other enemies of the said colony.

Nevertheless, our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby declare, to the rest of our colonies in New-England, that it shall not be lawful for this our said colony of Rhode-Island and Providence plantations in America, in New-England, to invade the natives inhabiting within the bounds and limits of their said colonies, without the knowledge and consent of the said other colonies. And it is hereby declared that it shall not be lawful to or for the rest of the colonies to invade or molest the native Indians, or any other inhabitants in having within the bounds or limits hereafter mentioned, (they having subjected themselves unto us, and being by us taken into our special protection,) without the knowledge and consent of the governor and company of our colony of Rhode-Island and Providence plantation. Also our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby declare unto all Christian Kings, Princes and States, that if any person, which shall hereafter be of the said company or plantation, or any other by appointment of the said governor and company, for the time being, shall at any time or times hereafter rob or spoil, by sea or land, or do any hurt, or unlawful hostility, to any of the subjects of us, our heirs and successors, or any of the subjects of any Prince or State, being then in league with us, our heirs and successors; upon complaint of such injury done to any such Prince or State, or their subjects, we, our heirs and successors, will make open proclamation, within any parts of our realm of England, fit for that purpose, that the person or persons committing any such robbery or spoil, shall, within the time limited by such proclamation, make full restitution or satisfaction of all such injuries done or committed, so as the said Prince, or others so complaining, may be fully satisfied and contented; and if the said person or persons, who shall commit any such robbery or spoil, shall not make satisfaction accordingly within such time so to be limited, that then we, our heirs and successors, will put such person or persons out of our allegiance and protection; and that then it shall and may be lawful and free for all Princes or others, to prosecute with hostility such offenders, and every of them, their and every of their procurers, aiders, abbetors and counsellors, in that behalf.

Provided also, and our express will and pleasure is, and we do by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, ordain and appoint, that these presents shall not in any manner hinder any of our loving subjects whatsoever, from using and exercising the trade of fishing upon the coast of New-England in America, but that they, and every or any of them, shall have full and free power and liberty to continue and use the trade of fishing upon the said coast, in any of the seas thereunto adjoining, or any arms of the sea, or salt-water, rivers and creeks, where they have been accustomed to fish, and to build and set upon the waste land belonging to the said colony and plantations, such wharfs, stages, and work-houses as shall be necessary for the salting, drying and keeping of their fish, to be taken or gotten upon that coast. And further, for the encouragement of the inhabitants of our said colony of Providence plantation, to set upon the business of taking whales, it shall be lawful for them, or any of them, having struck a whale, dubertus, or other great fish, it or them to pursue unto that coast, and into any bay, river, cove, creek or shore, belonging thereto, and it or them, upon the said coast, or in the said bay, river, cove, creek or shore, belonging thereto, to kill and order for the best advantage without molestation, they making no wilful waste, or spoil; any thing in these presents contained, or any other matter or thing to the contrary notwithstanding. And further also, we are graciously pleased, and do hereby declare, that if any of the inhabitants of our said colony do set upon the planting of vineyards, (the soil and climate both seeming naturally to concur to the production of wines,) or be industrious in the discovery of fishing-banks, in or about the said colony, we will, from time to time, give and allow all due and fitting encouragement therein, as to others in cases of like nature.

And further of our more ample grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, we have given and granted, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give and grant, unto the said governor and company of the English colony of Rhode-Island and Providence plantation in the Narragansett bay in New-England, in America, and to every inhabitant there, and to every person and persons trading thither, and to every such person or persons as are or shall be free of the said colony, full power and authority, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, to take, ship, transport, and carry away, out of any of our realms and dominions, for and towards the plantation and defence of the said colony, such and so many of our loving subjects and strangers, as shall or will willingly accompany them in and to their said colony and plantation, except such person or persons as are or shall be therein restrained by us, our heirs and successors, or any law or statute of this realm; and also to ship and transport all and all manner of goods, chattels, merchandize, and other things whatsoever, that are or shall be useful or necessary for the said plantations, and defence thereof, by any law or statute of this our realm; yielding and paying unto us, our heirs and successors, such the duties, customs, and subsidies, as are or ought to be paid or payable for the same. And further, our will and pleasure is, and we do, for us, our heirs and successors, ordain, declare and grant, unto the said governor and company, and their successors, that all and every the subjects of us, our heirs and successors, which are already planted and settled within our said colony of Providence plantations, or which shall hereafter go to inhabit within the said colony, and all and every of their children which have been born there, or which shall happen hereafter to be born there, or on the sea going thither or returning from thence, shall have and enjoy all liberties and immunities of free and natural subjects, within any the dominions of us, our heirs or successors, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever, as if they and every of them were born within the realm of England.

And further know ye, that we, of our more abundant grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, have given, granted and confirmed, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give, grant and confirm, unto the said governor and company, and their successors, all that part of our dominions, in New-England in America, containing the Nahantick and Nanhlygansett alias Narragansett bay and countries and parts adjacent, bounded on the west, or westerly, to the middle or channel of a river there, commonly called and known by the name of Pawcatuck alias Pawcawtuck river, and so along the said river, as the greater or middle stream thereof reacheth or lies up into the north country, northward unto the head thereof, and from thence by a strait line drawn due north, until it meet with the south line of the Massachusets colony, and on the north or northerly by the aforesaid south or southerly line in the Massachusets colony or plantation, and extending towards the east or eastwardly three English miles, to the east and north-east of the most eastern and north-eastern parts of the aforesaid Narragansett bay, as the said bay lieth or extendeth itself from the ocean on the south or southwardly, unto the mouth of the river which runneth towards the town of Providence, and from thence along the eastwardly side or bank of the said river (higher called by the name of Seacunck river) up to the falls called Patucket falls, being the most westwardly line of Plymouth colony; and so from the said falls, in a strait line due north, until it meet with the aforesaid line of the Massachusetts colony, and bounded on the south by the ocean, and in particular the lands belonging to the town of Providence, Patuxit, Warwicke, Misquammacock alias Pawcatuck, and the rest upon the main land, in the tract aforesaid, together with Rhode-Island, Blocke-Island, and all the rest of the islands and banks in the Narragansett bay, and bordering upon the coast of the tract aforesaid, (Fisher's-Island only excepted) together with all firm lands, soils, grounds, havens, ports, rivers, waters, fishings, mines royal, and all other mines, minerals, precious stones, quarries, woods, wood-grounds, rocks, slates, and all and singular other commodities, jurisdictions, royalties, privileges, franchises, preeminences and hereditaments whatsoever,

within the said tract, bounds, lands and islands aforesaid, to them or any of them belonging, or in any-wise appertaining.) To have and to hold the same, unto the said governor and company, and their successors for ever, upon trust, for the use and benefit of themselves, and their asociates, freemen of the said colony, their heirs and assigns.

To be holden of us, our heirs and successors as of the manor of East-Greenwich, in our county of Kent, in free and common soccage, and not in capite, nor by Knight's service. Yielding and paying therefore to us, our heirs and successors, only the fifth part of all the ore of gold and silver, which from time to time, and at all times hereafter, shall be there gotten, had or obtained, in lieu and satisfaction of all services, duties, fines, forfeitures made or to be made, claims and demands whatsoever, to be to us, our heirs or successors, therefore or thereout rendered, made or paid; any grant or clause, in a late grant to the governor and company of Connecticut colony in America, to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding; the aforesaid Pawcatuck river having been yielded after much debate, for the fixed and certain bounds between these our said colonies, by the agents thereof, who have also agreed, that the said Pawcatuck river shall be also called alias Narrogancett or Narrogansett river, and to prevent future disputes that otherwise might arise thereby, for ever hereafter, shall be construed, deemed and taken to be the Narrogancett river, in our late grant to Connecticut colony, mentioned as the easterly bounds of that colony. And further, our will and pleasure is, that in all matters of public controversies, which may fall out between our colony of Providence plantation, to make their appeal therein to us, our heirs and successors, for redress in such cases, within this our realm of England; and that it shall be lawful to and for the inhabitants of the said colony of Providence plantation, without lett or molestation, to pass and repass with freedom into and through the rest of the English colonies, upon their lawful and civil occasions, and to converse, and hold commerce, and trade with such of the inhabitants of our other English colonies as shall be willing to admit them thereunto, they behaving themselves peaceably among them; any act, clause or sentence, in any of the said colonies provided, or that shall be provided, to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding. And lastly, we do for us, our heirs and successors, ordain and grant unto the said governor and company, and their successors, by these presents, that these our letters patents shall be firm, good effectual and available, in all things in the law, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever, according to our true intent and meaning herein before declared; and shall be construed, reputed and adjudged, in all cases, most favourably on the behalf, and for the best benefit and behoof of the said governor and company, and their successors, although express mention &c. In witness, &c, witness, &c.

Per Ipsum Regem.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II there have been some 47 new nations created out of the once vast colonial empires of England and France, and the smaller oversea possessions of Holland and the United States, 47 new nations whose people are learning to live and develop alongside their own institutions, under their own leaders, under their own independent governments.

Today I want us to remember a nation that was not so fortunate, a nation whose short-lived independence was one of the first submerged into the monolithic wave of what has become the world's leading colonialist power, Soviet Russia. March 25 is the 45th anniversary of the founding of the Byelorussian Republic, a Republic that lived for 3 short years between 1918 and 1921, after 300 years under the subjection of czarist Russia. The people of Byelorussia are known as White Russians—a name synonymous with heroic resistance against oppression. Their leaders declared their people's independence during the height of Russo-German fighting toward the end of the First World War, when the czarist empire was falling into pieces and when at last it appeared the Russian autocracy was to be destroyed. During Byelorussia's brief independence there was a constant struggle to survive; it was absorbed back into Russia as soon as the new Red autocracy could consolidate power and destroy any self-sought freedoms on the part of former czarist subjects. Today 10 million Byelorussians may find their only vestige of freedom to be membership in the United Nations, but this is a fictional independence, supported and totally controlled by the Kremlin.

On this anniversary we must not, in the onrush of events, forget the peoples past and present, who have fought and are fighting for freedoms that we consider part of our daily lives. We must, in remembering their struggles, renew our determination to see their eventual liberation.

BIRTHDAY OF THE FREE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, is the birthday of the Free State of Maryland. Although a relatively old State, Maryland was described in a recent report by the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, as a State "whose economy has been showing the boundless energy of a teenager."

Three hundred and twenty-nine years ago today, a group of colonists under the leadership of Leonard Calvert, brother of Lord Baltimore, landed on St. Clement's Island, and the colony of Maryland was founded. The first Lord Baltimore had arranged for a charter for the colony which Charles I insisted should be called Terra Mariae or Maryland in honor of his Queen Henrietta Maria. Lord Baltimore died before the charter was issued, and King Charles granted it to his son Cecil on June 20, 1632.

It took some time to assemble the colonists and supplies for the trip to the New World and it was not until November 22, 1633, that the expedition sailed for America. The two vessels chartered by the colonists—the *Dove*, weighing 50 tons, and the *Ark*, 350 tons—carried Leonard Calvert and about 200 others of various trades, professions, and religious beliefs. On March 25, they landed on St. Clement's Island in the Potomac River and held a religious service. A few days later, they sailed up the St. Marys River and founded the town of St. Marys, which became the capital of the colony. The colony was founded in the spirit of tolerance and religious freedom.

There are many other outstanding events in Maryland's history. In 1783 Annapolis, Md., became the temporary capital of this Nation and in 1791 Maryland ceded to the United States land for the District of Columbia and location of the Nation's Capital. Our National anthem was written at Fort McHenry in September 1814. The first railroad in America and the first telegraph line in America were established in Maryland. Of all these events, however, the initial element in the founding of the colony of Maryland—tolerance—is the most important and much needed in today's world.

On the 300th anniversary of the founding of Maryland, a great American, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, spoke over the radio in honor of the anniversary and highlighted the significance of the founding of Maryland. He said:

> Lord Baltimore and his colonists sought in their charter liberty not alone for the members of the expedition, but for all later comers as well. It is a good thing to demand liberty for ourselves and for those who agree with us, but it is a better thing and rarer thing to give liberty to others who do not agree with us. We would do less than our duty to Lord Baltimore if on such an anniversary we paid no tribute to this, his greatest contribution to America, a free America.

TRIBUTE TO A SOLDIER-PRIEST

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, frequently the heroic deeds of men are not revealed in full until many years after they have occurred. Such is the case of a distinguished and heroic service rendered by the Very Reverend Dr. Vladimir Klodnycky, pastor emeritus of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Holy Ascension of Newark, N.J. Father Klodnycky formerly served a pastorate in my home city of Bayonne, N.J.

The New Jersey region of the Anti-Defamation League has honored Dr. Klodnycky for his humanitarian efforts

to save the Jewish community of Chmelnyk in the Ukraine during the years 1919–20.

What follows is an excerpt from an article, "Soldier of Peace," which appeared in the ADL bulletin published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

The article was written by Dr. Joseph H. Lichten, director of ADL's department of intercultural affairs:

SOLDIER OF PEACE

More than 40 years ago, a time when eastern Europe was plagued by anti-Semitic pogroms, a rabbi in the small Ukrainian town of Chmelnyk wrote an unusual letter and gave it to an army officer. The letter, addressed to the rabbis of all Jewish communities, identified its bearer, Maj. Vladimir Stepanovich Klodnycky, as a man who had "distinguished himself for his great spirit, love of truth, and love for the Jewish people." It also appealed to the rabbis to recognize and aid the major in all things he sought to do.

This month in New Jersey, a different type of Jewish community honored the Chmelnyk rabbi's appeal. Through the Anti-Defamation League's New Jersey regional advisory board, tribute was paid to the former major who is now Reverend Klodnycky, a 70-year-old Orthodox priest who was ordained 30 years ago in the United States and, for the past 23 years, has been pastor of the Holy Ascension Church in Newark.

The League citation to Reverend Klodnycky begins: "In recognition of his humanitarian efforts to save the Jewish community of Chmelnyk in the Ukraine during the years 1919–20 * * *." The story of the major turned priest is one of the brightest memories of a dark and troubled era.

In August 1919, Major Klodnycky's unit of the Ukrainian Galician Army was sent to Chmelnyk in the center of an industrial area. There were two problems in Chmelnyk—plunderers and pillagers had a special interest in the rich territory and unrest had spread throughout the whole region. In addition, the relationship between the Jewish population of 15,000 and the peasantry was an uneasy one. When Major Klodnycky's unit entered the town, antagonism between Christian and Jew had reached the point of crisis—a crisis set off, oddly enough, by love.

The only daughter of a Jewish merchant living in a small village outside of Chmelnyk had eloped with a Christian peasant and converted to Christianity. The Jewish parents, unhappy about the marriage and conversion, severed relations with their daughter. Or, at least, the girl's father did. Her mother secretly met the girl and her husband and invited them to the parents' home—when the father was away. One night the young couple left the house with gifts—two cows, featherbeds, money, and jewelry. When the girl's father returned and found out what had happened, he vowed to destroy his son-in-law's house. The father set fire to the straw-thatched house; the wind carried sparks to other houses, and soon the entire village was burned to the ground. The disaster took place on the eve of Major Klodnycky's arrival.

The Jews feared a pogrom. They knew the inhabitants of the burned village and neighboring villages were waiting for an excuse for vengeance. "The Jews burned down the village of Chmelnyk" would be the cry. Despite their fears, the Jews appeared in town for their market day. On that day, too, an unusually large number of farmers and peasants appeared on the streets of the town, carrying rifles, revolvers, and, as was later discovered, machineguns concealed in their wagons. At the inn, near the center of town, was a small army unit and patrol.

Major Klodnycky ordered his soldiers to ride, fully armed, through the streets. After the villagers had a chance to see the strength of the troops, they were assembled in the main square in front of the city hall. The major addressed them.

"Dear brothers," he said, "certainly every one of you built his own house. When you began laying the foundation, you crossed yourself three times, recited the 'Our Father,' sprinkled your work with holy water, and in a whisper to heaven asked our Lord to help you build.

"My men and I have been summoned by the Ukraine Government to help you build your homes, and your state. We are building a nation, my brothers. How can you think of sprinkling the foundation of our nation with blood? There must be law and order in our nation. To take the law into your own hands to settle real or imagined grievances is sinful."

The peasants put away their weapons and began to return home. In a half hour, the streets of Chmelnyk were empty. Major Klodnycky had stopped a pogrom before it was started.

PRESIDENT'S PHYSICAL FITNESS PROGRAM

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot recently about our President's physical fitness program. The Nation has been swept by an enthusiastic hiking movement.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, to be the purveyor of additional good news on physical fitness from the Fourth District in Florida. It concerns the sponsors and members of the Homestead, Fla., Bicycle Club. This small group of interested people, who are enthusiastic about the joys and therapeutic effects of the sport of bicycling, had an idea and stanchly went to work to put it into operation.

And so these dozen people of Homestead, Fla., without a budget and at very low cost, propelled the bicycle and the urgent need for a bicycle safety campaign into national prominence.

In order to accomplish their goals—demonstration of the healthful effects of bicycling, and the promulgation of safety measures—this little band of amateurs approached Dr. Paul Dudley White, the eminent heart specialist who attained fame as President Eisenhower's physician. He is a cycling enthusiast. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, he is a very astute man in other areas than his own specialty. He is a frequent vacationer in Homestead and has made public his appreciation of Homestead as, in his words, "a homely and peaceful community without commercialized tourist exploitation." Dr. White is one of the Nation's leading exponents of biking for physical fitness. He prescribes proper diet, sensible living, and such regular exercise as walking and bicycle riding as preventives of heart attacks.

Next, the Homestead bicycle enthusiasts begged, borrowed, and earned sufficient money to erect bicycle signs through the city of Homestead, marking bicycle routes to schools, parks, and the downtown section.

High point of the bicycle safety campaign was the dedication ceremony at which Homestead Mayor Richard Conley, Dr. and Mrs. White arrived, all pedaling bikes. Addressing a group of more than 200, predominantly adults in their middle or past middle years, Dr. White commented:

Homestead is setting an example for the whole Nation. It's providing the spirit and impetus that can make other cities sit up and take notice—and then follow the lead of this town's bicycle club and the interested and dedicated people who have worked to get these safe-for-cycling routes and to further cycling for exercise and enjoyment.

So successful were the efforts of this little band of Florida amateurs that they have engaged national attention through nationwide press stories, radio and TV coverage, including mention on network TV shows, and stories in Time and Life magazines.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to acquaint my colleagues with the full report and editorial comment on this event in the News Leader, Homestead, Fla., on February 26, 1963:

UNITED STATES NOTES HOMESTEAD BIKING—PEDALCADE HIGHLIGHTS BIKE ROUTE OPENING

Homestead, bicycles and hearts made national news Sunday with the visit of Dr. Paul Dudley White to South Dade to take part in the dedication of Homestead's bike routes—a first in the Nation.

It was Dr. and Mrs. Paul Dudley White Day, proclaimed by Mayor Richard Conley to coincide with the dedication and with National Heart Sunday, in which the noted cardiac specialist is especially interested.

Kicking off the day's events was the cutting of blue and white ribbons stretched across North West Fourth Street at Krome Avenue—one of the bicycle routes mapped out by traffic experts and marked with new blue and white signs.

Some 500 people turned out to see the ceremony and hear Dr. White. Almost half of them joined in a bicycle tour of the town, led by the famous doctor after the ribbon cutting.

Homestead is the first city in the Nation to be officially proclaimed "The City of Bicycles"—a fact that drew Time and Life magazine photographer-reporters, newsreel cameramen from all three Miami television stations, representatives from a number of newspapers in the area, and cycle-minded visitors from as far away as Missouri.

After more than an hour of pedaling around Homestead and the immediate area, cyclists wound up at the city's ball park and picnic grounds for a chicken barbecue, where caterers served more than 200.

Another group of more than 200, predominantly adults in their middle or past-middle years, turned out Sunday evening at the Homestead Armory to hear the famous cardiac physician tell how to prevent heart attacks through proper diet, sensible living, and such regular exercise as walking and bicycle riding.

The famed heart specialist arrived at dedication ceremonies pedaling beside his wife and Homestead Mayor Conley, and stopped to pose for pictures before mounting the speaker's platform.

"Homestead is setting an example for the whole Nation," Dr. White said. "It's providing the spirit and impetus that can make other cities sit up and take notice—and then follow the lead of this town's bicycle club and the interested and dedicated people

who have worked to get these safe-for-bicycling routes and to further cycling for exercise and enjoyment."

The doctor, one of the Nation's leading exponents of biking for physical fitness, first visited Homestead last year, when the city of bicycles movement was only beginning.

Since then, he has talked of the town and its project to groups all over the country, and has given Homestead untold publicity by his remarks.

"Doctor," said Mayor Conley, "you and your wife are officially citizens of Homestead and we salute you." With a grin, he added, "And no taxes."

The Paul Dudley White Bicycle Club of Homestead, at whose invitation Dr. White officiated at the bike route dedication, presented Mrs. White with a charm bracelet from which dangled three miniature bicycles. Dr. White's "charm," presented by Milton Fischer, was one of the 300 safety route signs, to which a bronze plaque had been attached in tribute to his interest in the bicycle city idea.

Also lauded during the ceremonies was Irvin Barnett, who has been one of the bicycle club's most ardent supporters, both with work and in financing the signs which were dedicated Sunday.

Barnett accepted a framed certificate of appreciation, which he immediately presented to Conley, who was serving as president of the Chamber of Commerce when the bike movement got chamber endorsement and backing.

Congratulations from Gov. Farris Bryant were conveyed by J. Robert Terry of the Florida Development Commission, and a lengthy telegram of approbation from Senator GEORGE SMATHERS was read.

During the bike parade which followed, some 250 cyclists streamed along behind Dr. White, who was preceded by a truck bearing newsreel cameramen, photographers, and reporters.

At first, cyclists filled the streets from curb to curb, but the agile doctor, an advocate of safe cycling, hopped aboard the news truck to direct riders to go two abreast or single file. * * *

LOCAL BIKE CLUB GOES TO TOWN ON NATIONAL SCALE

The boosters of Homestead's Bicycle Club deserves the praise and imitation of all organizations in South Dade.

They have taken the bicycle and a campaign of bicycle safety and lifted it to a high position as a "vehicle of national publicity."

Nationwide press services have carried the story of Homestead to the newspapers and radio stations.

Time and Life magazines covered the event.

Three TV stations photoed the affair.

And it was mentioned on network TV shows yesterday morning.

Such a job, as these dozen people of a bicycle club, at a very small cost and with no budgeted money, have done is a better job than the heavily financed Dade-Miami Publicity Bureau would have done, or could have done.

In order to accomplish their purposes, this little band of amateurs, enlisted the help of Dr. Paul Dudley White, a heart specialist, who attained fame as President Eisenhower's physician. He is a cycling enthusiast, and vacations in Homestead frequently, finding it a "homely and peaceful community without commercialized tourist exploitation."

This group also begged and borrowed and earned enough money to put up bicycle signs throughout the city, marking bicycle routes to schools, parks, and the downtown section.

These two factors were put together by the bicycle club and with only this to go on, parlayed into a really worthwhile nationwide advertising of Homestead and South Dade.

Other efforts of a similar nature should be invited and promoted by other areas in South Dade, an area which is neglected by the leaders of our county, who know little about our area, and who concentrate their effort to other areas, with South Dade paying part of the bill.

So it is up to the initiative and effort of local groups such as the Dr. Paul Dudley White Bicycle Club of Homestead.

Hats off to these promotion pioneers of South Dade, who are pushing a new club slogan: "I'd rather bike than hike," which is a twist of the hiking craze which recently started in Washington governmental circles, and which amounted to little because the politicos couldn't take it. They too should take up cycling.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to compliment Dr. White for his selection of Homestead, Fla., as a frequent vacation spot and his public service in encouraging and participating in this bicycling and bicycle safety movement, which not only aids the middle-aged and senior citizens by giving them healthy recreation and constructive exercise, but contributes to the well-being and happiness of our youth and all our citizens.

I should like also to commend Mayor Conley and the Homestead City officials, the sponsors and members of the Homestead Bicycle Club, the News Leader, and the citizens of Homestead, for their public-spirited efforts which have brought merited recognition to the Homestead area.

We in Florida have demonstrated that it can be done. We have led the way. Other communities should be inspired to follow our example. I challenge other cities and States to adopt similar programs. Let us get all of America aboard bicycles for health and happiness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. GOODLING), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of of Mr. GOODLING), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. GOODLING), for 30 minutes, on Thursday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HUDDLESTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. WILLIS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODLING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. GOODELL.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. GLENN.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. DADDARIO.

Mr. MULTER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GILL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. HEMPHILL.

Mr. MORRIS.

Mr. PATTEN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, March 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

584. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements concluded during February 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

585. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report relating to the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Employees' compensation claims and expenses" for the fiscal year 1963, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

586. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

587. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the January 1963 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

588. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act"; to the Commitee on the District of Columbia.

589. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes,' approved March 1, 1899, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

590. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the U.S. Information Agency's 19th semiannual report, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

591. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to

amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize a grant-in-aid program, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

592. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the supply management of electric lamps within the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

593. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of unnecessary costs to the Government for packing shipments of household goods for Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps personnel; to the Committee on Government Operations.

594. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of retention by General Dynamics/Pomona (Convair), a division of General Dynamics Corp., Pomona, Calif., of refunds related to illegally imposed local taxes included in the prices of Department of the Navy contracts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

595. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to the Saline Water Act for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 448, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

596. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1989. A bill to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds; with amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 116. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 117. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 118. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 5096. A bill to amend paragraph 368 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to duties imposed on the importation of clocks, clock movements and other measuring devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5097. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5098. A bill to repeal section 2(d) of the District of Columbia Nonresident Tuition Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 5099. A bill to authorize the acquisition of lands for addition to the Adams National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 5100. A bill authorizing the modification of the Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colo., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 5101. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 5102. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Cancer Society; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 5103. A bill to prohibit nepotism in Government employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5104. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 5105. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5106. A bill to amend section 36 of the Investment Company Act of 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5107. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through research, technical assistance, and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5108. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities of certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5109. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of information filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 5110. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to prevent discrimination because of sex in payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 5111. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a form of averaging recovery of amounts received as damages for injury to crops through pollution of air, water, or soil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5112. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5113. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5114. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5115. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 5116. A bill to prohibit the extension of Grand Teton National Park without the expressed approval of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 5117. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 5118. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Whitestone Coulee unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 5119. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to advancement by step increases of certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 5120. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 5121. A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 5122. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 5123. A bill to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the "unfit for human consumption" category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5124. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5125. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773, 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5126. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for two additional Assistant Secretaries, one of whose prime responsibility shall be forest resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5127. A bill to provide for assistance in the construction and initial operation of community mental health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5128. A bill to extend the benefits of the civil service retirement and group life and health insurance programs to certain legislative employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 5129. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 5130. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act (relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts) with respect to the maximum amount of insurance which may be provided thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 5131. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize State and community youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 5132. A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to require the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe standards based on the extent of migration out of certain areas for the purpose of designating such areas as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 5133. A bill to make cotton available to domestic users at prices more competitive with prices foreign users pay for cotton, to authorize the Secretary to permit cotton-growers to plant additional acreage for the 1963 and succeeding crops of upland cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5134. A bill to provide transportation for certain parents and unremarried widows of deceased members of the Armed Forces who are buried in national cemeteries outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 5135. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 5136. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 5137. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act (relating to compensation of Members of Congress) to provide for a method of incentive pay increases for Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 5138. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the National railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 5139. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for two additional Assistant Secretaries, one of whose prime responsibility shall be forest resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 5140. A bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.J. Res. 343. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in order to authorize the several States to permit the offering of a prayer in public schools and other public places; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 344. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.J. Res. 345. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.J. Res. 346. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 347. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.J. Res. 348. Joint resolution to establish a commission to study the feasibility and advisability of and to formulate preliminary plans and recommendations for a site and for the development and construction of a National Visitor and Student Center in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEED:

H.J. Res. 349. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States restricting the judicial power of the United States in State legislative apportionment cases to those States which do not provide their citizens with the opportunity to initiate and vote upon plans of State legislative apportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.J. Res. 350. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.J. Res. 351. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document, the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and auxiliaries regarding proposed amendments; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H. Res. 297. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred for minority purposes in the Education and Labor Committee; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. Res. 298. Resolution to amend clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 299. Resolution to amend clause 4 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred to as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to naming the lake and recreation area created by the Flaming Gorge Dam on the Wyoming-Utah border after the Honorable Joseph C. O'Mahoney; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Senate, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine protesting against the proposed transfer of internal revenue personnel and services from the State of Maine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging immediate action by ordering that the Secretary of Defense locate two or three air fighter interceptor and reconnaissance squadrons along the northwest coast of Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the national defense system in Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging favorable consideration to the proposal to restore medical care benefits to owner-operators of fishing vessels and self-employed seamen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the rejection of the changes in timber taxation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to increasing the insurance limit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to $25,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to protecting the U.S. lumbering industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing appreciation to the Secretary of Agriculture for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would substantially eliminate

the capital gains on the sale of timber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the enactment of legislation authorizing the Bumping Lake Reservoir project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the Cooperative Extension Service and opposing the use of the Extension Service as a promotional arm of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging consideration of legislation providing that 90 percent of all moneys received from the sale of or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals on federally controlled minerals within the State be paid by the Treasurer of the United States to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to asking consideration of the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming who favor Federal legislation providing for regulation and control of appropriations, distribution and use of underground and surface waters within their State and her sister States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing legislation designed to return to the State of Wyoming additional sections of land from the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing legislation regarding the feasibility reports required in connection with applications for Federal small projects loans, and requiring such reports only when they are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting certain legislation to make various areas of reclamation nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging legislation to prohibit the killing of elk by the park rangers in Yellowstone National Park and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States reaffirming support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Committee; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose Federal legislation which would encroach on State-administered workmen's compensation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the Federal Insurance Contribution Act and opposing any future increase in the social security tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to passing legislation which would place the timber industry of this country in a competitive position with foreign production through the establishment of import quotas or other means; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follow:

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 5141. A bill for the relief of Leung Kar Wai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 5142. A bill for the relief of Dana Hinton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5143. A bill for the relief of Paul Griffith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5144. A bill for the relief of Doyle A. Ballou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5145. A bill for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5146. A bill for the relief of Adamo Buono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5147. A bill for the relief of Irma Hegedus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5148. A bill for the relief of Pei-Chi Pan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 5149. A bill for the relief of the Liberty National Life Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5150. A bill for the relief of Spyridoula Mavrogianopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 5151. A bill for the relief of Panayota Tanglis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5152. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Vaccarezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 5153. A bill for the relief of Harry Cornish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 5154: A bill for the relief of Wilfredo Larar de Leon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5155. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Guiseppa D'Aquanno, Maria D'Aquanno, and Benedicto D'Aquanno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

72. By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. Fred Wynn, chairman, Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to calling upon Congress in the public interest to initiate proper legislation to make labor unions subject to the same laws as industry, amenable to the national security and public welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

73. Also, petition of John Biancucci and others, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

74. Also, petition of Bernard E. Hanus, assistant committee clerk, Wayne County Board of Supervisors, Detroit, Mich., relative to acquisition of Federal revenue stamps in connection with property transaction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Byelorussian Democratic Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1963, marks the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

I proudly join my colleagues in paying tribute to the inspiring courage and determination of Byelorussians all over the world. I am certain that the independence they once enjoyed, will be regained and that freedom will flourish.

Byelorussia was once an independent country and made important contributions to the medieval history of Eastern Europe. In 1795, this freedom was crushed when Byelorussia was made a part of the Russian Empire by force.

Since then, Byelorussians have fought to regain their independence, without success. Major attempts were made in 1812 and 1863; and in 1917, after creating a congress with the goal of establishing an independent Byelorussia, the democratic body was attacked and scattered by the armed power of Soviet Russia.

Unconquered, despite this tragic defeat, the Council of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic proclaimed independence by passing the Third Constitutional Act on March 25, 1918. But Soviet Russia attacked and defeated the young democratic state, consisting of 10 million persons.

Demonstrating their indomitable courage and love for freedom, the people of Byelorussia rebelled and fought in the Slutsk District in 1920, but were defeated by the Soviet armies, and again during

World War II, when the central council organized armed forces.

Despite 45 years of Soviet despotism and exploitation, Byelorussia has not surrendered, and never will. The flame of freedom is never extinguished by the violent winds of tyranny. And as Byron wrote of those who perish in freedom's constant struggle, "they never fail who die in a great cause."

Freedom is the greatest cause of all and its ultimate victory is inevitable.

Byelorussia will be free and happy again.

News Register Becomes a Daily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I address the House of Representatives today on a most felicitous occasion. As you and many of my colleagues know, the most populous portion of the Ninth Congressional District is southerly Alameda County, an area of incomparable climate, rich farmlands, vineyards, and delightful cities and towns.

One of these cities is Fremont, northern California's largest city area. Formed in 1956 by incorporating the five rural communities of Centerville, Irvington, Niles, Mission San Jose, and a large amount of agricultural land, Fremont's population has risen since 1956 from 22,443 to nearly 60,000. The projected constant growth over the next 15 years is 8,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, such a rapid growth too many times means chaos for a community, but this is not the case in Fremont. The reason is that our city is a planned community in the most perfect sense, a city whose master plan has provided for a proper balance of industrial, commercial and residential development, of parks, recreation, and wildlife areas. As the American Institute of Planners stated in awarding Fremont the 1962 honor award for "outstanding achievement in comprehensive planning," Fremont is, of course, almost unique.

The fact that this explosive growth has been guided and controlled pursuant to sound and imaginative planning is a credit to the city government, its staff, its elected officials, and ultimately to the entire citizenry.

Mr. Speaker, this steady course that I have described has not been easy. After all, what has been accomplished here is the blending into one great city of five rural communities, each with its own leaders, its own points of view. It would have been difficult, perhaps impossible, to have done this continuing job without the existence of an enlightened newspaper, whose first loyalty was to the community and its people and not to any personal partisanship of its publishers.

This newspaper is the News Register, Mr. Speaker, published by Mr. George P. Oakes and Mr. George H. Oakes, and serving, in addition to Fremont, the growing and vital cities of Newark, Union City and Milpitas.

I ask my colleagues today to join me in sending congratulations to the News Register on its joining of the great American family of daily newspapers. May it live long and prosper well, continuing to serve its community and its country in the fair and impartial dissemination of news, and in the honest and incisive criticism of its editorial page.

Tribute to Mrs. Clara I. Harrison Who Is Retiring After Long Congressional Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress fully realize that in order to properly carry out our duties and responsibilities we must have efficient staffs, particularly competent administrative assistants. And not only do the services of these employees mean so much to each of us but to the successful operation of Congress as a whole.

It is most fitting to pay tribute to a congressional aid who will retire March 31 after 22 years of faithful and meritorious service. I refer to Mrs. Clara I. Harrison who has served as an assistant to Louisiana Members of Congress longer than anyone else, having begun her congressional employment in 1922 as secretary to former Representative Leonard Allen of the Eighth Louisiana District. When the latter retired from Congress, Mrs. Harrison became secretary to former Representative Henry D. Larcade of Louisiana's Seventh District and following Representative Larcade's retirement she has served as administrative assistant to his successor, Representative T. A. THOMPSON, since January 3, 1953.

Incidentally, Mrs. Harrison is closely vied for the longest service to the Louisiana congressional delegation by three other members of our staffs. Miss Florence "Flo" LeCompte, personal secretary to Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, began her congressional duties May 1, 1942, while Mrs. Florence Cooley has been administrative assistant to Representative JAMES H. MORRISON, of the Sixth Louisiana District, since January 3, 1943. Bill Candler, who has been my executive secretary for a number of years, has been on the Hill since November 4, 1942, having previously served with former Representative James Domengeaux, of the Third Louisiana District, and with former Representative Larcade.

A native of Louisiana, Mrs. Harrison was born at Marthaville. She graduated from Northwestern State College at Natchitoches, La., with a bachelor of science degree, and from Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge with a master's degree in business administration, and served as supervisor of student teachers in Louisiana. She is a member of the Baptist Church.

Mrs. Harrison is the wife of Derwood D. Harrison, a career employee with the General Accounting Office. "Bud," as he is best known, came to Washington from North Carolina as an employee of former Representative and Comptroller General Lindsay Warren.

Mr. and Mrs. Harrison maintain a delightful home in Bethesda. In addition to her congressional work she is popular in Washington social circles, numbering among her close friends and personal acquaintances many Members of Congress and others in Washington official circles.

Since Representative THOMPSON has interested himself over the years in assisting young men to secure an education in Washington, "Miss Clara," as so many know her, has been a veritable Washington housemother to these young people, many of whom have successfully completed their professional educations.

After these many years of devoted, loyal and most helpful service to Congress and to her employers, and her years in the teaching profession, making approximately 30 years she has served the public, Mrs. Harrison is certainly entitled to a well-earned rest although she will no doubt continue many of her activities. Members of the Louisiana congressional delegation and their staffs join with all the many others in her wide circle of friendships in wishing for Miss Clara a very pleasant and happy retirement.

Comparison of Gross Tax Burdens of Various Nations in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, in order to compare the relative tax burdens of industrialized and nondeveloped countries, it is best to show total taxes either as a percentage of gross national product or national income. The generally accepted definition of national income does not include indirect taxes. Many countries rely to very different degrees on indirect taxes—some have a high proportion of indirect taxes in their tax structure, while others do not have such a high percentage. Thus using national income as a yardstick of taxload may result in an overstatement of the fiscal burden for the one class and an understatement for the other.

The United Nations Yearbook of National Accounts Statistics for 1961 gives latest available gross national product and tax figures for 1960. Since the data for gross national product are collected on a relatively uniform basis, percentages of taxes calculated as part of the gross

national product of each country have the advantage of international comparability. These taxes include all indirect taxes collected as well as all social security contributions.

On the basis of latest available U.N. statistics, total taxes as a percentage of gross national product show the following relative tax burdens among various countries for 1960:

Country	Taxes as percent of GNP	Rank
West Germany	34.0	1
France	33.2	2
Austria	32.9	3
Norway	32.1	4
Sweden	31.3	5
Finland	30.8	6
Netherlands	30.1	7
Italy	28.7	8
United Kingdom	27.9	9
United States	27.5	10
New Zealand	27.5	11
Denmark	25.1	12
Canada	24.8	13
Belgium	24.2	14
Australia	23.5	15
Chile	22.9	16
Ireland	22.1	17
Japan	20.2	18
Burma	19.8	19
Greece	19.6	20
Mauritius	19.3	21
Portugal	17.5	22
China-Taiwan	15.5	23
Malta	15.2	24
Republic of South Africa	15.1	25
Ecuador	15.0	26
Costa Rica	14.7	27
Rhodesia and Nyasaland	14.2	28
Korea	14.1	29
Jamaica	13.0	30
Panama	12.2	31
Colombia	11.4	32
India	9.7	33

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD a tribute to the freedom-loving Byelorussians on the occasion of the anniversary of their independence.

For more than four centuries the Byelorussians, one of the oldest and proudest national groups in Eastern Europe, have been living under Russian rule. Except for a brief period of independence, they have been subjected to the worst excesses of the autocratic czarist regime and the Communist totalitarian system. Although they have suffered more than any other national minority group, the Byelorussians have steadfastly maintained their national identity and their love of freedom. They have struggled for independence and liberty for centuries despite hardships, privation, exile, and death.

The turbulent events of World War I and the Russian revolution gave the Byelorussians their long-sought opportunity to break away from the Russian shackles. On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was proclaimed. The Byelorussian government quickly set to work to expand its activity in such fields as education, culture, and social protection, despite the wartime difficulties and devastation. With the retreat of the German armies in November 1918, the Red army began to advance into Byelorussia. The government, unable to oppose this aggression, was forced to leave the capital city of Minsk and withdraw to Grodno. The fledgling republic's leaders were unable to build up enough military strength to defend its independence and integrity. In 1921 the country was partitioned by Poland and Russia in the treaty which ended the war between these two powers.

Early in World War II Byelorussia was unified under Soviet rule as a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. The freedom-loving Byelorussians are still under the heel of their Russian oppressors. They do not even have the freedom to observe the anniversary of their Independence Day. We in the free world celebrate the anniversary of that historic event and echo the deep-felt sentiments of the Byelorussian people.

Boom to South Jersey Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, when New Jersey State Senator Frank S. "Hap" Farley, Republican, of Atlantic City, said recently, in speaking of the proposed southern New Jersey expressway, "This is the culmination of an 8-year dream," the senior New Jersey State senator spoke of a dream which has been the aspiration and the hope of every citizen who lives in the southern New Jersey seashore area.

The new expressway provides speedy access to and from Atlantic City and the adjacent resorts. It is worth noting that the $46,800,000 road was made possible by the determined efforts on the part of State Senator Farley and Charles W. Sandman, Republican, of Cape May, and the Republican members of the New Jersey House of Assembly.

This new toll road will be open for the summer of 1964. It will enhance the travel of tourists to and from the area. It lends to the growth and development of business. I foresee, with the opening of the expressway, the beginning of a whole new era of employment and development in south Jersey.

In the not too distant future south Jersey will be highly industrialized, with an easy flow of traffic on a year-round basis into and out of the area.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, with the hundreds of thousands of miles of highways in our Nation, a simple expressway might not appear important. What is important is the fact that for many citizens travel to and from Atlantic City has been difficult, if not awkward. It has cost the area millions in employment, hampered industrial growth, and relegated the area to a place of second consideration for our traveling population.

Now, due to the forthright action and determination of our legislators, we see the dawn of a new day. A day when more of our citizens will come to the world's famous playground, to bathe in the Atlantic Ocean, and to walk upon the most famous boardwalk in the world.

The land of the salt water taffy will again take its rightful place in the hearts of people everywhere.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the smaller Slavic ethnic groups in the Soviet Union, the Byelorussians are little known in the West, and their distinct national identity is often confused.

This is partly because they have always intermingled with other more numerous and powerful Slavic peoples, and partly because for centuries they have been subjected to the oppressive rule of foreign overlords. For hundreds of years their far more powerful neighbors, the Russians, have done all in their power to subdue them and represent them to the world as Russians.

The history of Byelorussian people proves beyond any doubt that they formed a distinct national group in their homeland, east of Poland and west of Moscow, long before the formation of the modern Russian state. However, during most of modern times Byelorussia has been part of the Russian Empire just as it is part of the Soviet Union today.

The autocratic czars of Russia and their callous agents could not eliminate the Byelorussians as a distinct ethnic group. The more the Byelorussians were oppressed by their Russian overlords, the more these sturdy people clung to their traditional national ideals and longed for the day of their independence.

Finally, this came about in 1918, when the czarist regime in Russia was no more. On March 25 of that year Byelorussian leaders took the fate of their people into their hands and proclaimed the Byelorussian National Republic. Independent Byelorussia was recognized by the governments of numerous countries, and the new state seemed to be on its way to full sovereignty in historic Byelorussia with Minsk as its capital.

Unfortunately, the independence thus attained and proclaimed could not last long without effective foreign aid. Such help did not come, and the Republic soon succumbed. It was under constant attack by the Communist forces of Russia. Once the Red army was effectively organized, one of its first tasks was to overrun and occupy, and then annex Byelorussia to the Soviet Union. The Byelorussian National Republic actually existed little more than a year. By late

1919 its status was very shaky and early in the next year it ceased to exist.

Since then, for more than four dreadful and dreary decades, some 10 million Byelorussians have been living under oppressive Soviet tyranny. It is no exaggeration to say they have suffered longer under Soviet communism and have sacrificed more than any other non-Russian people in the Soviet Union. But they have not abandoned their ultimate goal for freedom and independence, and they ardently look forward to the day of their liberation from Communist tyranny.

On the 45th anniversary of their independence day let us all hope and pray for their freedom and independence.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussians constitute one of the less numerous and little-known Slavic peoples on the East European borderland, east of Poland and west of Moscow. Their modern history is inextricably blended with and sadly overshadowed by Russian history, because for centuries they were subjected to ruthless Russian czarist regimes. But the Byelorussians, who have had a longer history as a nation than the Russians themselves, were never willing to forgo and forget their distinct national identity. They always longed to regain their national independence. This supreme goal was attained in 1918.

On March 25 of that year, after Russia's detested czarist regime had collapsed and the new Communist regime in Russia was still weak, the Byelorussians proclaimed the establishment of the Byelorussian Republic. At the time it was hoped that these 10 million hard-working and liberty-seeking people, having become sovereign in their historic homeland, would be able to enjoy the fruits of freedom in peace. Unfortunately their subsequent history took a disastrous turn. Early in 1921, long before the Byelorussians had the chance to consolidate their new government and put their own house in order, Soviet forces attacked and overran the country. Byelorussia as an independent and sovereign nation vanished from the international scene. For more than four decades since that time these sturdy and stouthearted Byelorussians have been living under the unrelenting and ruthless rule of their Communist overlords in Moscow. As much as any other people subdued by Russia's massive might, these unhappy subjects have been completely isolated from the free world, and today they are no better off as a nationality group than they were under the most ruthless of Russian czars. Even so, they have not given up their hope for their eventual freedom and independence. They all cherish that noble ideal, and on the 45th anniversary of their independence day let us all hope and pray for their deliverance from Soviet totalitarian tyranny.

Appropriation for Conservation Program Should Not Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement I submitted to the House Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations urging that the 1964 appropriation for the conservation program of the Department of Agriculture should not be reduced.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, OF CONNECTICUT, TO THE AGRICULTURAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am grateful for the opportunity to present to you and the distinguished members of your subcommittee a brief statement in regard to the 1964 appropriation for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

May I direct your attention to page 126 of the Budget of the U.S. Government, 1964, Appendix, where it is stated as follows in connection with the budget for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:

"A level of $150 million for the 1964 programs is proposed, a reduction of $100 million below the 1963 program. Payments for the 1964 program will be made from the 1965 appropriation."

The proposed reduction from $250 to $150 million for this program in the coming fiscal year—a reduction of 40 percent—is very disturbing. I have received letters of protest from the Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts in the State of Connecticut urging that "this budget proposal should not be cut from $250 to $150 million". In a letter dated March 5, 1963, the president of this association, Mr. Erwin Kelsey of Middletown, Conn., in my Congressional District, informs me as follows:

"We feel that without the Federal cost-sharing our objective in developing the conservation plan with landowners on each acre of his holdings according to its needs and used within its capabilities will be greatly jeopardized."

Your committee is well aware, I am sure, of the aims of this program in encouraging conservation by Federal sharing with farmers of the cost of carrying out approved soilbuilding and soil and water-conserving practices, including also benefits to wildlife. Without this assistance from the Government the farmers would not and could not undertake these conservation projects by themselves with their limited resources. The rate of this cost-sharing program is approximately 50 percent, and that is a fair rate. These conservation measures include the establishment of permanent protective cover, improvement and protection of vegetative cover, conservation and disposal of water, protection of soil from wind and water erosion, and benefits to wildlife.

In Connecticut, the local agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, participating in this Federal cost-sharing program, place particular emphasis on the physical type practices seeking to benefit wildlife, provide protection of vegetative cover and conservation of soil and disposal of water.

This program is extremely important to the State of Connecticut. A reduction of $100 million in the budget for this vital program is, in my view, shortsighted and may in the long run prove to be a waste of resources rather than an act of economy. I am interested in economy and will gladly support such efforts, but this is most certainly an example of false economy.

I urge you and the members of your committee to increase the amount of the conservation program to the same level as it was last year, namely, to provide the full amount of $250 million for this service which is beneficial to the whole country.

Greg Samuels Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the State finals of the Indiana High School Athletic Association's annual basketball tournament was played last Saturday, March 23, at Indianapolis, Ind.

Garfield High School, of Terre Haute, Ind., which is located in the Sixth Indiana Congressional District, was one of the final four participants in this statewide competition.

An outstanding member of this Garfield team coached by Mr. Willard Kehrt, is Greg Samuels, who was awarded the tournament's coveted Arthur L. Trester Award for mental attitude and scholarship following the final game at Butler University Fieldhouse.

The Trester Award is the highest athletic and scholarship honor that can be attained by an Indiana High School boy and Greg Samuels certainly deserved the honor.

In addition to being a star player for Coach Kehrt, leading his team into the finals with a great performance in the defeat of defending champion, Bosse of Evansville, Greg has compiled an outstanding scholastic record at Garfield.

Greg has been president of his class for 4 consecutive years and has maintained an "A–B" average throughout his high school career.

Greg's achievement in winning the Trester Award is a tribute not only to Greg himself, but his teachers and coaches at Garfield High School, his parents and the entire community of Terre Haute.

Fortunately, for the State of Indiana, Greg is planning to continue his education at either Indiana State College at Terre Haute, or Wabash College in Crawfordsville. Both of these excellent colleges are also located in the Sixth Indiana Congressional District, and Greg could make no finer choice of schools than Indiana State or Wabash.

I am pleased to bring news of Greg Samuels' achievement to the attention of this body. This talented and dedicated youth deserves national recognition for his record at Garfield High School and his personal triumph as Indiana's outstanding athlete-student for this season.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am thinking, not only of the people of ancient Greece who laid the foundations of democratic government and the men, women, and children of modern Greece so close to our hearts, but as well of those of Greek ancestry and blood who as our fellow Americans have made such a mighty contribution to our own United States in culture, religion, business, the professions, in all of our activities, and so well in the new land of America have kept aflame the torch of democracy first lighted centuries ago in ancient Greece.

In my own city of Chicago no nationalistic group is held in higher esteem and affection. Its sons and daughters are numbered among the leaders in all the worthy activities of a great metropolis.

It is only natural that a nation's independence day have a particular significance for the people of that nation. This is the case for Greece, but her independence day is also meaningful for other peoples in the world. The Greeks, it will be recalled, were the first people to conceive and advocate the concept of independence in ancient times, yet for some 2,000 years they were deprived of this precious right. This is why the rebirth of free and independent Greece 142 years ago is such an important milestone in the history of mankind. The Greeks' unceasing determination to fight for their liberation from alien rule earned them the admiration of many people throughout the world, and the free and sovereign state of Greece was welcomed into the family of nations.

The past 400 years of Ottoman rule had proven particularly arduous. The Greeks who have also always cherished the ideals of individual freedom and dignity, were treated as mere subjects to be exploited, rather than as citizens. Their uprisings and rebellions were never successful, however, for the Sultan's forces were superior. It took a 9-year war of independence and the assistance of European powers to wrench Greece free from Turkish rule.

For 142 years now the Greeks have been independent, and their country has become a valued member of the community of free nations. Greece was admitted to the Council of Europe in 1949, to NATO in 1951, and is a party to the Balkan Pact with Turkey and Yugoslavia. Greece took a historic step last year in becoming associated with the European Economic Community. This association presents both a challenge and an opportunity for the Greek people in their efforts to modernize the economy of their country.

On the occasion of the 142d anniversary of Greek Independence Day we congratulate the Greek people on their achievements and reaffirm the close ties between our two nations, democratic Greece and democratic United States.

Maryland Day—1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate a significant anniversary in Maryland. Monday, March 25, is Maryland Day, the 329th anniversary of the first founding of the colony of Maryland when the tiny ships, the *Ark* and *Dove*, brought the first Maryland colonists to St. Clements Island in the Potomac River. Then they landed at St. Marys to found what has become a historic and a great State.

We should take time in 1963 to consider what the State of Maryland means to us now and what it has meant over the years. Maryland has been a place where great ideas have been developed, where great concepts of government have been tried. When proven, they have been handed down to other States and to the world at large. Some of the institutions of Maryland have been preserved in the Government of the United States. And so we have good reason to examine what is great in our own Maryland history.

Last year on Maryland Day we recalled the Act of Toleration. That act was passed by the General Assembly of Maryland 3 centuries ago to give all persons in Maryland the right to practice their religion in their own manner. This was religious freedom and individual liberty which was unique in the 17th century. We can be very proud of our Maryland heritage for developing a climate of toleration which is now a fundamental part of our constitutional right as Americans.

There were other things which we can remember with great pride. For instance, in 1648 there was the incident in the general assembly in which a woman claimed for the first time in recorded American history the right to sit as a legislator. The Journal of the General Assembly of Maryland for Friday, January 21, 1648, records:

Came Mrs. Margaret Brent and requested to have vote in the House for herself and voice also.

On this occasion the Governor denied Mrs. Brent both voice and vote as a member of the General Assembly of Maryland, but she had asserted for all time the claim that a woman had a right to sit as an equal with other members of the legislature. Today, of course, Mrs. Brent's claim has been vindicated. There are women in Annapolis who are valuable members of the general assembly. And in Washington the Congress, which is in a sense a direct descendant of the General Assembly of Maryland, also has valuable Members who are women. This is a principle which had its birth and its first expression in Maryland. It is another incident of Maryland history which can make us proud of our heritage.

If today we are sometimes discouraged because our political progress in Maryland seems to be slow; if we are discouraged because interest in good government seems to be limited to too few, we can look back to our long and proud history and I think gain good cause for our optimism for the years ahead.

Because of its historic interest I append the Journal of the general assembly for January 21, 1648, as follows:

[From Archives of Maryland, Proceedings and Acts of the Assembly of Maryland 1637/8–1664]

MARYLAND DAY—1963

The freemen bownd to attend the Assembly appeared except Mr. Ffenwick, Mr. Thorneborough, Mr. Brookes & George Saphyer.

Summons to George Saphyer to be att the Assembly forthwth. vppon sight & c

was read certaine orders to be obserued in the howse during the Assembly

Came Mrs. Margarett Brent and requested to have vote in the howse for her selfe and voyce allso for that att eh last Court 3d Jan: it was ordered that the said Mrs. Brent was to be looked uppon and received as his Lps Attorney. The Gov.r denyed that the s.d Mrs Brent should have any uote in the howse. And the s.d Mrs. Brent protested agst all proceedings in this pnt Assembly, unlesse shee may be pnt. and have vote as afores.d.

Byelorussian Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the date of March 25 marks the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. The people of Byelorussia first proclaimed their freedom on March 25, 1918, but their young Republic was soon turned into a battlefield for the armies of Russia and Germany and later of Russia and Poland. Engulfed from the east and from the west, Byelorussia was conquered and her territory divided. During the occupation resistance continued and during World War II Byelorussia was able to organize a free government and arm herself against Soviet Russia. Russian might once again crushed the Republic and, in an attempt to crush also the spirit of the Byelorussian people, the conquering Soviet Union ignored natural ethnographical order and redistributed the people.

During this 45-year history of persecution and oppression, the anniversary of that 1918 proclamation of independence has been honored. From their tragic history we have come to respect and admire the valiant courage and determination of the Byelorussian people. They have become an exceptional symbol of resistance to the flood of communism and it is proper that we should join them on this day in the rededication of their goals toward a free and independent Byelorussian Republic.

Justice Department Asked To Investigate Satevepost "Fix" Story Violations of Federal Wiretap Statute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the Saturday Evening Post article in the March 23, 1963, issue entitled "The Story of a College Football Fix" is false generally in its charges against Paul Bryant, University of Alabama, and Wallace Butts.

However, it also is emerging more clearly now that the alleged source of the article has a record of convictions on bad check charges, various financial difficulties, and obtained the information on which the article is based illegally. It appears, from the story in the Satevepost, that the man, George Burnett, of Atlanta, overheard a conversation between two men over the long distance telephone. His reporting of the conversation appears to be in violation of title 47, section 605 of the United States Code.

I have written the Attorney General the following letter asking that appropriate action be taken. I insert the letter as a part of my remarks herewith:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General of the United States,
U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am writing to call your attention to the Saturday Evening Post article entitled, "The Story of a College Football Fix," which appeared in the issue dated March 23, 1963. The article begins on page 80 and refers to a telephone conversation between Wallace Butts, University of Georgia athletic director, and Paul Bryant, University of Alabama athletic director, allegedly overheard by a George Burnett. The alleged phone call originated in Atlanta, Ga., by Butts calling Bryant in Tuscaloosa, Ala. The article referred to gives details of the conversation which Mr. Burnett "overheard" after he was "accidentally" cut into the conversation.

Although I am personally convinced that the alleged conversation in no way incriminates either of the athletic officials in a fix, it is apparent that the article is based on what Mr. Burnett says he overheard. It is my belief that the article is defamatory and libelous. But that is a civil matter which will be decided in the courts.

I believe that it is equally clear from the language of the article that the author, Frank Graham, Jr., of Brooklyn, N.Y., the Curtis Publishing Co., of New York, N.Y., publishers of the Saturday Evening Post, and George Burnett, of Atlanta, Ga., are in violation of title 47, section 605, United States Code, the Federal wiretap statute. The statute is, as you know, part of the Federal Communications Act. It reads in part as follows:

"And no person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person; and no person not being entitled thereto shall receive or assist in receiving any interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio and use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto; and no person having received such intercepted communication or having become acquainted with the contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the same or any part thereof, knowing that such information was so obtained, shall divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the same or any part thereof, or use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto."

I will appreciate your investigating the circumstances surrounding the alleged telephone conversation, keeping in mind the pertinent provision of the Federal wiretap statute, herein quoted, and taking appropriate action in the premises.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.,
Member of Congress.

The 1963 Tax Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, Representative ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, of the Fifth South Carolina District, last week made a most comprehensive detailed statement before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on the 1963 tax message. I ask that these remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE 1963 TAX MESSAGE

(Statement of ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Member of Congress, Fifth South Carolina District, before the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, 88th Congress, March 14, 1963)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am most grateful to you for allowing me to appear here today. I am not an expert on taxation, but my appearance here today is stimulated and inspired by the realization that I represent a precious segment of taxpaying American people, the people in the 5th Congressional District of South Carolina, who have a stake in your decision on any changes made in the tax laws in the 88th Congress. Let me assure you that I respect the position of decision and power which each of you holds as a member of this committee, and I recognize that you are members of this committee because you have been recognized by the respective political parties which elected you to this committee.

Let me begin by saying that I favor a tax cut. I also favor tax reform, although I am not in favor of certain proposals which I hope to discuss with you today, and which adversely affect the well-being of the people of my district, or the business which is carried on by or for or with the people of my district. I pause here to salute the President of the United States for his courage and his foresight in proposing tax legislation and change this year, particularly a tax cut. I have every confidence in his sincerity of purpose, his ambition to keep the American economy not only rolling along at the prosperous rate it has enjoyed, but to improve the status of the economy. When the President of the United States stated in his tax message of January 24, 1963, "Our present income tax rates structure now holds back consumer demands, initiative, and investment," he was saying the same thing that I have heard from hundreds of businessmen. Sadly I report that most of these businessmen are people who have expressed a dislike to Mr. Kennedy, and now that he has said it I am sure it is not as popular with them as if others had said it. Nevertheless, he has said it, he has spoken the truth and I am happy in the confidence that your committee will do something about our tax laws, and if any feeble effort on my part can be of assistance to the members of this great committee I am as near as your telephone.

Recently there came across my desk a little booklet entitled "Comments on the President's 1963 Economic Report," put out by the Department of Economics and Research of the American Bankers Association. I quote from that report:

"In our judgment, the requirement for implementing a tax cut 'within the bounds of fiscal prudence' would not preclude a temporary swelling of the Federal deficit—if this increase resulted from a tax reduction of the magnitude proposed by the President. For practical as well as economical reasons, our endorsements of tax reduction has not been coupled with the demand that the reduction be accomplished without exerting a temporary adverse of impact on the Federal budget. We regard tax reduction as an investment in future economic vigor, and we look upon the accompanying temporary enlargement of the deficit as the price, though the purpose, of the tax cut. Even a temporary enlargement of the Federal deficit resulting exclusively from tax reduction is not without risk at this time—the risk of generating renewed inflationary prices and compounding our balance-of-payments difficulties. Yet our confidence in the constructive forces that tax reductions can unleash leads us to believe that the price, in terms of a temporary and manageable swelling of the deficit, can and should be made."

I hope I have not taken this out of context. I respect the group that made the study.

I share your wishes that we could accomplish a tax cut without any enlargement of the deficit. I also share the belief that the President of the United States and those who have recognized the advantages of a tax cut at this time, that a tax cut will be of great benefit to this country, even with a corresponding rise in the national debt. My recollection is that this is the first time in the history of this country that the President of the United States has proposed a tax cut as a stimulation for business. All of us who are privileged to have enjoyed any length of maturity as American citizens, or as people privileged to serve their people as Members

of Congress, recognize the fact that this is the last needle in the economic doctor's kit. We continue to be under the influence of a wartime military budget, which has become a basic foundation of our economy—or should I say we depend more than we realize on expenditures for military purposes to keep the plants running, the people employed, and production steady. We are going to have to face, someday, and soon, the impact of this economic factor, and the problem of reduction of defense outlay without hurting our economy. If we are to stimulate the economy in any way, the tax cut seems to me the last and only hope that we have in our store of possible remedies, under present economic realities.

Before I proceed into discussion of specifics of the proposed tax legislation that I will discuss with you because of the effect on my district, let me ask your indulgence in one area of tax practice. In any consideration of reform of the tax structure of the United States today, or tomorrow, or in the immediate future, one ambition of this committee should be to simplify the filing of tax returns to such an extent that a man with an income of less than $5,000, in order to claim the grace, the benefits allowed him by certain deductions, would be able to accurately and honestly fill out the form without having to hire someone to do it. I believe most of the accountants of this Nation would share that wish with me. I am a country lawyer, and I have filled out hundreds of tax forms; naturally, when I did, I had to charge people for them. I have not filled out any but my own since I have been a Member of the Congress, but I have observed others filling out their forms, and the forms today are too complicated. They encourage mistakes, and I think a major challenge to this committee, not today because I realize that this particular tax legislation you are considering today must be limited to the scope intended, is the challenge shining like a light in the faces of the members of this committee and the Members of the Congress of the United States, to do something about the difficulty of making a return. Perhaps you say that this is an administrative matter; it may be, but you and I as Members of the Congress have some responsibility, too, and the fact that the forms are so complicated, or maybe the laws are so complicated, that people have to pay to get their tax forms filled out, even simple ones, seems to me an added burden of taxation which I know the legislators who passed the tax laws never intended. I plead with you for a simple form at some future date.

I do not believe the average taxpayer in the Nation knows how big a stake he has before this Congress, and which we must meet before we recess this year. The business people know, as a change in travel and entertainment expense account procedure brought them home to reality: the business of the Government is the business of the businessman as well as the responsibility of the Congressman, the Senator, the executive branch of the Government. Everything we do here affects every businessman in America in some way.

I make no apologies for singling out matters of importance to the people of my district. Their problems are my responsibility. I wish time permitted my dwelling on more facets of the tax proposals.

REVISION OF CAPITAL GAINS AND LOSSES

In the committee print of the President's 1963 tax message, February 6, 1963, under subdivision XVIII, C-2(b) (see p. VI of index), at pages 142, 143, I find the following:

"Under present law, a lump-sum distribution of an employee's interest in a qualified pension or profit-sharing plan is taxed as long-term capital gain if the distribution is made to the employee on account of his separation from the service of the employer or is made to the employee's beneficiary on account of his death. Under the recommendation, the recipient would not treat the lump-sum distribution as a capital gain; rather, it would be regarded simply as ordinary income. However, he would be permitted to average the lump-sum distribution in the manner described below.

"The special averaging treatment would generally be available in the case of lump-sum distributions which qualify for capital gains treatment under present law; that is, those that are made on account of separation from service or death. It would not be available, however, unless contributions had been made for the employee under the pension or profit-sharing plan for at least 5 previous years.

"This averaging technique will result in a tax comparable to that which would be payable if the distribution had been received over the first 5 years of the employee's retirement. For the average employee, the tax on his lump-sum distribution will be roughly the same as he would pay under the present capital gains rates. For those employees who are presently covered under pension and profit-sharing plans, the tax may be even lower because a portion of their distributions will qualify as capital gain subject to the new rates.

I am afraid the intended purpose of this proposal will be defeated if drastic change in the proposals are not made. I gather from exhibit No. 17 (p. 483 supra) that this is aimed at "highly paid employees * * * able to withdraw huge sums from the company's pension or profit-sharing plan when they retire or leave the company and pay only the low capital gains tax." The trouble is that we find ourselves at the muzzle end of a scattergun instead of watching someone shoot a rifle at a selected target.

In my district approximately 10,000 people share in a wonderful profit-sharing plan—I believe it is second to none in the Nation—as employees of Springs Cotton Mills. For the calendar year 1962 the employees' share was $4,240,485. I quote from the Springs Bulletin of Wednesday, February 27, 1963:

"In releasing these figures, H. W. Close, president of the Springs organization, pointed out that the company's contribution to the Springs fund was the largest since the fund was established in 1953. There are 9,310 employees in the Springs fund and their share accounts now total $15,420,004.

"PLAN REVISED

"The largest contribution made previously by Springs to the Springs fund was $2,800,000 in 1960. The increase in this year's contribution was made possible by the revision of the plan in 1962. As approved by the Internal Revenue Service, the formula for the amount of the annual contribution is now based on profits, after dividends, without regard to the amount of capital invested.

"On the recommendation of the Internal Revenue Service a division has been made in the Springs fund setting up one trust for hourly and piece-rate employees and another for those on salaries. This change does not affect present account balances but will give hourly and piece-rate employees a larger share in the future.

"The distribution of extra pay in the form of vacation and Christmas checks was begun in 1948 by Col. Elliott Springs. These checks add up to approximately 1 week's pay for employees with less than 5 years' service and range up to 4 weeks' pay for those who have been on the job 25 years or longer. This cash distribution amounted to $879,919 in July 1962 and $862,484 at Christmas.

"FUND GROWING

"Participation in the Springs fund has grown steadily since it was established in 1953. There were 8,836 share accounts in 1960, 9,222 in 1961, and 9,310 at the end of 1962.

"There has also been a steady increase in the total funds in these accounts. This total was $10,404,532 in 1960, $12,515,625 in 1961, and $15,420,004 at the end of 1962.

"The Springs fund has been built up entirely by contributions from the Springs Cotton Mills and through earnings on investments of the trust funds.

"Employees are eligible to participate in the Springs fund after 3 years' employment. They make no contribution to the fund nor is any deduction made from their paychecks.

"They are not compelled to remain in the Springs fund but the greatest benefits build up for those who stay in until they retire, die, or are disabled. Those who 'draw down their cash' forfeit part of the money credited to them and must wait 3 years before they may reenter."

From a little booklet on the profit-sharing plan, I call your attention to certain excerpts:

"The profit-sharing plan is for all employees. If you are an hourly paid or piecework employee, you may join the plan if you have worked for the company for 3 years or more.

"When you have been with the company for 3 years, you simply fill out a registration form, and you are a member.

"You also name the person you want to get your profit-sharing money in the case you die.

"You don't pay a cent to get into the plan. You don't pay a cent to stay in the plan, but it does cost you money to get out of the plan * * * if you pull out before you retire, get disabled or die.

"Let us take an example:

"We take the case of a typical weave room or spinning room employee, presently age 25, who earns $3,500 a year in wages. If he stays in our employ, and in the profit-sharing plan, until retirement at age 65, if his earnings continue at the same rate, if the company's profit experience continues at the present level until that time, and if the plan continues until that time with its current rate of earnings and forfeitures, our typical employee will have a credit at retirement of $36,268.

"Under present capital gain provisions, 50 percent of this credit or $18,134 would be included in taxable income. Assuming no other income and assuming exemptions and deductions of $2,000, our typical employee would pay a tax at current rates, of $3,268.

"Under the proposed capital gain provisions, our typical employee, on the same set of assumptions, would pay a tax, at the proposed reduced rates, of $6,994.20.

"The reason for this rather amazing consequence is to be found in Mr. Dillon's statement respecting the so-called 'averaging' or 'mitigating' provision. Thus, although the lump sum distribution is to be divided by 5 before computing the tax, it would appear that exemptions and deductions (where they exceed other income as in the case above) are to be 'subtracted from the lump-sum distribution before the averaging provision is applied.' (See the end of the fourth subparagraph under paragraph (2)(b).)

"If the exemptions and deductions were deducted after the averaging provision had been applied, our typical employee would pay a tax of only $4,128.25.

"To summarize:

"a. Under the present capital gains provisions and at current rates:

Lump sum distribution	$36,268.00
Includible income (50 percent)	18,134.00
Less deductions and exemptions	2,000.00
Taxable income	16,134.00
Tax	3,965.00

"b. Under the proposed law and at proposed reduced rates (with exemptions and deductions subtracted before averaging):

Lump sum distribution	$36,268.00
Less exemptions and deductions	2,000.00
Total	34,268.00
Divided by 5	6,853.60
Tax on the above	1,398.84
Tax (5 times the above)	6,994.20

"c. Under the proposed law and at proposed reduced rates (with exemptions and deductions subtracted after averaging):

Lump sum distribution	$36,268.00
Divided by 5	7,253.60
Less exemptions and deductions	2,000.00
Total	5,253.00
Tax on the above	825.65
Tax (5 times the above)	4,128.25

"With respect to an employee whose profitsharing credit at retirement is $20,000, the comparable tax figures are (a) $1,680, (b) $2,680, (c) $1,400.

"If we are correct in our reading of the proposal, it would appear that there is no real averaging, no real effort to spread the impact over a 5-year period, for only 1 year's exemptions and deductions are given any effect in computing the tax.

"Perhaps the most disturbing part of this proposed new treatment of lump-sum distributions, at least from the viewpoint of those charged with administering the plan, is the proposal that the new tax treatment shall not apply to that portion of a lump-sum distribution which equals the amount in the employee's account on February 6, 1963, plus future earnings, on this amount. (See the third subparagraph of par. (2)(b) of Mr. Dillon's statement.)

"In other words, the company, or someone, shall have to maintain two accounts for each participant. Instead of 9,310 accounts, there will be 18,620. Each time there is a forfeiture, or an appreciation in investment value, or a dividend or interest item, there will have to be thousands of additional computations in order properly to divide the item and allocate it between that part of each participant's account representing 'the amount in the employee's account as of * * * February 6, 1963, plus the future earnings on this amount,' and that part of the employee's account which represents the balance.

"I'm sure you are aware that this increases the burden imposed on industry to report this project, to make this return, or to supply that information, to Federal, State and local governments."

I represent the people who are in this pension plan. There are other pension plans in effect in my district. Every man, woman, and child in my district will eventually be affected, adversely, if this change takes place. I solicit your earnest consideration.

REPEAL OF UNLIMITED DEDUCTIONS FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

As I understand the statement on page 100 of the committee print on the President's 1963 tax message, the recommendation for repeal of the unlimited deductions for charitable contributions was based upon the premise that such is a special deduction of limited application which enables individuals with substantial incomes to escape all Federal taxes on their income. I am frank to admit that I do not have enough expertise on taxation statistics or practice to refute that statement. Certainly, as a taxpayer, I want to pay my tax, but not more, but, at the same time, I want the other fellow to pay his share because the man who doesn't pay his share adds to the burden of the taxpayer who is honest about his taxes.

I recognize the concern about people who do escape all Federal taxes on their income. I do not think that the rule of unlimited deductions applies only to people with large incomes. If this committee wants to write a limitation as to large incomes, since that is where any alleged inequity is pinpointed, I would certainly consider it proper if it means that the man with the smaller income is paying more tax because a man with a larger income is getting out of paying a fair share of taxes due because of this deduction. But let us consider the matter in the light of facts.

I am happy that I live in a portion of the country where people are moral, extremely religious. We have numerous churches, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish. Many of these churches have small congregations, a majority of which make $5,000 to $7,000 or less. Many of the individuals of these assemblies tithe and I salute them for doing so; they are not rich nor do they try to get out of paying their taxes. If you repeal their right to deduct contributions, it is my opinion that you will do great harm because you would discourage the working people of this country from making contributions to their churches, to their orphanages, to their church schools.

It is not that their contributions are motivated by income tax regulations allowing deductions, but this has been the practice over many, many years, and as a Member of Congress I do not expect to be a part of any effort, or support any legislation, which will reduce the contributions so necessary to the churches, the church schools, and the orphanages.

Many of our orphanages and other charitable and educational church institutions rely heavily on contributions from various groups, particularly those of incomes below $20,000 because, in my section of the country, $20,000 is a tremendous income, and the people who support the various orphanages usually give $5 to $10 at a time; I know because I read the bulletins from the various church orphanages and I am interested in them and I know of the good work that they are doing.

To put a damper on this method of financing charitable institutions would be a disservice to the Nation, a disservice to the churches of this land and the good works they accomplish because they are financed, in large part, by contributions.

Many ministers have talked to me about this and many lay members of the various churches. We today are laboring to improve the education of every American, and were this tax effort to put a stumbling block in the path of church schools that use contributions to help finance the education of pupils who need it, would be a backward step in American progress and not in keeping with our overall purpose as a nation.

I am confident in your consideration of this proposal and your ability to preserve charitable accomplishments. I believe this proposal can be amended to do justice and to accomplish the purpose basically intended, and at the same time take care of the people with smaller incomes, the smaller contributors, and thus take care of our charitable institutions.

Churches, church schools, church orphanages are necessary, magnificent, institutions of this free land. They deserve every consideration from the Members of Congress.

CARRYOVER OF EXCESS DEDUCTIONS

On page 33 of the committee print (Feb. 6, 1963), I read from the statement of the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury:

Under present law, taxpayers are able to reduce their taxable incomes from other sources by deducting substantial amounts of development costs and other expenses incurred when a mineral property is not yet profitable. But they are not required to take these deductions into account in determining net income for the purpose of computing the limit on the percentage depletion allowance on the property when it does become profitable. Even if the deductions are carried forward in the form of a net operating loss carryover and used to reduce future taxable income, they are never subtracted from net income from the property for purposes of the percentage depletion limitation. As a result, the amount of percentage depletion deducted over a property's life may be far more than one-half of its total net income. This result would seem to be clearly contrary to the purpose of the 50-percent net-income limitation on percentage depletion. The operation of present law is illustrated in the technical explanation.

But let us reason about this.

The President stated in his budget message that deductions taken with respect to a mineral property, to the extent they exceed the gross income from the property during the year taken, must be carried forward to future years for the purpose of reducing percentage depletion through reduction of the limiting net income from the property. All costs deducted with respect to the property would be subject to this provision, presumably even to State and local real estate taxes paid on idle mineral land. A careful study of this proposal will show that it is based on an error in reasoning as to the history and intent behind the depletion provisions of the present law and that it would operate to the broad detriment of the mining and quarrying industry. It would unfairly penalize both the small operator with a smaller margin of profit and the large operator who is required to incur heavy carrying costs to maintain levels of reserves in keeping with the size of his operations.

Secretary Dillon has stated that he felt the purpose of the 50 percent of net limitation is violated unless percentage depletion is limited to 50 percent of the net income over the life of the property. A brief review of the history of percentage depletion will reveal this to be erroneous.

In 1918 Congress granted discovery value depletion which in effect placed the finders of any mineral deposits on the same level with those producers who had found their deposits prior to March 31, 1913, and were entitled to deduct the 1913 value thereof. Once the valuation of the mineral deposit was completed the per unit depletion deduction was established and did not fluctuate with prices thereafter. As a result when market values decreased or when operations went sour causing a loss from the operation of the property there was still available a depletion deduction based on the original valuation in 1921. Congress limited the discovery value depletion to 100 percent of the net income from the property during the taxable year and this was later changed to 50 percent of the net income from the property in 1924. Subsequently when percentage depletion replaced discovery value depletion the 50 percent of net income limitation remained unchanged. Congress did not give any reason for its action in 1924 and prior but it is quite evident that the purpose was not to limit the deduction of discovery depletion to 50 percent of the net income over the life of the property. It would seem on the other hand that Congress was somewhat unhappy with the fact that inherent defects in the valuation procedure could result in values for depletion which in light of subsequent events seemed absurd and permitted deduction against nonmining income without the actual expenditure of funds. If the present recommendations are adopted this move cannot be explained by alleging it will carry out the original intent of Congress. In essence this proposal

is simply another method of reducing the benefits and effectiveness of percentage depletion and related provisions of the tax law.

The recommendation that carryover of excess deductions be used to reduce depletion in future years would cause some very inequitable results and would bear much more heavily upon the operation of a marginal quarry or mine than upon the operator of a heavily successful quarry-mine or mine. As an illustration let us assume that two properties have $10,000 excess deduction in the nature of development cost during the first year. In subsequent years assume that each property produces 20,000 units which market for $100,000; if property A makes a small profit so that it is already limited by the net under present law it will eventually lose $5,000 of its depletion deduction because of the proposed carryforward. However, if property B has net income of $30,000 in the first year of operation it will not lose any of the depletion deduction, even if the proposed changes are adopted. Imposing heavier burdens on the marginal mine seems very inequitable and undesirable since these are the properties which will first be driven out of business by this type of taxation. The unfairness of the proposed carryforward can be further illustrated as follows: Assume that two different properties are adjacent, each producing 20,000 units selling for $100,000 with a net profit before depletion of $10,000; assume further that property A has operated at this rate of profit since commencing operation but property B had loss of $5,000: under present law each of these properties having the same gross and net income will have a percentage depletion deduction of $5,000. However, if the proposed carryforward is adopted, property A will continue to have a depletion deduction of $5,000, whereas property B will have its depletion deduction reduced by $2,500, simply because it had an operating loss in the preceding year.

The carrying costs on reserve mineral property would eventually operate under the proposed carryforward to reduce the percentage depletion allowance. Companies which move large tonnages are forced to acquire and hold reserve mineral properties if they are to survive. They cannot wait until a deposit is exhausted before searching for another to replace it. Where ad valorem taxes are imposed during this idle period the payment of those taxes should not reduce the depletion allowance in future years when the property goes into production. Nevertheless this would be the result under the proposed carryover provision.

We do not have lucrative quarrying or mining in my State, my district. As a result, the cost of removing overburden is a factor of economic life or death. I do have mining and quarrying in York, Cherokee, Fairfield, Lancaster and Kershaw Counties in my district and elsewhere in South Carolina. They must be kept in operation.

Actually the appellation "excess depletion" is a misnomer. We are talking about depletion, expense, and cost of production.

MULTIPLE SURTAX EXEMPTIONS

The President has recommended in his 1963 tax message to the Congress that corporations which are members of an affiliated group should be restricted to one surtax exemption, both where a common parent holding company exists (parent-subsidiary group), and even went so far as to favor restriction to one surtax exemption, and to force a single consolidated income tax return on a group of corporations where, by the difficult and complicated attribution rule under section 318 of the code, 80 percent of the stock is owned by five or fewer individuals in substantially the same proportion (brother-sister groups).

In this brother-sister grouping, you are dealing frequently with grassroots, county seat, small, and family-owned businesses. The relation of brother and sister and parents, some quite militantly independent of each other, is difficult to unify by wording of an attribution statute.

As to the impracticality in forced consolidated returns, let me give you an example of a widow aged 80, whose four sons and one daughter are in five separate incorporated businesses in one country town with each member of the family owning approximately 10 percent in each of the units, except that the widow and the child who manages each separate unit own the remainder. Each son and daughter are very independent in the management of each of their separate units, three units are in retailing, two in farming and farm processing.

Merely because the elderly widow continues to live but is sick and is completely inactive, forces all of these business units under section 318 to file one consolidated income tax return wherein all in fact are on a different accounting basis or a different fiscal year basis, and would be in serious management and personal difficulties if forced consolidation were to occur. There is no business relevance to the contended longevity of an aged lady not engaged in business activity.

Section 318 of the Internal Revenue Code has been referred to as a Pandora's box of construal problems (Ownes, "Stock Redemptions and Partial Liquidations under the 1954 Code" 32 Taxes 979 (1954)). To force it upon family-owned businesses is a serious mistake.

The feuding and difficulties in executive management resulting from such a situation would be incalculable, and would greatly hinder the formation of new business units at the family capital level, where the largest volume of new business units start. The difficulties of the average small business dealing with the vagaries of substantially proportionate ownership as set forth in the principal statement of Secretary Dillon, and the tremendous complexities of construing section 318 of the "Code on attribution of Ownership of Stock" will result in a reaction from small business units that would be violent. A mere list of topic headings under section 318 in Mertens, "Law of Federal Income Taxation, Code Commentary," is indicative of the complications:

"TOPICAL HEADINGS, SECTION 318 U.S. INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

"From Mertens Law of Federal Income Taxation

"Section 318. Constructive ownership of stock

"Section 318:1. General

"Section 318:2. Legislative background

"Section 318(a)(1):1. Attribution between members of a family

"Section 318(a)(2):1. Attribution between partnerships, estates, trusts and corporations and their respective partners, beneficiaries and shareholders

"Section 318(a)(2):2. Meaning of 'directly' or 'indirectly'

"Section 318(a)(2)(A):1. Partnerships and estates—Attribution from the entity to the person

"Section 318(a)(2)(A):2. Partnerships and estates—Attribution from the person to the entity.

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):1. Trusts—Attribution from the entity to the person

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):2. Trusts—Attribution from the person to the entity

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):3. Trusts—Meaning of 'maximum exercise of discretion'

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):4. Trusts—Attribution to grantors from the trust entity

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):5. Trusts—Attribution to entity from the grantor

"Section 318(a)(2)(C):1. Corporations—General rules of attribution

"Section 318(a)(2)(C):2. Corporations—Attribution from the entity to the person

"Section 318(a)(2)(C):3. Corporations—Attribution from the person to the entity

"Section 318(a)(3):1. Options

"Section 318(a)(4):1. Constructive ownership as actual ownership

"Section 318(b):1. Cross references."

I know that the recommendations as to the change and reduction in normal tax and surtax is worthy, but in the particular situation of attempting to unify individuals and families at the grassroots level of small business into one consolidated return under the concept of brother-sister affiliated group is one of the most inherently dangerous administrative problems faced in the President's tax message.

This entire matter of multiple corporations was thoroughly considered relative to section 1551 of the Internal Revenue Code by your eminent committee in 1951 and many capital investments, creative to our citizens, have been made in the assumption of reasonable continuity and stability in this field of taxation. I urge your eminent committee not to disrupt business organization without compelling reasons which do not appear at present.

RELATION ALSO TO THE PARENT-SUBSIDIARY GROUPS AS WELL AS "BROTHER-SISTER" AFFILIATED GROUPS

I am opposed to the proposal to limit the surtax exemptions of a group of related corporations to one exemption. Congress in 1951, in considering section 1551 of the Internal Revenue Code, gave to newly organized corporations which were organized as part of a program of expansion, a separate surtax exemption for each. This provision led to expansion. Expansion is what is now desired. Continuation of the present provision will encourage such expansion. Adoption of the Treasury provision on surtax exemption limits would curtail expansion with consequent loss of employment. If the Treasury provision were applied to existing corporations, this would be a breach of faith on the part of Congress and would unduly penalize stockholders who invested their capital in reliance on the existing provision. Denial of the surtax exemption to a small corporate enterprise, albeit a subsidiary, is economically unrealistic and discriminatory, since perforce, it must compete at the community level with other enterprises of surtax size and nature.

This is a matter which also deeply concerns small business.

I particularly refer to the well phrased testimony on March 12, 1963, of John A. Gosnell, general counsel, National Small Business Association where he stated:

"We have also had considerable comment about the proposal to eliminate the corporate surtax exemption in certain cases. This may appear to be primarily important to larger corporations, but it is pointed out that the expansion of small business by the acquisition of small corporations is a sound device, both from a legal and an economic standpoint, and it has a proven and useful place in the small-business segment of the economy. In cases where the separate corporation is established or acquired for a legitimate business purpose, the fact of common control does not destroy its local identity; its contribution to local economy, or its responsibilities under local statutes. It would seem that any attempt at this late day to make a fine distinction between those corporations which should pay the surtax, and those which should not, would result in many unjustified hardships and dislocations which would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to rectify. As a point of general tax law such a move would appear

to be the imposition of an additional corporate tax on a discriminatory basis. The motive for the proposal is beyond us. The revenue would not be material, and the present safeguards are adequate to prevent abuse."

Let me assure you again that I am no expert, but the proposals so seriously affect the future of many businesses in my district, and the enterprising people who work there, that I must ask your serious consideration in opposing this recommendation.

ORDINARY INCOME ITEMS TREATED AS CAPITAL GAINS—TIMBER AND COAL

On page 145 of the President's 1963 tax message, we find the proposed treatment of capital gains on timber outlined. This involves a provision of section 631 and section 1231(b)(2) relating to timber and coal.

Under present law, a taxpayer who owns timber is accorded capital gains treatment upon the sale of the timber, whereby an economic interest is retained by such owner whether the taxpayer is making a casual sale or whether the taxpayer is in the trade or business of selling timber.

The new proposal seeks to allow an annual exemption to each individual taxpayer only up to $5,000 of timber sale income for the purposes of capital gains treatment, but amounts in excess of $5,000 would be accorded ordinary income treatment. I fully recognize the loopholes of the present law in connection with some real estate tax shelters, but I must outline to this great committee the damage which might be effected if the proposal is honored by the committee as stated by Secretary Dillon.

We must realize that tree farming has become a major industry in certain parts of America. The growth of this industry has been significant since World War II, and thousands of people are employed in the pulpwood and lumber industry, who otherwise would be unemployed because of the decline in row crop farming, and particularly cotton farming in the South and Midsouth. As a result of the capital gains treatment of timber transactions, not only have many people been able to go into the business properly expecting a profit, but, in addition, this means employment to those who work in the woods as producers of timber or pulpwood, or employees of those producers.

Thousands of people are now employed in paper mills in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and other Southern States. The proposal to limit, or put a ceiling on the capital gains expectations would be a blow to the future expectations or plans of this industry, possibly cause loss of jobs.

Frankly, we need this industry to replace the farming which the soil bank and mechanization have affected.

It is my opinion that capital gains offers the soundest procedure for taxing timber as a natural resource. It is the same for large and small producers, all growers of timber. If the treatment were only to large growers we might speak of special privileges but such is not the fact.

Perhaps the capital gains treatment which has been practiced was enacted in part to recognize the incentive for reforestation in America. Reforestation is expensive and we in Congress well know, for we have appropriated money for the soil bank and other programs. In addition, the capital gains treatment, we believe, acknowledges the risk from fire, insects, diseases, and other hazards in that long period of growth (pine pulpwood about 20 years) between planting and harvesting.

Timber growing is a unique and somewhat new enterprise in some parts of our Nation, which now knows heavy investments in this sort of farming; money is tied up for long periods of time during which there are hazards of fire, insect, and disease, which constitute potentials of physical and economic risk.

Much of the timber farming in the United States is affected by small private forest owners.

Until World War II economic circumstances were adverse to private investment in forestry and only limited progress was made in developing the permanent productive use of the three-fourths of the Nation's forest land in private ownership. The postwar period brought greatly changed economic conditions. Classifications established in the Revenue Act of 1943 in essence permitted capital gains treatment of revenues resulting from long-term increases in timber growth and value, regardless of the method used in disposing of the timber. This removed a major tax barrier to investment in forestry by timber-processing companies and by investors who retain an economic interest in the forest being cut as required by sound forest management. This was of fundamental importance in releasing the flow of investment into private forestry which has occurred during the postwar period. The major improvement in the Nation's timber supplies, the large-scale investment in wood-processing facilities with related permanent employment in many rural areas, and the watershed and recreational benefits derived from forest management which have been achieved on private lands during the last 20 years are directly traceable to this classification of timber revenues.

Private forest land is held in a wide variety of ownerships, ranging from small farm woodlots to large corporate holdings. The owners of the larger holdings have taken the leadership in the development of private forestry; progress has been slower on the small holdings. Equity requires comparable classification of timber revenues regardless of the size of holding. Removal of capital gains treatment from large holdings would penalize the very ownerships which have made the greatest progress in forestry.

Because of the long period of timber production, the greater part of the investments in timber growing which have been made since 1943 have not yet come to fruition. Good faith requires a continuation of the capital gains classification of timber revenues which was a condition of these investments.

Let me give you some idea of the farming business in my home county, Chester County, S.C.

Number acres land in Chester County, 377,000; number acres woodland, 259,000; number farms, 1,322; average size farm, 157.4 acres; percent farm acreage in woodland, 51.5; percent of woodlands in farm woods, 41.3.

Annual farm income in Chester County, $4,156,000; percent income from forest products, 18.2; forest income, $717,000.

Number board feet lumber sold: Pine, 11,700,000; hardwood, 3,600,000; annual income, $319,198.

Number sawmills operating in county, 12; number sawmill workers, 120; weekly sawmill payroll, $6,000.

Number cords pine sold, 57,113; number cords hardwood sold, 10,627; wood chips sold, 250 cars.

Pulpwood income: Pine, $371,234.50; hardwood, $26,567.50; chips, $60,000; total, $451,802.

Number companies buying pulpwood, 10; number pulpwood dealers, 8; number pulpwood workers, 300.

Additional income from pulpwood employment, $664,784; annual income from all forest products and related services, $2,359,784.

Number trees planted yearly: 1959, 1,964,000; 1960, 2,879,600; 1961, 2,580,500.

Number tree farmers, 17; acreage in tree farms, 44,207.

Number professional foresters in county: Private, 1; company, 12; Government, 4.

Let us recognize the fact that growing timber is a long-term risk for every owner. When a tree is cut, a capital asset is gone, no matter how it is sold. The 1944 law placed an owner who cuts his timber or disposes of it under a cutting contract on the same tax basis as an owner selling outright. This was recognition that all such owners are essentially doing the same thing and should receive the same tax treatment.

It takes 20, 50, or 100 years to grow timber. Land and investment are tied up. There are many risks. The Congress recognized that it would not be fair to tax the gain from long-term increase in value under these conditions as if it all occurred in the year when the tree is cut. To tax this long-term growth at steeply graduated income tax rates was confiscatory in effect.

The 1944 tax reforms recognized the national interest in growing and conserving timber. They removed an existing impediment to the practice of sustained renewal of timberlands.

Since the capital gain treatment recognizes the long-term risk and the slow accrual of capital value, owners are now conserving and reproducing timber at rates never before achieved in the Nation's history.

Timber capital gain taxation has proved itself to be in the national interest for nearly two decades.

It has removed inequities in prior law, resulting from different tax treatment of similar transactions.

Our forest resources are expanding.

America's forest owners, 4,500,000 in number, have as a group taken great strides in forestry management and improved the supply of timber, on a sustained yield basis, for the Nation.

Their output is vital to the national economy.

Under fair and equitable taxation, they can be counted on to increase our national wealth in forest resources, meet the national need for forest products, and provide an enduring source of tax revenue to the National Government.

IN CONCLUSION

There are other proposals I would touch on, but I have concentrated on those possibly affecting jobs in my district, my State. I would like to borrow from the fine statement of Hon. Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, before the committee, February 6, 1963.

"In order to provide jobs for the unemployed, to accelerate the rate of economic growth and thus demonstrate to the rest of the world the dynamic strength of which we are capable, we must furnish greater incentives to the private sector to improve its performance. These incentives, I believe, are best provided by reductions in individual and corporate income taxes. The tax reduction approach to the solution of our present difficulty is two pronged. The reduction of the individual income tax rates in the middle and lower brackets will serve for the most part to increase consumption expenditures. These are the groups which spend the highest proportion of their incomes. With the expansion in consumer demand, idle plant capacity will be put back into operation and employment will increase. Corporate profits, which are especially sensitive to increases in the rate of plant utilization, will increase. Corporate profits motivate investment in new plant and equipment. Therefore, the gain in consumer spending will lead to greater corporate profits and more funds and incentive for investment.

"The second prong of the tax approach bears more directly on investment incentives. By reducing the tax rates on individuals in the upper brackets and on corporations, the motivation to exploit new opportunities in product and process invest-

ment is encouraged directly. Reduction of the corporate income tax to the recommended level will mean that Government is no longer the senior partner in sharing corporate profits. Furthermore, reduced income taxes mean greater cash flow for corporations.

"The President's tax program, therefore, would remove the overburden of taxation from the economy and provide the bigger markets and the greater incentives necessary for more vigorous economic growth."

Again let me assure you that I salute our President for the courageous approach to our tax problems. I hope to work with this committee in solving them. Thank you for listening to me today.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 23, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, March 23, 1963)

THE STRUGGLE—CAPITALISM VERSUS SOCIALISM

The real struggle in the world today is between capitalism and socialism. The free world, and especially we in the United States have allowed the Communists to put us on the defensive and have made us afraid to say what we are fighting for. They have made capitalism a dirty word and we have let them get away with it. We cannot win the struggle for survival and the freedom of mankind until the people and Members of Congress have the courage to stand up and shout that we believe in capitalism, that the choice man must make is between capitalism and socialism. The victory between these two basic systems will decide whether or not man will be free, for only under capitalism can he be free; he can be only a slave under socialism. The time has come for us to stop being apologists for a system which has given mankind its greatest opportunity and freedom in the history of the world. We know, and it is time to say it out loud, that profits are good, not evil.

The people know what the world struggle is all about. Members of Congress know the real issue, but few have the courage to name the combatants in this world struggle. We see the failure to say what we are fighting for in the stalling tactics of the present session of Congress. Nearly 3 months of this session have gone by and little, if any legislation has been passed by Congress. Indeed, no measures are being reported from the committees. Why? Because practically all of the New Frontier sponsored legislation moves us farther along the road to socialism and Congress is stalling in an effort to save our free enterprise system—capitalism. The only way we can save it is to face the issue openly and squarely, call socialistic legislation socialistic and serve notice that we are out to save and strengthen the capitalistic system.

The first step is to proclaim fiscal responsibility. Cut Federal spending and balance the budget. To be positive in support of capitalism and freedom a Member of Congress, in my opinion, must say "no" to new welfare porgrams and increased Government spending. The budget can be cut. I included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this week an excerpt from the U.S. News & World Report in which ways were listed to chop $3 billion from the President's spending programs. I suggested ways to chop off an additional $10.5 billion as follows: No public works until the budget is balanced; get the Government out of the power business; liquidate public housing; cut out federally sponsored urban renewal; eliminate Federal participation in depressed areas; cut the farm programs 20 percent; cut foreign aid by $3 billion; cut military authorizations 5 percent, and research 12.5 percent; knock $1 billion off the space program. This is the beginning of the way back to a sound and healthy economy, protection of the value of our dollar, renewed confidence in our system with the increased spur to individual and private initiative which are the weapons to win the war for capitalism and freedom.

DANGER SIGNS IN OUR DEFENSE STRATEGY

There are many danger signs in the various statements by the State Department and in the disarmament programs advocated by the White House and our military leaders. Each item in itself seems harmless, but pulling all the factors together a pattern seems to develop and in it I recognize a potential threat to the sovereignty and freedom of the United States. First, there was the establishment of the Disarmament Agency in the last session of Congress. Many Members of Congress voted for it because they believed it to be a valuable means of propaganda, but would mean nothing. I felt otherwise and voted against the disarmament resolution and said we should not give the world the impression that we were ready to disband our military forces so long as we were faced with a powerful enemy with a military machine dedicated to our destruction. Second, the now-famous State Department statement 7277, "Freedom From War," in which the suggestion is made that we turn our military forces over to the United Nations. Third, a new concept seems to be developing (U.S. News & World Report, March 25) to withdraw all our forces from Europe and Asia and create a Fortress America. It is this pattern that worries me and should worry the American people because we are not being told by the Kennedy administration of its plans—as a Member of Congress, I have to read about the development of a Fortress America in a magazine. Fortress America may be a sound concept, it seems to me, but let's talk it over. Members of Congress and the people should not be bypassed.

WHITHER THE UNITED NATIONS

If the American people are to lose their sovereignty to the U.N., what about a bill of particulars on the purposes of the U.N.? In recent research I am making there are further disturbing signs. The U.N. support of Communist slave states such as Cuba—the tendency of some of our representatives of the U.N. to swear greater allegiance to the international body than to the United States—the throwing the cloak of respectability around international gangsters such as Castro—the acceptance by the U.N. of international immorality in the conduct of government. Additional research has revealed to me direct conflicts between the U.N. Charter and the Constitution of the United States (examples: the charter delegates power to the Security Council to declare war. Under our Constitution only Congress can declare war for the United States. We saw this part of the charter in operation in the Korean war. The Security Council may regulate the kind and size of armaments for our national defense.

Since we have only one vote out of seven our sovereignty is in the hands of seven European and Asiatic nations whose interests are hostile to the United States, and our foreign policy would be in their hands. The charter destroys the Monroe Doctrine and scuttles the Pan American Union by subjecting them to the approval of European and Asiatic nations. We cannot continue to foster an international organization whose authority supercedes our own Constitution unless the people are told the whole truth about our relationship to the United Nations are given an opportunity to decide for themselves if they wish to trade our Constitution for the U.N. Charter. I am pointing out the danger points in this area so that the people may know about them for whatever action the people see fit to take.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN COSTA RICA?

There are no apparent results in the President's trip this week to Costa Rica. We provided no leadership except to squelch any action or desire toward action to eliminate communism from Cuba. Little militant action on the part of the leaders of Latin-American nations against Cuba was indicated. No commitments have been made by Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Chile to tighten up on air travel to Cuba. Frustration continues throughout South America. Out-and-out Communists, according to late news stories, do hold key posts in Brazil's Government. The leftists are due to cause trouble in Argentina in the June elections. Americans fear the Communists will score heavy gains in Chile's 1964 elections. Khrushchev continues to thumb his nose at the United States in his arrogant withdrawal of a handful of troops from Cuba and no guarantee that he intends to do more than that. The stage is now being set for the successful subversion by the Russian Communists of Latin America and South America. I raise these points now as a warning in the hope tragedy can be averted, much as I did my best to sound warnings in my newsletters and on the floor of the House for 22 months before Cuba was blown into a crisis by becoming the armed base for Khrushchev and communism in this hemisphere. Our foreign prestige continues to slide as the world sees us, under this administration, unable to lead the cause of freedom and unwilling to exercise domestic discipline required to bring about fiscal responsibility. In hearings before my Committee on Ways and Means I am now seeing the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American bankers, the NAM, all who have denounced deficit spending and an unbalanced budget now accepting them in order to get a tax cut. In the cause of freedom for all mankind, America must face up to the struggle—we must name the war as a war between capitalism and socialism and win the war for capitalism as only in such a victory can man truly be free.

Legislative History of Public Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 3, of the Committee on the Judiciary, charged with the responsibility of preparing the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code, I am constantly concerned with methods of making the publication of the laws more understandable and useful.

I want to call to the attention of the House a most significant and valuable

improvement in the publication of the laws by the General Services Administration; and I want to extend to the Administrator and to his staff in the Office of Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, responsible for this improvement, my warmest congratulations.

In my hand is a copy of Public Law 88–1, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. This print, which is popularly called a "slip law," is the initial publication of a Federal law upon enactment, and may be obtained at the National Archives. At the bottom of the page of this law is a legislative history, showing that this legislation was reported from the House Appropriations Committee, House Report No. 35, from the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senate Report No. 9, and that it was considered and passed by the House on February 27, 1963, and by the Senate on March 4, 1963—with a reference to volume 109 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This information, available for the first time as an addendum to the slip law itself, gives the essential information needed for research regarding the law. It will save untold hours of research. Without the information in this form it has, until now, been necessary for interested persons to have recourse either to the House Calendar or to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—which are not always readily available even here in Washington—presupposing that they have the necessary familiarity with those publications to enable them to know what to look for. From now on, with the guide published in the legislative history, that part of the research is already done and all that is necessary is to obtain the reports from the Superintendent of Documents and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for the days indicated.

I understand that the legislative history printed on the slip laws may be expanded in the future to give a reference to printed committee hearings on the legislation. In this connection, I hope that it will be possible for all committees to adopt a uniform simple method of identifying hearings—such as by serial numbers—so that only a brief reference to a serial number in the legislative history will be adequate. This would avoid lengthy descriptions of the subject matter of the hearings now frequently necessary to identify them.

I also understand that it may be planned to present the legislative histories in tabular form in the volumes of the statutes at large in the future. These volumes are, of course, the cumulation of the slip laws for each session. Incidentally, one of the recent improvements in the printing of the slip laws is the marginal reference to the volume and page of the statutes at large in which the particular law will ultimately be printed. Another recent improvement was in the numbering of the laws by incorporating a prefix indicating the number of the Congress. For example, this law is Public Law 88–1 and the next one will be Public Law 88–2. This system precludes the uncertainty that used to prevail when reference was made to, let us say, Public Law 601, without identifying the Congress.

I know that the Members and all other persons who must have recourse to legislative history join me in expressing this commendation to those responsible for these notable improvements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, a copy of Public Law 88–1—called a slip law—to illustrate these improvements.

PUBLIC LAW 88–1, 88TH CONGRESS, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 284, MARCH 6, 1963

Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign assistance programs

Public Law 480

For an additional amount for "Public Law 480," to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation due to expenses and costs of sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1701–1709), $508,172,000, to remain available until expended.

Approved March 6, 1963.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

House Report No. 35 (Appropriations Committee).

Senate Report No. 9 (Appropriations Committee).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109: February 27, 1963, considered and passed House; March 4, 1963, considered and passed Senate.

President Kennedy's Chicago Speech—A Sound Warning to Both Democrats and Republicans About America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the people of Chicago had the great pleasure of entertaining President Kennedy, who flew there to dedicate O'Hare Field. Huge throngs greeted the President along the 22-mile route from O'Hare Field to the Conrad Hilton Hotel, where the President was honored at a civic luncheon arranged by Mayor Richard J. Daley.

The President took this occasion to sound a clear and decisive warning to the Congress of the United States and the people of this Nation that unless we start meeting the mounting problem of creating new employment opportunities for the millions of additional Americans coming into the labor force, this Nation could face very serious problems.

President Kennedy's prophetic Chicago speech, in my judgment, is one of the great pronouncements of this century. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the compelling facts marshaled by President Kennedy in his Chicago address should, above all, serve to unite the Democratic majority in the Congress from North and South into a common cause. But just as decidedly, Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues can no longer ignore the grim consequences that face our Nation if they do not face up to the staggering problem and instead oppose administration measures merely for the sake of partisan objection.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that every Member of Congress in both Chambers will take the time to read President Kennedy's vitally important message delivered in Chicago and then unite behind this common cause—not as Democrats and Republicans, but as Americans.

The President's address follows:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S CHICAGO SPEECH—A SOUND WARNING TO BOTH DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS ABOUT AMERICA'S FUTURE

I am grateful for the warmth of your greeting. My gratitude to this city, and to your dynamic mayor, goes back many years; and I shall always welcome the opportunity to come once again to Chicago.

On each trip I see new signs of progress. Today we dedicated a great international airport. Already this city is becoming a great international seaport. And when I contemplate Chicago's role as a hub of American commerce—as a point of concentration for north, south, east and west—and as a point of convergence for rail, highway, air, and waterway travel—I am reminded that the decade in which we live seems to have been given a similar role in history. For in almost every sphere of activity, at home and abroad, countless rivers and streams which began long ago as tiny hidden springs are now all converging at once, in full floodtide, upon the turbulent sixties.

Today I want to talk about one tide that is causing us particular concern—the tide of manpower. That tide could be either favorable or ill fated. If this Nation can provide enough jobs to make the most of that flow, it will surely be a tremendous asset to our economic strength; and those nations which are short of manpower—such as most of those in Western Europe—will then envy America's good fortune.

But if this tide continues to flood our labor markets with pools of idle men, then, I must warn you, this Nation faces a decade of chronic trouble and recession—characterized by the economic waste and the human tragedy of unemployment, by higher welfare payments and weaker consumer markets, by recurrent problems of crime and delinquency and unstable labor relations. Already the issue of job security is placing an undue strain on collective bargaining—as those out of work demand negative solutions, such as import restrictions, featherbedding rules and a 35-hour week—and those still on the job grow less secure in the face of so much labor surplus.

That is why our No. 1 domestic concern is, and must be, jobs—jobs for the sixties, jobs for the tidal wave of men and women now flooding our labor market. It is a concern which requires the best efforts of us all—Federal, State, and local governments—management and labor leaders—builders of education and moulders of opinion.

Some may think it strange that the issue of jobs looms as large in the 1960's as it did in the 1930's, when the Nation was in depression. The difficulty then was an inordinately low supply of jobs to meet the manpower

demand. The difficulty now is an inordinately high manpower demand which exceeds the supply of jobs. But now, as then, every effort must be made to strengthen our economy so that the supply of jobs will equal the demand.

I would like to review with you today three of the principal causes of this manpower tide now converging upon our Nation.

For if we can better understand these causes, we can see more clearly that unemployment in the sixties cannot be reduced by the usual platitudes and pious hopes. The effects of all three of these tides, I might add, can be felt right here in Chicago.

FARM

1. First is the labor released by the revolution in farm technology. Agriculture has long been this Nation's largest employer—engaging more people than steel, automobiles, public utilities and the transportation industry combined. But now one farmer can meet the food and fiber needs of 25 Americans, compared to only 7 at the turn of the century. High speed farm machinery is much more widespread, and much more efficient and automatic. New fertilizers, insecticides and research are multiplying the yield per acre and worker. Since 1947, our farms have increased their output by more than 30 percent at the very same time that the number of man-hours worked on our farms was cut nearly in half.

Farm employment during that period declined by 3 million—an average of 200,000 a year, comparable to the entire work force of Akron, Ohio, being thrown out of work each year.

In the last 2 years alone, farm employment dropped by 500,000 while farm production and farm income were both rising. It is estimated—as disturbing as it sounds—that not more than 1 out of every 10 boys now living on the farm will find full-time work in agriculture.

YOUTH

2. This leads us to the second growing tide of manpower—our Nation's youth. The crest of the postwar baby flood has swept through the elementary and secondary schools and is now about to engulf the labor force. Last year, for example, 2.8 million young Americans reached the age of 16—but this year there will be 3.8 million reaching that age. Altogether, in the 1960's 26 million new young workers will enter the labor market—an increase of 40 percent over the fifties and a far greater number than this country has ever had to train and absorb in any previous 10-year period.

Already workers under the age of 25, though they comprise less than one-fifth of the labor force, constitute more than one-third of the unemployed. Last year the unemployment rate for men age 25 and over was roughly 4.4 percent—but for those age 20 to 24, it was 9 percent; and for those age 14 to 19 it was a shocking 13 percent.

Although young people are staying in school longer than their fathers, the rate of school dropouts—4 out of every 10—is still far too high; for job openings for the untrained and the unskilled are declining, in factories and mines, on farms and railroads, in the construction and service industries. Moreover, the jobless rate is always highest among unskilled and semiskilled workers. In our modern society, even high school graduates find their skills too often insufficient. But Labor Department surveys show that their rate of unemployment is at least far below that of school dropouts, not only in the year of leaving school but in later years as well. The latest available survey also showed a rate of unemployment among college graduates, whose job opportunities are broadening continually, to be only one-fifth as high as it was among those who had not completed elementary school; but unfortunately, only 1 out of 10 finishes college.

In short, as challenging as it will be to provide first jobs for the 26 million new young workers entering the labor market in the 1960's, far more difficult will be the problems posed by the 7.5 million of them who will not have completed high school, including nearly 2.5 million who will not even have completed the eighth grade. I ask you to mark those figures well; for youth unemployment poses one of the most highly explosive social and economic problems now facing this country—and this city. In the last decade, for example, arrests of youth increased 86 percent. What will the figure be for the next decade, when the net increase of potential young workers in the labor force rises 15 times as fast as it did in the 1950's.

AUTOMATION

3. Finally, underlying all of these trends is a third phenomenon, both cursed and praised; and that is technological advance, known loosely by the name of "automation." During the last 6 years, this Nation increased its manufacturing output by nearly 20 percent—but it did so with 800,000 fewer production workers; and the gain in white-collar jobs did not offset this loss. Since the Second World War, the real output of the private economy has risen 67 percent, with only a 3-percent rise in man-hours. I do not wish to be misunderstood; increasing productivity and advancing technology are essential to our ability to compete and to progress—but we also have an obligation to create an additional 2 million jobs each year for those displaced by these gains.

This city is no stranger to these problems. You have seen your railroads laying off machinists and boilermakers as the proportion of diesel locomotives rose from less than 15 percent of all locomotives in 1947 to more than 97 percent today. You have seen your downstate coal mines laying off workers as new machinery makes it possible for 46 men to produce the coal dug by 100 workers in 1947. And you have seen your steel mills employ 79 men to produce the steel products which required 100 men only a short decade ago. (Chicago, I might add parenthetically, also provides the exception to this pattern—since it now takes 10 men to manage the Cubs instead of 1.)

This is not a blue-collar problem alone. Office and clerical workers are increasingly being displaced by automatic computers and processors. I know, for example, that the Farmers Home Administration processes 35 percent more loans per employee than it did only 2 years ago.

This administration intends to press ahead with its efforts for Government economy—but we must also expand the private economy to find jobs for all who are willing.

OTHER FACTORS

There are other trends affecting manpower in the 1960's, in addition to those I have mentioned:

Far more women are in the labor market than ever before, now that so many more of them live in urban areas, receive a better education, enjoy more laborsaving devices at home and find more acceptance in industry.

There are more older workers than ever before, and those who lose their jobs must endure an average period of unemployment that is far above the national average.

Job discrimination against Negroes continues to hurt every age and occupational group, with even skilled Negro workers finding that their race keeps them out of work much longer and more often than their white counterparts.

And particular communities, called distressed areas—46 out of our 150 major labor market areas in February—continue to be extra hard hit by persistent and substantial unemployment.

CHICAGO

All these trends you have seen in this city and State—workers displaced by automation, school dropouts roaming the streets, men looking for work who have left the farm or the mines or a railroad or a distressed area. You have your share of jobless Negroes and women and older workers and all the rest, even though, under Mayor Daley's hard-driving, hard-working leadership, this city is creating new jobs faster than most.

THE NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

The same is true on a larger scale of the Nation as a whole. Our civilian labor force grew by nearly 12 million during the last 15 years, but the number of jobs grew by only 10 million. In the last 5 years, we saw an annual increase of only 175,000 private jobs outside of agriculture, compared to 700,000 in each of the previous 10 years. Our total output (gross national product) grew at a rate of only 3 percent—while unemployment remained continuously at 5 percent or above. And last year's loss of man-hours, in terms of those willing but unable to find full-time work, was a staggering 1 billion workdays, equivalent to shutting down the entire country with no production, no services, and no pay for over 3 weeks. Some 14 million Americans had some unemployment in 1962. And 28 percent of last year's unemployed were out of work 15 weeks or longer—15 percent were out of work a full 6 months or longer. This Nation can do better than that.

The trouble is that each of these figures grows worse after each recession—and each one is bound to grow worse in the sixties as the labor force increases even faster, unless we take actions to reverse these trends and make the most of our manpower. Unless we step up our rate of growth—unless we create a supply of jobs that is more equal to the demand—our rate of unemployment will steadily and swiftly climb to the recession level of 7 percent, even without a recession.

Without full employment, consumer markets are below their potential. Without stronger consumer demand, plant capacity is not fully in use. Without full plant utilization, profit margins are reduced. Without higher profits, investment lags behind. And so the sagging spiral continues.

OUR MANPOWER PROGRAM FOR THE SIXTIES

Our task is to reverse this spiral—and no single magic solution will solve all of our manpower problems.

Above all, we need to release the brake of wartime tax rates which are now holding down growth at the very time we need more growth to create more jobs. Ten billion dollars more in tax savings, in the hands of American consumers and investors, as I have proposed to the Congress, will be multiplied many times i. new markets, new equipment, new jobs, new payrolls and then still more consumption and investment.

As this decade is unique in terms of the trends converging on it, so is 1963 uniquely qualified to be the year we cut Federal taxes. Inflationary pressures are at bay. No world crisis strains our resources. The dollar is strong and respected. New investment incentives have been enacted. World raw material prices are stable. And the number of idle men and machines can clearly absorb more expansion.

But tax reduction alone is not enough if we are to attack unemployment in those areas and among those workers where the need is greatest.

Tax reduction alone will not employ the unskilled or bring business to distressed areas. And tax reduction alone is not, therefore, the only program we have offered.

To mention but a few:

We urgently need to improve our schools and colleges—to reduce the number of dropouts—to reduce the number of unskilled

workers—to keep young people out of the labor market until they are ready for the jobs which automation creates, instead of those it is sure to replace.

We urgently need a new youth employment opportunities program, to give young people training and job experience, and to put their energies to good use.

We need to step up our efforts for aid to distressed areas, for the retraining of the unemployed, for more security for the aged, for improving our housing and our transportation industries, and for ending race discrimination in education and employment.

These are all controversial measures. They all take time to enact and take effect. But meanwhile the growing pool of manpower continues to grow, a burden that should be a blessing, a liability that could be an asset.

I have no doubt that these problems will someday be solved. The question is, Will they be solved in ways that impoverish us—with restrictions on the workweek, or on efficiency, or on competition? Or will they be solved in ways that enrich us—by expanding our economy and putting all hands to work? The choice is up to us all—to you in Chicago as well as to those of us in Washington. It depends on the will of the people as well as the will of the Congress.

Twenty-five hundred years ago the Greek poet Alcaeus laid down the principle which best sums up the greatness of Chicago.

"Not houses firmly roofed," he wrote, "or the stones of walls well builded, nay, nor canals and dockyards make the city—but men able to use their opportunities."

Chicago is blessed to have such men at its helm. And my fervent hope is that the United States of America, in meeting the needs of this decade, will also be peopled and governed by men able to use their opportunities.

Foreign Handouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the December 17, 1962, issue of U.S. News & World Report carried a splendid question and answer exclusive interview with our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [OTTO E. PASSMAN] on the subject of foreign handouts.

Mr. PASSMAN knows more about our foreign aid program than anyone else, either in or out of Congress. For the fiscal year 1964 budget he proposes a 50-percent cut in the appropriation for foreign aid.

I commend this interview to all who wish to be informed on a program which is rapidly undermining our economy.

HARD LOOK AT FOREIGN AID

(NOTE.—Are Americans getting their money's worth out of the foreign-aid billions? Representative OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign-aid Appropriations, has studied the U.S. program more thoroughly than any other one Member of Congress. Mr. PASSMAN has just returned from a world tour, taking a look at foreign aid in operation. What are his impressions now? In this exclusive interview, the Congressman tells of widespread waste and mishandling, and what he thinks should be done about it.)

Question. Mr. PASSMAN, after this latest checkup at firsthand, what is your impression of the foreign-aid program?

Answer. I'm completely disgusted with foreign aid. I can convince any reasonable man that we've substituted aid for trade, we've substituted appeasement for a firm and fair foreign policy. The people are taking advantage of us all around the world.

Question. In what way?

Answer. It is a waste of the wealth of the American taxpayer to pour foreign aid into nations that are enjoying a good standard of living and where they do not tax their own people on the same basis we tax ours—we who are giving the aid.

Let me give you an example:

I was in Bangkok, Thailand, having dinner with one of the wealthier merchants, and I asked the specific question: "If you should earn $100,000 net from your business, how much income tax would you pay?" He said: "I'd have to pay $12,000. It's robbery."

I said: "Do you realize that if an individual in the United States earns $100,000 net he must pay the Government $72,000?" He couldn't believe it.

Question. You spoke earlier of waste in foreign aid—

Answer. I mean money going in on a political basis rather than going in actually to help the masses. That's almost the pattern of aid throughout the world, with the exception of a few industrialized nations.

I find the masses in many countries just don't know anything about American aid. The aid is going to governments, not to the people. It's not accomplishing the objectives we wish for it.

The money isn't being used effectively. In almost any country you visit, you'll find a few powerful individuals who are anxious to get hold of cash—and it winds up in some bank in the United States or Switzerland. It doesn't do the country any good.

Question. Is there some way to straighten out these things?

Answer. We're trying to apply the Marshall plan formula that worked successfully in industrialized nations in Europe to primitive and underdeveloped nations around the world. Well, the fact is, you see, many of these people are perfectly happy with things as they are.

Question. Are there fields where aid can be beneficial in these primitive, underdeveloped areas?

Answer. The aid program, in my candid opinion, is uncontrolled and uncontrollable.

Question. What makes you say that?

Answer. A lot of the appointments are made on a political basis. Men are placed in charge of huge programs who have never met a payroll in their lives. They may be good, patriotic Americans—of course, they are—but they just don't know anything about what they're doing.

And many times the aided countries, themselves, don't do anything like their own share to help their people.

Question. Can you give us a concrete example?

Answer. Take Hong Kong. I recommended the full amount requested for the refugee program out there because of suffering caused by a typhoon. Well, when you speak of funds for refugees, that doesn't just mean food. It involves resettlement, sending the children to school, many other things. These take careful, knowledgeable planning.

Another thing. Hong Kong has some of the wealthiest merchants in the world. There are some 3,000 shops there and practically all of the money they take in is either in dollars or can be converted into dollars. Still, a man in Hong Kong who makes $100,000 pays only $3,000 in taxes.

So what we're doing is taxing ourselves into destruction to help people all over the world before we make sure that they are taxing their own people on the same basis as we tax the American people.

Question. Do you expect any major changes as a result of the appointment of David E. Bell to head foreign aid?

Answer. I do not. I don't think the Director has any more to do with running the aid program than I have to do with the doctors who run Walter Reed Hospital. He may make certain decisions as to levels of aid, but, in the end, it is an arm of foreign policy. We're handing out dollars from the top level. It's hard for any man who has been successful in life to take the punishment he has to take as Foreign Aid Director. We've had, if I'm not mistaken, 12 Directors in 14 years.

I think Mr. Bell is quite able. I think he should have the opportunity to do a thorough job and cut down on expenditures. If he does, I'll cooperate with him.

But if he's being put in there to find ways to spend money, I'm going to fight him with all the ability I have.

Question. How much will the administration want next year?

Answer. I hope the request is for far less. Since I became chairman I have had a foreign-aid goal of $2.5 billion annually. We did work it down to where we appropriated $2.8 billion, but then the thing started up again. This year it was almost $4 billion.

Question. Will you still work for that $2.5 billion ceiling

Answer. I shall. Since coming back, I'm just as disgusted with foreign aid as I've ever been—maybe more so. We've gotten to the point where we try to let the American dollar do everything in the world. The world has got to help itself.

The Test-Ban Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the March 18, 1963, Washington Report of the American Security Council, entitled "The Test-Ban Trap":

THE TEST-BAN TRAP

By 1958, the long Communist propaganda campaign to arouse world hysteria over nuclear fallout had succeeded even beyond expectations. Perhaps that is why the United States, during that year, plunged into the Geneva nuclear test-ban treaty negotiations without resolving the basic issue of whether any such treaty is in the fundamental U.S. national interest.

There have been attempts since then to resolve this basic question concurrently with a second vital one, namely, whether various proposed treaty terms under negotiation are safe. This has only served to confuse and obscure the answers to both.

The answers cannot be found in well-intentioned hopes for a less dangerous, more peaceful world; they must come from a realistic, hardheaded evaluation of today's risky facts of international life, among which are these:

1. The prime objective of the United States—survival of the Nation and its free world allies—is in direct conflict with communism's unalterable objective—world domination.

2. To deter Communist leaders from choosing nuclear war to quickly gain their

objective, U.S. national policy is to maintain a superior nuclear weapons arsenal capable of instant and deadly retaliation.

3. Risk-reducing international agreements are made difficult by communism's consistent record of treaty breaking, which caused former President Eisenhower to warn, "We can have no confidence in any treaty to which the Communists are a party, except where such a treaty provides within itself for self-enforcing mechanisms."

IS A TEST-BAN TREATY IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES?

Any consideration of this question must assume that an enforceable treaty can be negotiated with the Soviet Union, that is, one under which significant nuclear testing by the U.S.S.R. and the United States would be equally inhibited.

Test-ban adherents contend such a treaty would bring about a net reduction of the risks faced by the United States and its free world partners. Prudence, however, requires that this assertion be examined in the light of whether an actual net reduction in risks would occur, or whether new and different risks might be created which would leave matters worse off than before.

On this score, the reader will be left to his own evaluation of the arguments for and against a comprehensive treaty banning nuclear tests in all environments—the air, underground, underwater, and outer space. Here are the arguments most commonly heard:

Pro. A treaty will slow down the development of nuclear weapons by limiting research to the laboratories, unassisted by the important element of practical experimentation.

Con. The Soviets can keep top-quality scientists working under these conditions; a free society cannot. Thus a shift of nuclear weapons superiority would be inevitable. What happens then?

Pro. A treaty will slow down proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries—holding down the chances of accidental war and the number of parties to be satisfied before workable arms control agreements can be reached.

Con. It is dangerously naive to believe one nation can "handle" another which is determined to achieve nuclear weapons—France, for example. Attempts by the United States to "handle" European allies will strain NATO to the breaking point.

Pro. A treaty will help to open up the closed Soviet society and establish an invaluable precedent for working out other and more comprehensive arms control agreements.

Con. It is idle to think a very small number of inspections in the U.S.S.R would have significant impact on the structure and attitudes of a Communist society.

Pro. A treaty will eliminate whatever danger exists from fallout from U.S. and U.S.S.R. nuclear weapons testing in the air.

Con. Only a simple atmospheric treaty is needed for this. Until the U.S.S.R. agrees, fallout from tests is the inevitable price for avoiding fallout from war.

Pro. A treaty will promote international good feeling and will spur arms control and disarmament.

Con. Artificially manufactured good will would generate euphoric pressures for schemes in fact disarming the West and only in theory disarming the Communists.

ARE TEST-BAN TREATY PROVISIONS UNDER PRESENT CONSIDERATION SAFE?

Whether or not a study of the pros and cons leads to a conclusion that a test ban treaty is undesirable, the U.S. Government is in the process of negotiating one. Thus it becomes pertinent to inquire: Will provisions the United States now wants to put into the treaty stop the U.S.S.R. from conducting significant nuclear tests and clandestinely capturing nuclear weapons superiority?

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is writing a new draft treaty for submission at Geneva this spring. During recent hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the draft's "enforcement" provisions were outlined as:

1. Cheat detection machinery capable with fair reliability of spotting underground tests of 3 kilotons or larger in geologic formations of alluvium;

2. Seven "on-site" inspections annually on Soviet soil of "suspicious" events which can be detected; and,

3. Relatively unreliable machinery to detect cheating in space.

We need not examine here the possibilities of cheating in space or at yields above 3 kilotons. This is simply because the draft contains at least three other bigger and more attractive holes through which the Soviets could sneak forward secretly to surprise nuclear superiority and its equivalent: world domination.

HOLE 1: UNDERGROUND TESTS BELOW 3 KILOTONS

A parade of witnesses told the Joint Committee that tests underground—singly or in series—below 3-kiloton yield simply cannot be detected at all. In this testing range the United States would forego wholly any and all weapons development and, as a practical matter, simply trust to the Soviets to keep their word not to carry on undetectable tests and secretly develop nuclear weapons of vast military significance.

These are the significant weapons which Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, the AEC's director of military applications, told the Joint Committee could be clandestinely tested and developed in this undetectable area:

1. Relatively low-yield weapons of the tactical type.

2. Much high-yield battlefield tactical weapons by extrapolation from explosions as small as 1 kiloton without the necessity for proof testing.

3. At least one-half of all strategic weapons of all yields and types of interest to the military—also without the need for proof testing.

As an indication of where weapons development interest lies, General Betts stated that about 50 percent of all actual U.S. underground testing in Nevada is carried out in this low, undetectable, below 3-kiloton range.

HOLE 2: DECOUPLED UNDERGROUND TESTS

The simplest expedient of conducting tests in underground cavities drastically muffles their seismic effect. Shock waves from the explosion are decoupled from the surrounding earth. In this manner, seismic signals of 10 kilotons to 30 kilotons can be reduced far below the 3-kiloton threshhold of nondetectability.

General Betts authoritatively told the Joint Committee that by this means a cheater, without any possibility of detection, could develop a substantial fraction of all large yield strategic weapons of military interest. The remaining one-half of tactical weapons not sneaked through hole No. 1 could, of course, be sneaked through this hole.

HOLE NO. 3: SURPRISE ABROGATION

Surprise abrogation is possibly the most serious of all holes in the new test ban treaty draft. Even Disarmament Agency Administrator William C. Foster admits surprise abrogation might put us "as much as 18 months behind in our readiness to test." He minimizes its effect by saying:

"The Government will make it a matter of national policy to maintain readiness to test, and to provide funds necessary to keep competent scientific talent available. Under these circumstances, our scientists should retain incentives to continue nuclear weapons research and our weapons laboratories should function effectively."

This, however, is wishful thinking. The best answer to it comes from President Kennedy himself. On March 2, 1962, in announcing test resumption at that time, he said:

"But in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly, and found it impossible of execution."

In summary, there is no rational ground to argue that the test ban treaty draft soon to be offered by the United States is safe—there is more ground to argue that it is not even sane.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress, California.

A Salute to Sacony and S. Augstein & Co., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1963, I was privileged to attend the celebration marking two decades in South Carolina for Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc. On that occasion, along with Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, I flew to Cheraw and there visited the Cheraw Division of the Sacony Manufacturing Co. Later that afternoon I was privileged to stand in the receiving line at the reception when many of the citizens of Cheraw gathered for the purpose of speaking to the various guests. At 7:30 in the Cheraw armory an enormous banquet was held, and 500 people met to do honor to Sacony Manufacturing Co., S. Augstein & Co., Inc., and to salute the members of the Sacony family who have contributed to our growth for 10, 15 years, and more. It was a happy and festive occasion, and pins were given to those with 10 and 15 years of service. The pins were distributed by Mr. Sidney Augstein, president, and chief executive officer of S. Augstein & Co., Inc.

After the national anthem, a most appropriate invocation was given by Rev. H. Dwight McAlister, of Cheraw. The Honorable Reginald R. Sipe, mayor pro tempore, city of Cheraw, delivered the address of welcome in the absence of Mayor Russell Bennett, who had to be out of town on business. Mr. Thomas E. Hassett, Jr., president of Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc., made appropriate remarks and presented to Mr. Adolph M. Augstein, chairman of the board of directors, a memento from the many officials and employees of Sacony, who were delighted to do him honor and pay him homage on the occasion.

Mr. Adolph M. Augstein then made an address which was followed by the presentation of the gold service pins by President Sidney Augstein. The list of those receiving the pins follows:

Cheraw—10 years: Loyd Allen, Martha Ammons, Dora Bailey, Ruby Baker, Ruby Baucom, Gladys Bone, Geneva Braswell, Edythe Brigman, Eva Mae Brigman, Annie Brock, Christine Brock, William Brown, Dorothy Bruce, Myrtle Campbell, Uzell Campbell, Annie Sue Carpenter, Allen Cassidy, Ramona Cassidy, Emma Jean Chapman, Flora Chavis, Grace Chavis, Mattie Cheves, Vernie Clark, Catherine Crawley, Cora Lee Curry, Lucy Deese, Eva Mae Dixon, Clara Mae Driggers, Mary Driggers, Kathryn Easterling, Rose Evans, Geneva Freeman, Doris Gardner, Edith Gardner, Jean Gaskins, Joan Gaskins, Jayne Gentry, Clyde Hair, Sue Harpe, Mary Etta Keith, Clyde Kimrey, Ruth Kimrey, Lawrence King, Kermit Q. Kirby, Tululah Knight, Charles Kudrna, Edna Lee, Oscar Lewis, Janie Livingston, Nellie Lofton, Geneva Lowrey, Margaret Mathis, Gertrude McDonald, Edith Miller, Alice Moore, Hester Moore, Nora Morris, Lucille Phillips, Betty Margie Pruitt, Virginia Quick, Mary Ruth Rivers, Nezzie Sings, Ethel Spencer, Robert Tanner, Clyde Tolson, Ethel Tolson, John Tucker, Ruby Turnage, Doris Wallace, Jessie Wallace, William Wallace, Ruby Watts, Margaret White, Thelma White, Ophelia Wood, and Irene Wooten.

Fifteen years: Louise Barfield, Beatrice Boatright, Doris Brigman, Viola Bruner, Ruby Butler, Mary Chapman, Victoria Crould, Ruth Culbreth, Mildred DeBerry, Mary Lee Eddings, Evelyn Fisher, Louise Frazier, Eva Graham, Grace Hall, Viola Mathis, Grace McDonald, Pearl McDonald, James McQuaige, Sr., Jaine Parker, Sarah Quick, Nelle Rivers, Josephine Russell, Sue Spease, Elizabeth Strickland, James Stuard, Howard Thomas, Bertha Tilley, and Virgie Wallace.

Chesterfield—10 years: Ethel Adams, Evelyn Adams, Ola Baker, Almeter Brantley, Mary Brantley, Mary Brock, Nell Burch, Frances Burr, Lucy Burr, Maggie Davis, Margaret Davis, Katie Lee Deese, David Douglas, Mildred Douglas, Evelyn Eddins, Barbara Evans, Marguerite Gaskins, Ruth Gaskins, Betty Harpe, Joyce Hinson, Mary Huneycutt, Flora Huntley, Martha Huntley, Mary Huntley, Bessie Lee Jackson, Hallie James, Sally Johnson, Otis Jones, Alberta Jordan, Betty Jordan, Melba Faye Jordan, Marie Kirkley, Mary Lee, Clara Belle Lisenby, Leila Lisenby, Mary Ella Lisenby, Mildred Lisenby, Vivian Lisenby, Eva Mills, Nell Moore, Mary Pate, Nealie Polson, Mary Raffaldt, Carolyn Rhyne, Alma Rivers, Betty Rivers, Elizabeth Rivers, Ralph Rivers, Leila Rollins, Anthel Sellers, Daisy Sellers, Essie Sellers, Ruby Sellers, Vera Sellers, Sara Shaver, Emma Mae Smith, Margaret Smith, Ruby Smith, Ruth Stroud, Marion Teal, B. Thurman Teal, Mary Vaughn, Geraldine Watson, Eleanor White, Eva White, and Leatha White.

Fifteen years: Bessie Oliver and Olivia Watson.

Manning—10 years: Maggie Alsbrook, Cecil Anderson, Margaret Ardis, Frances Broadway, Janie Campbell, Emma Clark, Eunice Clark, Edith Cook, Frances Evans, Mary Evans, Minnie Evans, Sally Gardner, Caddie Gibbons, Aurelia Green, Edna Hodge, Ella Hodge, Rachel Hodge, Mary Johnson, Coline Kennedy, Jewell Langston, Anna Lowder, Corrie Mae McElveen, Mary McRoy, Virginia Melton, Helen Morris, Vista Peebles, Azilea Plowden, Catherine Prescott, Corine Rhodus, Annie Richbourg, Louise Richbourg, Edith Ridgeway, Cornelia Spigner, Ola Spigner, Dorothy Strange, Lucy Tarte, Lila Mae Thames, Corrie Thigpen, Liffie Thigpen, Richard Thigpen, Ruth Timmons, Hummin Tobias, and Luvenia Welch.

Pageland—10 years: Annie Allen, Betty Anderson, Laura Brock, Inez Byrd, Nell Carnes, Vera Cato, Ellen Clark, Evelyn Clark, Martha Clark, Crissie Clontz, Letha Donahue, Loretta Eubanks, Allie Evans, Henrietta Evans, Cleo Funderburk, Eva Funderburk, Marion Funderburk, Eunice Haithcock, Nettie Haithcock, Blondell Hamilton, Wilma Hancock, Azilee Hicks, Lavinia Hinson, Paul Hunter, Harry Jackson, Curtis Jenkins, Bessie Lee Johnson, Marsha Kelly, Lois Knight, Estelle Laney, Worth Lee, Theda Lynn, Cora Mangum, Johnnie Medlin, Virginia Mills, Joanna Nicholson, Lucy Nicholson, Mae Oliver, Mary Outen, Nelle Pigg, Lucy Price, Margaret Rallings, Gladys Rivers, Azilee Robertson, Grace Rogers, Bessie Rollings, Evelyn Rollings, Ola Rollings, Violet Rollings, Flora Rollins, Blanche Rorie, Winona Rorie, Maude Rushing, Clara Short, Grace Shrum, Annie Sims, Leila Sulivan, Cora Taylor, Mary Taylor, Grace Terry, Gladys Thomas, Minor Threatt, Mary Lois Timmons, Gladys Turner, Lessie Walters, and Helen Watts.

Fifteen years: Ovie Agerton, Christine Brewer, Mary Broome, Mildred Byrd, Henrietta Carter, Ethel Courtney, Mae Courtney, Vera Gibson, Lucy Griggs, Eva Gulledge, Ella Hancock, Lela Hicks, Jane Huneycutt, Bessie Jackson, Cloria Kirkley, Mae Laney, Bertha Little, Lillie Mangum, Mary Lee Maples, Janie Nash, Addie Price, Leona Price, Claire Robbins, Azilee S. Robertson, Nell Robinson, Rosa Robinson, Lee Roy Rollings, Lena Rollings, Thelma Rollings, Vinnie Rollings, Pearl Rorie, Mary Sanders, Zula Smith, Thelma Sutton, Allie Terry, Lennie Threatt, Willie Threatt, and Henry Watts.

Appropriate remarks were made by the Honorable Donald S. Russell, Governor of the State of South Carolina, who told of the happiness of our people in having Sacony as part of the South Carolina industrial family and pledged the continuing cooperation of the State of South Carolina in Sacony's magnificent production and posture.

As a pleasant and welcome surprise, Mr. Sidney Augstein presented to Mr. L. C. Wannamaker, dedicated legal counsel for the company, an appropriate plaque. This plaque saluted the wonderful legal services Mr. Wannamaker has rendered to the company over the 20-year period of its efforts in South Carolina. Mr. Wannamaker then introduced the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON, U.S. Senator from the State of South Carolina, who told of the coming of Sacony to South Carolina when he was Governor. He recited the incidents surrounding the visits to the Governor's office when he was Governor and not only welcomed Sacony to South Carolina, but pledged the cooperation and effort on behalf of the State of South Carolina. Then Senator JOHNSTON took occasion to salute the Augstein family, whose significant history is intertwined with the company presently giving employment and production in South Carolina, and I am sure I speak the feeling of those present when I say that his address was heartwarming, appropriate, and inspiring. I include Senator JOHNSTON's address. It was preceded by a magnificent introduction by Mr. L. C. Wannamaker, whose very cadence reflected the happiness of the occasion and his delight in participating. The address of Senator JOHNSTON is as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR OLIN D. JOHNSTON

Caston, I am not quite sure what you want me to do for you but whatever it is, you let me know because I guess I will have to come through after all those nice things you said about me.

Governor Russell, Mayor Bennett, Mr. Adolph Augstein, and Mr. Sidney Augstein; and other distinguished guests: When I was first asked to attend this 20th anniversary celebration, I hesitated to agree to deliver any speech because I have been so close to the development and life of the Augstein Industries in South Carolina that I thought I might be a little handicapped, or you might say prejudiced, in what I would say.

Today in South Carolina when a great percentage of our people in business, government, and industry think in terms of the industrial growth of our State, we like to pat ourselves on the back, rightfully so, and talk about the miraculous changes that have taken place in our economy as a result of our efforts to bring new industry into our State.

Too often we fail to pat the backs of those who in the early days of our industrial development had the foresight and the pioneering spirit to come into our agricultural area and promote industry. Industry begets industry and I feel that today we owe a deep debt of gratitude to companies such as Sacony, headed by Mr. Augstein, for helping us in South Carolina to grow industrially.

Twenty years ago when Adolph Augstein first came to South Carolina, surveyed our assets and liabilities, I was in my second term as Governor of South Carolina. We had been fighting the freight rate battle and had established the first State development board, the industrial commission, labor department, as well as our ports authority and other institutions looking toward industrial development. Caston, many of the industries we have brought to South Carolina in recent years probably would not have come here if such men as the late Senator Jim Leppard, of Chesterfield and yourself, as legislators, had not followed my recommendations as Governor, and passed laws creating the labor department, the workmens compensation law, and other similar progressive acts necessary for a good industrial climate. But we did not have all the anwers to the industrialists who came into our State wondering whether or not they should move or start new industries within our borders. Anyone starting a new industry in a primarily agricultural society, necessarily took a certain risk in their development. Sacony is one of those industries which helped to lead the way for other industries.

In our early development years we pointed with pride to Sacony as an example of what other industries could do in our primarily agricultural economy. We looked to Sacony as one of our examples of success. I know Sloan Gable with the State development board can well remember in those early days how Mr. Augstein and Sacony helped us with the many industrial prospects who came to South Carolina. Once we had them inside a Sacony mill we let Mr. Augstein and his people do all the talking. We couldn't have hired better salesmen to help us get new industry to South Carolina. So you can see, Sacony has played a principal part in the overall industrial development of our State.

When Sacony located in South Carolina in 1945 the war had ended and it was before the great South Carolina industrial development revolution.

Today Sacony employs over 2,500 people in Pageland, Chesterfield, Bethune, and Manning plants, and the future, because of wise planning and cooperation on local levels, continues to be bright. Throughout these 20 years of growth in South Carolina, I have maintained close personal relations with Sacony and from time to time have been involved in some of the problems and some of the jobs that have come the way of Sacony.

Many people who hear the name Sacony, think of it in terms of just another plant or another industry and another payroll and another source of tax revenue, but the impact on our economy goes far beyond just these factors.

I guess people know more about Sacony through its products than they do about Sacony. Sacony has established high standards of plant operation and relations with employees. From the first day of its operation until now, Sacony's record in South Carolina has never been marred by any labor-management dispute. This speaks well for management and for those employed in these plants.

Sacony represents the kind of industry South Carolina needs and wants. We are glad in South Carolina that we had something to offer Sacony, but let it never be said that South Carolina has not been thankful for what Sacony has given her. I speak in terms of South Carolina because it takes the whole State to cooperate and keep an industry operating successfully and smoothly and to remain on its feet.

But certainly I cannot commend the relationship between Sacony and our State without singling out the people of Chesterfield County who cooperated in this pioneer venture 20 years ago. What the people in Chesterfield County did in cooperation with Sacony equals in contribution to our entire State's industrial growth to what Sacony contributed. The harmonious relationship and the success of Sacony in Chesterfield County has been a living example for other areas of our State to follow. No section of our State has met the challenges of industrial expansion and contributed to our State's growth in a more splendid manner than Chesterfield County.

Sacony is one company that has spanned the entire postwar industrial growth era of our great State, and I predict they will continue on matching their growth and success with our State's growth and success throughout the coming years.

I think I should cite here the executive management of S. Augstein & Co., Inc., and Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc. They are as follows:

S. Augstein & Co., Inc.; executive management: Chairman of the board of directors, Mr. Adolph M. Augstein; president and chief executive officer, Mr. Sidney Augstein; corporate secretary, Mrs. Carolyn A. Winik; treasurer-controller, Mr. Leon Reinharth; vice president, manufacturing division, Mr. Thomas E. Hassett, Jr.; vice president, women's wear division, Mr. Arthur R. Travis; vice president, assistant to chairman of the board, Mr. Saul N. Pollack; director, children's wear division, Mr. Irwin Alfin; director, fabric division, Mr. Albert S. Baris; and director, sportswear division, Mr. Chester S. Strasser.

Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc.; executive management: President, Mr. Thomas E. Hassett, Jr.; manager, quality control division, Mr. Charles G. Kudrna; manager, shipping and warehouse division, Mr. William J. O'Donnell; manager, Cheraw cutting division, Mr. Kermit Q. Kirby; manager, Cheraw sewing division, Mr. Clyde Hair; manager, Chesterfield sewing division, Mr. Otis M. Jones; manager, Chesterfield special manufacturing division, Mr. David F. Douglas; manager, Manning sewing division, Mr. Harold Lee; and manager, Pageland sewing division, Mr. Linwood Zeigler.

The young and vigorous president of S. Augstein & Co., Mr. Sidney Augstein, made a most significant address as part of the festivities of the occasion. He recalled the ambitions and the dedication of his family, and in the audience were his father, mother, and his sister. Rather than try to embellish his statements, I include at this point the complete text of his remarks:

REMARKS OF SIDNEY AUGSTEIN AT CHERAW, S.C.

Honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I don't need to tell you how proud we are that you have taken the time to come here tonight to break bread with us, and remind us how warm and hospitable the people of South Carolina can be. It was Emerson who said: "Hospitality must be for service not for show." Certainly the hospitality of South Carolinians is one of service and the manner in which you extend it is gratifying indeed.

When we first came to this State 20 years ago, there were, undoubtedly, some among you who were dubious about the establishment of a factory to make women's and children's apparel. There has always been a certain precariousness about the apparel trades, a doubt that any given company can long endure. Justification for this attitude lies, no doubt, in the industry records which show that the average length of company life in the apparel trades is less than 10 years.

I am sure that you recognized something in Sacony, even 20 years ago. At that time we had been in business for over 50 years. I for one am ready to admit that the very real assistance which you gave us has made it possible for us to chalk up more than 70 years of continuous operation, something rare in the apparel trades.

But I want to stress that we are in an important industry, one that is often underrated in a Nation that has become accustomed to the workings of giant corporations; where total business and profits are measured in billions or hundreds of millions of dollars.

By contrast there are no apparel manufacturers who can show as much as $100 million in annual sales, maybe a half dozen have passed the $50 million mark, and only a handful do better than $10 million.

I repeat, we are in an important industry, nevertheless. It is one essential to the welfare of the Nation, and one that we can be proud of even though the individual producing units are relatively small.

Will there ever be a General Motors in the fashion industry? I doubt it. Sacony will grow and so will other apparel manufacturers, but not to a point where any one will ever account for more than 2 or 3 percent of total fashion industry sales.

As apparel producers, we are doing something more than just covering the human body; we are helping the wearer to create an image of good grooming and, I like to think we are helping to uplift her spirit to give a sense of security and well-being.

There is a subtleness in this business that precludes the use of any fully automated process. A good apparel style is like a work of art, but not a work or art that can be reproduced on a printing press. Each garment has in it, a little bit of the maker, his skill, his concern, a little bit of his love for humanity.

Women's apparel alone is a $12 billion industry in the United States. This is at the wholesale level, our level. Including infants' and children's and men's and boys', the figure would easily reach over $20 billion annually. Expenditures for apparel at the retail level are probably in excess of $31 billion a year.

This Nation boasts of the highest standard of living in the world. This is reflected in the expenditures our people make, not only for the essentials of living but for luxuries as well.

Expenditures are now running at a rate of $360 billion a year. Clothing stands high on the list of articles that consumers buy, and contrary to what many think, there is more money spent for the purchase of clothes than the purchase of automobiles. Clothing expenditures are also greater than those for furniture and household equipment.

The late Thorstein Veblen, a brilliant critic on modern business, wrote: "The material framework of modern civilization is the industrial system, and the directing force which animates this framework is business enterprise."

I quote Veblen only to spotlight something we are often reluctant to admit; namely, the goal of business is to make a profit. I believe this is a legitimate goal, but—and it is a big but—if this were our sole aim, we will have failed. We must take into account other human goals, and the hopes and aspirations of the people involved, their friendship, and the need to help the individual achieve a sense of personal identity, a sense of belonging to this endeavor.

It has been said that the ultimate goals in life are often achieved by indirect means. We have among our goals the desire to create products of true economic worth, to offer the buyer a genuine advantage, and serve him better than anyone else. In the Sacony philosophy there is the axiom that building of customer loyalty will pay off.

And we will invest in people, particularly those who work with us, we will seek to create a climate in which they will want to work with us, where they can do the best they have in them to do.

We believe that a company of this kind will prove more profitable in the long run than one in which the "fast buck" is the sole objective, regardless of human values.

We hope that we shall never get so big that we will be out of touch with those who work with us. It is physically impossible, of course, for management to come into daily contact with everyone in our factories, but we want you to feel that we are establishing policies that do fulfill our obligation to you, no matter what your task, and that our supervisory personnel will be ever mindful of these policies.

Someone facetiously once said: "A corporation is an ingenious device for obtaining individual profit without individual responsibility." I disagree. Rather I would subscribe to the thought expressed recently by Mr. Greenewalt, chairman of the Du Pont Co., and I quote him:

"A corporation is not a cold legalistic instrument existing without heart or emotional involvement, but a sensitive human institution, reflecting nothing more or less than the human cells and sinews of which it is composed."

Mr. Greenewalt also expressed a simple truth in successful business operation that we often lose sight of:

"The difference between the notably successful institution and one whose record is simply run of the mill," he said, "is seldom very great. It does not consist of brilliant and inspired flashes of genius—certainly not over a considerable period of time. The difference rather is the small increment of extra performance diffused over a very large number of individuals at all levels of the organizations."

Looking at the business prospects for 1963, I would say that we certainly will have to expend a little extra effort to insure a successful year. The American woman, in large city and small hamlet, is probably more fashion conscious than ever before. And more quality conscious, too. This does not mean that she is looking for the high price items. She expects quality in the medium-range apparel too.

The women we are concerned with mainly are those between the ages of 17 and 35. This market totals about 21 million. While this is less than 20 percent of the entire population, women in this age group are

responsible for purchasing 35 percent of all women's apparel.

The children's market is constantly expanding. The segment of this market that we are concerned with is even larger than our women's market. There are 24,500,000 girls in ages from 1 to 12 years. The birth rate now is well over 4 million a year, soon it will be 5 million, and we can figure that about one-half will be girls.

But most important is the consumer's ability and willingness to buy. We haven't much doubt about his ability to buy. Personal income is at peak levels. There is the prospect of a cut in Federal income taxes that will put many more billions of dollars into the hands of the consumer.

In evaluating prospects for apparel, we never know for sure whether the consumer will show greater or less favor for soft goods as against hard goods, or whether he will decide to save more and spend less.

If we are going to forge ahead with Sacony products, we must make them well and make them attractive to insure that we get a fair share of the soft goods dollar. And this is what will take that little extra effort.

What about the future of Sacony? I can say that we have every intention of expanding our lines and our markets. We are not excluding the possibility of merging other apparel companies into our own. This will pose no danger for our factories in South Carolina, rather it will most probably bring more business and employment to this area.

I might add that apparel manufacturing has become an important industry in South Carolina. Plants turning our men's, women's, and children's apparel employ over 30,000 people, or more than 13 percent of all factory employees.

Our roster of employees who have been with us 10 to 20 years not only indicates that we have been here a long time but demonstrates a real measure of stability. With your help, we will continue to grow.

Thank you.

We welcomed Sacony to South Carolina 20 years ago. Our purpose on the evening of March 15 was not only to celebrate the 20th anniversary, but to assure Sacony our welcome continues, that they are an appreciated part of our industrial family, and to wish for them many more decades of successful production in South Carolina.

As we saluted those employees who have given such fine service over the years, we acclaimed also those who have made possible the fine record of this company. I hope I will have the privilege of attending the 30-year dinner, and many more.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Harley S. Hill, Wesleyan Methodist Church, Herrickville, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 1:1, 2: *Blessed is the man who walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful.*

Our Father which art in heaven hallowed be Thy name. We come to Thee in the name of Thy Son, Jesus. The poet wrote: "In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea, with a glory in His vision that transfigures you and me. As He died to make men holy so He died to make men free." O, God, build this Nation not with second-growth timber, but with virgin growth made strong by the north wind until our taproot gets down to the solid rock of God's divine grace. The Bible states about a nation which should be the head and not the tail. O, God, do not allow our eyes to become besmeared so that we cannot see the way Thou hast marked out for us, nor our minds dulled with selfishness and greed, nor our ears deaf to Thy voice.

The Bible says, "Ye shall hear a voice behind thee, saying 'This is the way, walk ye in it.'"

There will be such voices heard, but may we listen only to Thy voice. We believe that Thou hast raised us up as a nation to make a safe home for the free and the brave.

Bless Mr. Kennedy, our President; help us to hold up his hands in all that is right and strong. Bless the Speaker of the House, each officer, and each Representative. Give each divine wisdom to know the right and the wrong.

Blot out as a thick cloud our transgressions and, as a cloud, our sins.

In the name of the triune God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 25, 1963, was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1964.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 3120 and H.R. 3845.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Un-American Activities have permission to file the annual report of the committee for 1962.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. KING of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, at the request of President Kennedy, I introduced H.R. 3920, the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963. As I am sure all of you are aware, this is the President's proposal for health insurance for the aged under the social security insurance system. I am today proud to state that 21 of my distinguished colleagues from the State of California have introduced identical bills. I also am very proud to state that a number of my colleagues in the House already have introduced identical bills and, I am confident, there will be others who will do so as time goes by.

I think it is a significant development that 22 Members of the California delegation are now cosponsors of this exceedingly important legislative proposal and that, as of the present time, a total of 49 Members of the House are sponsors of the bill, or bills quite similar in purpose. I am gratified that this is the case.

I should like to take this occasion to again state that this legislation in my judgment will solve a problem which becomes more pressing with each passing month, and it deserves early and careful consideration. This is meritorious and fiscally sound legislation. Its adoption has been far too long delayed. I am urging that it be given executive consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means as soon as we complete our current schedule on the President's 1963 tax message. I am hopeful we will be successful in this endeavor. I now invite and urge other Members of the House who have not already done so to join with me in sponsoring and working for the early enactment of this legislation. Illness among the aged, and its aftermath of financial crises and ruin, wait for no one. We can and should act now on this bill.

ATTACKS ON FOREIGN SHIPS BY EXILES FROM CUBA

Mr. JOELSON. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am reading with increasing concern of attacks being made on foreign ships by exiles from Cuba who are presently in the United States.