much lower range of 14 to 65 percent. Such a cut in individual rates, combined with the proposed corporate rate reduction, would total $13.6 billion. The rate cuts may, of course, be somewhat revised in the bill that emerges from the House Ways and Means Committee. But I am confident that the net tax reduction will not be far from the proposed $10.3 billion.

The impact of that overall tax cut will be felt throughout the economy far faster than most people realize. If the President's program were to receive final approval by October 1st, the entire $10 billion in tax relief would be released into the economy within the following 15 months. The ultimate effect would be several times $10 billion—as evidenced by the report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, which estimated that it would eventually increase our annual Gross National Product by as much as $40 billion.

It would be a mistake, however, to measure the effectiveness of the overall tax program in dollar terms alone. For in the final analysis, what it will mean is more and better job and educational opportunities for millions of our citizens, greater profitability, productivity, and incentives for business and business investment, and increased Government revenues to provide for our growing national needs without risking large deficits.

The question of Federal expenditures and deficits has loomed large in public discussion of the President's tax proposals. I would like to devote some time to it today, for it is a question that has too often been beclouded with misunderstanding.

First of all, let me say that the reason we have had large deficits in recent years—either in this or in preceding administrations—is not because of excessive or unnecessary spending by the Federal Government. The real reason is simply that our economy has not been operating at levels high enough to produce the revenues we need to meet the demands of our rapidly growing population and the increased costs of defense and space.

Let us look at some of the facts involved in the issue of expenditure control: One very elementary point—which too many choose to ignore—was made by President Eisenhower in his 1960 budget message, and I quote:

"We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities."

The Director of the Budget, Kermit Gordon has provided some very telling examples of this population rise and of its impact on Federal services: By the end of fiscal 1964, the budget year on which we are now working, there will be 10 million more Americans than there were the day President Kennedy took office. Between fiscal years 1962 and 1964, the volume of mail will rise by more than 6 percent, the number of veterans or survivors receiving pensions by 10 percent, beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance program by 16 percent. Those are by no means all the figures one could cite, but they are enough to make the simple point that we are a growing nation which requires growing national services to meet the needs of its people and of its business and its industry.

President Kennedy, without neglecting essential national needs, has exercised, is exercising, and will continue to exercise a firm control over expenditures. Our budget has increased rapidly over the past 3 years, but fully 70 percent of the total increase from 1961 through 1964 has been in the areas of defense, space, and the inescapable interest on the public debt. When you include the 1964 Budget as submitted by the President, then—apart from defense and space—the total increase in all expenditures during the first 3 years of his administration will be $800 million less than the similar increase during the preceding 3 years from 1958 to 1961.

The facts are there for those who are willing to recognize them. I have no quarrel with those who do scrutinize the facts and who, after intelligent examination, pinpoint where they think cuts can be made. But seldom has any single issue generated so much loose and spend-thrift oratory as this matter of Government expenditures. It is hardly responsible, fiscally or otherwise, to pluck from the blue air—or from the nostalgic past—some arbitrary figure and proclaim it as the magic limit expenditures must never exceed, or as the exact amount expenditures must be cut.

Some who are seriously and honestly concerned with fiscal integrity are currently suggesting that fiscal 1964 expenditures should not exceed the fiscal 1963 level. That suggestion, I am afraid, is completely out of touch with the realities of fiscal life and national needs. The truth is that the entire $4.5 billion budget increase from 1963 to 1964 can be accounted for by increases in only three areas; defense, space, and interest on the public debt. The total of all other expenditures is being held below 1963 levels.

To reduce the total fiscal 1964 budget to the 1963 level would call for cutting defense and space expenditures by $4.5 billion, or cutting a similar amount from all other programs—which have already been held below their 1963 level—or some combination of the two.

The impracticality of such an arbitrary cut becomes apparent when one realizes that while the administration presents the budget and Congress considers it on an annual basis, the programs whose cost is expressed in the budget are in large part continuing programs which involve not only plans but commitments for years ahead. For example, over 40 percent of the fiscal 1964 expenditure budget involves payments from unspent authorizations enacted in previous years, most of which are already obligated. And there are other items—such as veterans pensions—which, while they are in a somewhat different category, are inherently contractual in nature.

Let us look at specifics: Where would you cut the budget to reduce fiscal 1964 expenditures by $4.5 billion?

The $4.5 billion increase was in space, defense, and interest on the public debt. Suppose you tried to cut the defense budget by $4.5 billion, where would you look first? Research and development costs $7.1 billion, so you would have to cut that more than in half. Procurement costs $16.4 billion, most of which represents payments on contracts already far along and funded out of earlier appropriations. Therefore, budget cuts here would have little effect in 1964, but rather in 1965 or even later. To reduce procurement expenditures in fiscal 1964 we would have to severely stretch our programs already underway and funded by appropriations which have already been made.

Expenditures for maintaining our standing defense forces at home and abroad total $25.9 billion. This amount is funded from the current budget, so it is here that we must cut if we wish to hold 1964 expenditures to 1963 levels. A cut of one-sixth in this area would provide almost $4.5 billion. But it would mean reducing the Army by more than two divisions—more than twice the total increase in manpower since this administration took office, reducing the Navy by more than 140 ships, reducing the Air Force by 14 combat wings, and so on right down the line. I doubt if there are many Americans who would favor such a course.

The same thing applies to the space budget. Here, the National Association of Manufacturers has suggested a cut of $1.4 billion in the $5.7 billion of new spending authority requested by the President. But even if such a drastic cut were made, it would only reduce actual 1964 expenditures by a little over $500 million.

My point is not that the budget cannot be cut, but simply that it cannot be cut arbitrarily or fitted into a fixed mold such as the 1963 expenditure total. We must not forget either that the fiscal 1964 budget is an extremely tight budget—one of the tightest ever proposed. It has already been cut—and hugely—by the administration itself. Since January, the President has reduced his fiscal 1964 requests by some $615 million. Before that, a full $19 billion was trimmed from agency requests.

In the final analysis, the only real solution for our recent large budget deficits is to increase our economic growth to the point where it will produce enough revenues to finance, within the context of a balanced budget, the minimum programs required to meet our national needs at home and abroad. Not only will substantial tax reduction in 1963 help generate that growth, but—as the President has repeatedly pledged—a large portion of the increased revenues that result will be applied toward eliminating the current deficit.

This is the positive approach to the budget issue—the approach that can help us to achieve our potential as a Nation, both in economic and human terms. Prompt and substantial tax reduction will, of course, greatly increase the potential for American business. Even more important, it will greatly increase opportunity for all Americans. Finally, and perhaps most important of all, by strengthening our economy, it will increase the ability of our entire Nation to provide a better and more secure life for this generation and the generations to come.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Luke 11: 28: *Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.*

Almighty God, how gracious are Thy words of welcome, inviting us to come unto Thee and how precious are Thy promises unto all who call upon Thee in the fellowship of prayer.

In penitence we confess our sins and seek Thy pardoning grace; in heartfelt gratitude we praise Thee for our many blessings; in humility we renew our vows to serve Thee in love and loyalty.

Grant that in these strange and strenuous days the mind and heart of mankind may be redeemed from pride and prejudice and be restored to compassion and charity, to good will, and mutual trust.

Inspire and constrain us to look upon bruised and broken humanity with insight and sympathy and show us how we may give help and healing to all who

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

are carrying heavy burdens and wandering in ways that are dark and lonely.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 13, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 603. An act relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the text of the bill (S. 74) entitled "An act for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer" with an amendment.

The message further announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the title of the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the Report of the Archivist of the United States Numbered 63-13.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the body of the RECORD, and to include a letter from the President, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD in two instances.

In fairness to the gentleman from Missouri, I will not submit those immediately, inasmuch as I have to be away for 2 weeks. I am asking this permission in order that I might submit them during my time of absence from the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object to the two extensions, in view of what I have previously stated.

DR. OLGA MARIE FERRER

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the private bill of the Senate, S. 74, for the relief of certain aliens, and concur with the amendment of the Senate to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this section of this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Resolved, That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the title of the above-entitled bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I inquire of the gentleman if the Senate amendment is germane to the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. FEIGHAN. The amendment of the Senate is germane to the House amendment and to the original bill.

On May 7, 1963, the House passed S. 74 with an amendment adding to the bill the provisions of a bill previously passed by the House. Under the bill, S. 74, as amended, both beneficiaries of this legislation would be placed in a position to file petitions for naturalization. Both beneficiaries are physicians, doctors of medicine, who desire to practice their profession in the States of Florida and West Virginia, respectively. For licensing purposes they need the status of U.S. citizens. Both have been admitted lawfully for permanent residence.

The Senate added to the bill one more case approved by the committee. The beneficiary is being granted, under the amendment, the status of permanent residence, thus making him eligible for naturalization as the case is in the matter of two other beneficiaries of S. 74.

Mr. POFF. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIMINATING DISTRIBUTION OF LITERATURE BY CONGRESS CAN SAVE MONEY FOR TAXPAYERS

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HAYS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I made the same request last week and it was objected to on the Republican side, as was my first request in 15 years for a special order. It was my purpose to object to all 1-minute speeches, but I shall not, pending my next request for a 1-minute speech. But, if it is objected to on the Republican side, I shall object to every request for a 1-minute speech from then on from that side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of saving money for the taxpayers, and there is not a Member here who is not so interested, I am sure, Congress could bring about an immediate saving of more than $1 million if we eliminated the distribution of so-called free literature such as Agricultural Yearbooks, Farmers Bulletins, Infant Care, and other publications.

Of course, we all know this literature is not free and the Members who distribute it do not pay for it. It is paid for by the taxpayers. I am confident that such a demonstration of good faith on our part, by eliminating these publications, would meet with the approval of the majority of our constituents.

I made just a rough check on the cost of some of the literature and find it costs approximately $213,000 to $220,000 a year just to print the Agricultural Yearbook. The Department informs me there is probably another $100,000 for complete financial analysis. Now, add to that the intangible costs of wrapping and mailing the Yearbooks from the House folding room and the cost of postage and you will see that the printing and distribution of the Yearbook alone would approximate a million dollars a year.

The Agricultural Bulletins, according to my information from the Department, come close to costing $275,000 a year.

Infant Care is just one of the booklets issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and a gross round number figure on the cost comes close to $119,000.

We can admit these are fine publications, but can we justify them as legitimate costs to the taxpayers? It seems to me we would be better to follow the example of an earlier Congress which eliminated the sending of free seeds to constituents, by eliminating free literature and permitting those who desire to purchase textbooks, library books, reference books and "how to" pamphlets to do so with their own money.

Even with the wide distribution given this literature, only a very small proportion of the people can get it, so free distribution through the offices of Members is discriminatory and unfair to those who must help pay the bill, but cannot get their share of the books and pamphlets being given away.

I invite others who are interested in saving money to join me in introducing legislation which will put an end to the practice.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and include extraneous matter in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after all legislative business and other special orders heretofore granted, I be allowed to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think under the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing editorials are supposed to go in the Appendix of the daily RECORD. For that reason I would object to the inclusion of the editorials in connection with the gentleman's remarks in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that request and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and include the material attached.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

HOOD COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to attend the 70th commencement exercises of Hood College in Frederick, Md., on June 9. During the conferring of degrees by President Elliott, of Hood College, honorary diplomas were given to Dr. Frances O. Kelsey, the researcher with the Food and Drug Administration, who was responsible for the public warnings about the dangers of thalidomide and to Dr. Muriel Meyers, an alumna of Hood College and now the associate director of the University of Michigan Simpson Memorial Institute for medical research.

A distinguished Member of the other body, the Honorable FRANK J. LAUSCHE, of Ohio, spoke to the graduates and their guests on "The Meaning of Time." In his very insightful and learned remarks, Senator LAUSCHE reminded the academic convocation that although threats to the peace of the world seem insurmountable today, the problem of man's survival is as old as history itself. Senator LAUSCHE told the graduates that "the marvelous present period is ours to do with it as we will. Many will do great things tomorrow, but tomorrow never comes. Delay is a tragic human failing and a failing of nations." The Senator concluded by urging each of the graduates to be aware of the opportunities which exist for public service and to seize the day, making the most of such opportunities.

I would like to extend my heartiest congratulations to all 102 new alumnae of Hood College and in particular I would like to congratulate the honor graduates, R. Louise Fisher Waynant, summa cum laude, Helen Carol Joice, magna cum laude, and Lorraine Clara Gorrell, cum laude.

Hood College, of Frederick, Md., represents a unique experiment in the education of young women. The administration and faculty deserve the highest praise for the standards of excellence which they maintain in this all-important work of preparing these young women for the future.

SPECIAL ORDER REQUESTED

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, June 18, after the completion of the legislative business and all other special orders previously entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SALUTE TO BOY SCOUTS AND SCOUTMASTER W. W. COULSON OF WICHITA, KANS.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, local, State, and National authorities today are concerned about the problems of juvenile delinquency. There also is discussion of establishing new agencies, financed by the Federal Government, to create outlets of activity for young people in metropolitan areas.

I would like to take a moment, however, to pay tribute to just one of the youth organizations in the United States which has done a monumental job in the development of good citizens. I speak of the Boy Scouts of America.

It was my privilege this morning to host 30 Eagle Scouts, all members of Troop 410, Fairview Christian Church, of Wichita, Kans. They are in Washington for a 4-day educational and sightseeing tour. They have worked hard for 2 years to earn this trip.

I also want to salute Mr. W. W. Coulson, the scoutmaster of this troop, who has provided inspirational guidance and leadership to Boy Scouts for 33 years in Wichita. He is dedicated to Scouting and to his boys. He possesses a commendable record in volunteer Scout work. Mr. Coulson, who will be 77 years old next month, has guided 175 boys to Scouting's highest rank of Eagle Scout. He has worked with them from the time they entered scouting as Tenderfoots until they attain the Eagle badge.

The city of Wichita, the State of Kansas, and these United States have benefited from the dedication and devotion of Mr. Coulson to his boys. He is representative of the thousands of men and women who volunteer their time toward building young men who are thoroughly prepared—educationally, morally, and spiritually—to assume the responsibilities of good citizenship.

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. 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 Ohio?

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

U.S. SHOULD CUT DIPLOMATIC TIES WITH HAITI

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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Haiti's anti-American President Francois Duvalier has demanded that the United States recall its Ambassador to Haiti, and has already recalled his own Ambassador to underscore his demands.

Coupled with Duvalier's recent harassment of U.S. citizens, this new turn in U.S. relations with Haiti points up one hard fact—that the United States should suspend its diplomatic ties with the Duvalier regime.

Furthermore, the American people have had the impression that U.S. aid to Haiti has been suspended. I am informed that this is not so. Under the U.S. food-for-peace program, Haiti last year received some $1.3 million in U.S. surplus foodstuffs subsidized by the U.S. taxpayer. Haiti also received last year some $1.3 million from the United States as part of a grant to finance a malaria control project.

And at present Haiti is free to market over 40,000 tons of sugar in the United States, and at the present prevailing price of sugar in New York last Friday, which was $152 per ton, Haiti could expect an income of $6,166,488 this year if its U.S. sales continued.

This aid should be cut as well. Positive actions, such as these, would do much to strengthen our position in the Caribbean and the rest of the hemisphere as well.

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DEROUNIAN. 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 York?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR DIRECTORS AND CHIEFS OF STAFF AT VA MEDICAL INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 228) to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of directors and chiefs of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3517) to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

BACK PAY ACT OF 1963

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4837) to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to observe I intend to object to all of the procedures under unanimous consent as they come along. I have been denied the right to have a special order and I have been denied the right to place information in the RECORD which I believe is of importance. I think until such time as the watchdogs of the House agree to some type of ruling that the procedures of the House are going to have to be delayed.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO MARKET POWER GENERATED AT AMISTAD DAM ON THE RIO GRANDE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4062) to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

INCREASING PER DIEM AND SUBSISTENCE, AND LIMIT MILEAGE ALLOWANCES OF GRAND AND PETIT JURORS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5905) to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEASE OF TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5930) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years the provisions permitting the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE 1963 TOBACCO ALLOTMENT LEASES

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 403) to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXPAND AUTHORITY OF THE CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3050) to expand the authority of the Canal Zone Government to settle claims not cognizable under the Tort Claims Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE CANAL ZONE CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3999) to amend section 66 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NURSES AS STAFF OFFICERS IN U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5781) to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REPEALING THE INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2876) to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from California if the gentleman's unanimous-consent request is made on the basis of his announcement of a moment ago and not because he objects to some provision of the proposed bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, my sole purpose is directed to the fact that we have degenerated into a juvenile children's hour of denying the various Members to run their own household and place documents and other matters in the RECORD which they feel they should place in the RECORD, and to have special orders.

Mr. Speaker, I object to it on that ground only and not on the merits of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REGULATIONS FOR PREVENTING COLLISIONS AT SEA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6012) to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MEDICAL CARE FOR COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 969) to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crewmembers and their dependents, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the further consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMEND INLAND AND WESTERN RIVER RULES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1036) to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and for signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. Is there objection to the further consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

LIMIT PRIORITY OF TAXES IN BANKRUPTCY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3438) to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RELATING TO DUTIES OF CENSUS ENUMERATORS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4818) to amend section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MERGING OF CERTAIN COAST GUARD APPROPRIATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 73) to provide for the merger of certain Coast Guard appropriations for operating expenses, Reserve training, and retired pay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXCEPTIONS TO THE RULES OF NAVIGATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 75) to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may permit vessels desiring to navigate or operate under bridges constructed over navigable waters of the United States to temporarily lower any lights, day signals, or other navigational means and appliances prescribed or required pursuant to law, rule, or regulation, and, if necessary, may authorize vessels so navigating or operating to depart from the rules to prevent collisions as prescribed by law, rule, or regulation. The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may also prescribe such special regulations to be observed by vessels so navigating or operating as in his judgment the public safety may require for the prevention of collisions.

(b) Notice of the regulations to accomplish the purposes of this Act shall be published in the Federal Register and in the Notice to Mariners, and after the effective date specified in such notices, such regulations shall have the force of law.

(c) Any person who navigates or operates a vessel in violation of the regulations established pursuant to this section shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding $500. In addition, any vessel navigated or operated in violation of the regulations established pursuant to this section shall be liable to a penalty of $500, for which sum such vessel may be seized and proceeded against, by way of libel, in the district court of the United States for any district within which such vessel may be found.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PART II, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4157) to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the only purpose I reserve the right here is to ask if there is not some way by which we can dispense with the printing of the bill. It would cost quite a lot of money to print the bill. I am asking for that permission to waive its printing.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, we plan to make that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 6, § 11-505(b)(7), fourth line, strike out "Court" and insert "Courts".

Page 6, § 11-506(a), first line, strike out "Court" and insert "court".

Page 30, § 11-1557(1), first line, strike out "sction" and insert "section".

Page 130, § 16-1314(b), fourth line, strike out "for" and insert "fee".

Page 163, Analysis of Chapter 29:

In heading of section 16-2922, after "widow" insert "or widower".

In heading of section 16-2924, after "widow's" insert "or widower's".

Strike out heading of section 16-2926.

Page 164, § 16-2921:

Second and third lines, insert "or widower" after "widow".

Fifth line, strike out "widow's".

Seventh line, strike out "commissoners" and insert "commissioners".

Tenth line, insert "or widower" after "widow".

Twelfth line, insert "or man" after "woman".

Thirteenth line, strike out "bonds" and insert "bounds".

Page 164, § 16-2922:

First line, insert "or widower" after "widow".

Second and third lines, insert "or her" after "his".

Page 164, § 16-2923, fourth line, strike out "wife's".

Page 164, § 16-2924, second line, insert "or widower" after "widow" and "or he" after "she".

Page 165, § 16-2924:

First and second lines, strike out "her" and insert "the".

Third line, insert "or he" after "she".

Fourth line, strike out "from her" and insert "of the".

Fifth line, strike out "her dower, and shall allow her," and insert "the dower, and shall allow her or him,".

Sixth line, strike out "her" and insert "the".

Eighth line, insert "or widower" after "widow".

Page 165, § 16-2925, fifth line, strike out "by the wife".

Page 165, § 16-2926, strike out the entire section.

Page 168, § 16-3111, first line, insert before the first word "With respect to the trial of issues in the Probate Court, including the taking and use of testimony of nonresident widowers, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, unless otherwise provided by law, are applicable thereto.".

Page 178, § 16-3902, ninth line, insert "not" before "available".

Page 186, § 17-303(b), first line, strike out "be" and insert "by".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I thought there was a request to be made that would estop the printing of this bill and save the taxpayers some $4,000 or $5,000.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Iowa, and I ask unanimous consent that the printing of this bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of bills on the Consent Calendar.

EXTENSION OF SECTION 221 MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORITY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.J. Res. 467) amending section 221 of the National Housing Act to extend for 2 years the broadened eligibility presently provided for mortgage insurance thereunder.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fifth sentence of section 221(f) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 467 is a very simple measure which would keep one of FHA's programs going for another 2 years. In the Housing Act of 1954 we established section 221 to provide liberal mortgage financing under FHA insurance for families displaced by urban renewal or other Government activity. This program applies to both homeownership and rental housing. In the Housing Act of 1961 we broadened section 221 to make the benefits available to low- and moderate-income families generally. In the same act we put a 1965 cutoff date on most FHA programs, but this broadened authority under section 221 was made for only 2 years. Under existing law it would go back to being available only for displaced families after June 30 of this year. This resolution would extend this broadened eligibility to 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard no opposition whatsoever to this extension. In the committee report—House Report No. 386—we included letters of endorsement from the National Association of Home Builders, the Mortgage Bankers Association, and the National Association of Real Estate Boards. In addition, of course, it has the endorsement of the Federal Housing Administration. The committee has received a great number of letters from builders urging the extension of this program, and I know many of my colleagues have received similar letters. This resolution was reported out of the Subcommittee on Housing without a dissenting vote and was also reported unanimously by the full Banking Committee.

There are just two subsections of the FHA law which would be affected by this resolution. Section 221(d)(2) authorizes FHA mortgage insurance on both new and existing single-family homes in amounts up to $11,000. There is the further provision that in the high-cost areas this may go up to $15,000.

The maximum term is 35 years, except that where necessary to enable the home-buying family to qualify on the basis of monthly payments the FHA Commissioner may extend the maximum maturity to 40 years. The minimum downpayment under the law is 3 percent. The other subsection is 221(d)(4) which provides for the insurance of mortgages on rental housing for low- and moderate-income groups.

In the 7 years prior to 1961, FHA insured 25,000 home mortgages under section 221(d)(2). Since the effective date of the 1961 Housing Act, it has insured an additional 36,000 units, making a total of nearly 61,000 homes. Under section 221(d)(4) a total of 62 projects covering 7,500 rental units have been insured, including 12 projects with 924 units insured since the 1961 act became law. These figures include units provided for displaced families as well as for low- and moderate-income families generally.

While the volume of activity has been relatively small, this program has great potential and fills an important need in our efforts to encourage private financing for housing in the low price and rent ranges. House Joint Resolution 467 would continue the program in its present form until June 30, 1965. I urge the passage of the resolution today so that the Senate can act and it can reach the President's desk for signature prior to the June 30 expiration date.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to affirm what the distinguished chairman has said. This resolution was reported unanimously by both the subcommittee and the full committee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The change that would be made would bring into line two sections, 221(d)(2) and 221(d)(4) to section 221(d)(3), which presently has an expiration date 2 years from now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the enactment of the resolution.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 467 to extend sections 221(d)(2) and 221(d)(4) of the National Housing Act for 2 more years.

Section 221 was made a part of the National Housing Act in 1954 to assist the housing industry to provide relocation housing for families displaced by urban renewal or governmental action. Although the act did not so specify, the intention was to help families of limited income, since most displaced families are in this category and those with higher incomes have no trouble relocating themselves.

Section 221(d)(2) authorized FHA mortgage insurance for home properties, and section 211(d)(3) mortgage insurance on multifamily rental housing sponsored by nonprofit organizations or public bodies. Section 221(d)(4), permitting mortgage insurance on rental housing with profit-motivated sponsorship, was added in 1959.

The Housing Act of 1961 made some sweeping revisions in section 221 in recognition of its suitability as a vehicle to provide housing for moderate income families in general as well as displaced families. The 1961 act removed the previous limitation, on mortgage insurance under the section, to relocation housing, and also removed the requirement for certification by the HHFA Administrator of need for the housing.

These new provisions of the section were intended for families with incomes too high for public housing but not high enough to enable them to compete for adequate housing in the private market. So that Congress might have an opportunity to assess the value of the new provisions in practical application, termination dates were provided except for relocation housing. The cutoff dates are July 1, 1962, for section 221(d)(2)—homes—and 221(d)(4)—multifamily rental and cooperative housing with profit-motivated sponsorship—and July 1, 1965, for section 221(d)(3)—multifamily housing with nonprofit sponsorship.

I feel very strongly that the (d)(2) and (d)(4) programs are needed and that the 2-year period in which they have operated in their present form has not been adequate to demonstrate their value. In the middle and higher income market, housing supply and demand have reached a state of balance in which there is no longer an acute shortage; but special financing terms are still needed to bring homeownership within the reach of families with lower incomes and to make good rental and cooperative housing available to other families for whom homeownership is not at present feasible.

In my own part of the country we are constantly made aware of the necessity for programs that will provide decent housing at the lowest possible cost. I recently had the pleasure of having FHA Commissioner Brownstein visit my district and review the housing problems of the area, and (d)(4) in particular was suggested as one of the possible answers to providing good rental housing for moderate-income families. We could probably make good use of (d)(2) also.

Figures on a national basis indicate how the industry has accepted the 1961 provisions of the latter section. In the first half of 1961, the FHA received 3,674 applications under the old provisions.

In the second half of the year, following passage of the 1961 Housing Act, more than 11,000 applications were received. Altogether, from the passage of the 1961 act through May 1963 there were 69,200 (d) (2) applications, compared with 39,-300 for the nearly 7 preceding years during which it was in effect. From August 1954 through June 1961, 25,400 mortgages totaling $232.9 million were insured, and from July 1961 through May 1963, 38,000 mortgages totaling $395 million have been insured.

Although section 211(d) (4) has been slower in starting under the 1961 provisions, builders are gradually becoming aware of its advantages in providing low-cost multifamily housing. No mortgages were insured under this section before the 1961 Housing Act became law. Since July 1961, the FHA has insured mortgages totaling $8.9 million on 14 (d) (4) projects with 1,117 units. Thirteen applications on projects with 1,477 units are in process at the present time.

One advantage of (d) (4) financing is that the mortgage represents a percentage of estimated replacement cost rather than of appraised value as under the regular section 207 rental housing program of FHA. Generally speaking, basing the mortgage on replacement cost rather than on appraised value permits a higher mortgage amount. If there are disadvantages of location, for example, appraised value will fall below replacement cost and the mortgage amount will be correspondingly restricted. Housing financing under (d) (4) does not have to meet the location requirements of section 207. It must be located in a marketable area but not necessarily in an exceptionally desirable area. A workable program for the community is not a requirement, nor is a finding of economic soundness required; however, cost certification provisions apply. The housing can be built in an urban renewal area or elsewhere. The provisions of the section are especially suitable for financing rehabilitation of multifamily properties.

This section fills a gap between urban renewal housing and the higher rent housing built under section 207. The mortgage limits are less than under section 207 or 220, but are higher than those established for nonprofit or limited-dividend sponsorship under 221(d) (3).

Because of the special incentives section 221(d) (4) offers and because of the growing interest in it, I recommend that it be continued for another 2 years as provided in House Joint Resolution 467.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, an issue is presently before the House that demands the support of every Representative from every district in the Nation. House Joint Resolution 467, a bill to extend the benefits of the Federal Housing Administration 221 housing program until 1965, is absolutely necessary if we are to continue to provide housing for our low and middle income citizens.

For many years the "package of tools" offered by Congress through the Federal Housing Administration has been among the most popular programs offered by the Federal Government. FHA has established itself as an efficient administrative agency and has good relations with both the public and the business community. Its programs have helped homeownership in the United States to reach an unprecedented level of 62.5 percent in 1961.

All FHA programs have been designed, in one way or another, to encourage homeownership by citizens who would otherwise be forced to remain renters all their lives. Section 221(d) (2) and section 221(d) (4) are exceptionally good examples.

Section 221 became a part of the Nation Housing Act in 1954 when Congress became concerned with the relocation of families from urban renewal projects. These families were largely renters and, for the most part, low on the income ladder. Their chances of homeownership were dim and the prospect of having to move to another slum area was ever present. Section 221 offered a chance for many of those unfortunate people to leave their old environment and reside in a suitable neighborhood either as renters or homeowners.

In 1961 sweeping revisions were made in the 221 program when it was recognized that it could be employed to meet the growing, and unmet, need for low and middle income housing other than relocation housing. Section 221(d) (2) differs from other FHA programs in that it requires a lower downpayment, in some cases has a longer mortgage term, and enjoys less restrictive minimum standards. Section 221(d) (4) offers encouragement to the construction of low and middle income apartments for those who need time to save for future homeownership.

Since enactment of these revisions in the 221 program in 1961 things have moved at a brisk pace. Under the (d) (2) program 36,000 units have been insured and 62 projects covering 7,500 rental units have been insured under the (d) (4) program.

It pleases me to lend my support to such a worthy program. The growing need for adequate housing in this country is a recognized fact. This is especially true in the area of low and middle income housing. These two FHA programs, the extension of which was reported favorably by both the House Subcommittee on Housing and the House Committee on Banking and Currency, deserve to be extended for another 2 years. House Joint Resolution 467 will legalize the continued benefits of these two vital FHA programs. This measure has received my enthusiastic support and I will continue to be a friend of such needed legislation. I trust that my fellow Congressmen will rally to the need in sufficient numbers so that this measure can pass without further hesitation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 467.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks on the housing resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3517) to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 4(b) and 6(c) of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 850 and 851; 5 U.S.C. 3053(b) and 3055(c)) are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 8(a) of such Act (74 Stat. 851; 5 U.S.C. 3057(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "In addition, the Government shall contribute annually and there shall be deposited in the Fund amounts for payment of expenses incurred by the Commission in administering this Act."

SEC. 3. Section 8(b) of such Act (74 Stat. 851; 5 U.S.C. 3057 (b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Fund shall be available without fiscal year limitation for all payments on account of the health benefits plan negotiated under section 3 of this Act, for payment of the Government's contribution provided for by section 6(a) of this Act to agencies of the Government which administer a retirement system for civilian employees of the Government, and for payment of expenses, within such limitations as may be specified annually in appropriation Acts, incurred by the Commission in administering this Act."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona, [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 3517, will probably not affect the destiny of the Nation, but it is an important bill to 415,000 retired Federal employees. Since objection was made when this bill was placed on the Consent Calendar, I think perhaps it is important that we take 3 or 4 minutes to explain what the bill is and what it would do.

This bill is based on a recommendation by the Civil Service Commission. A similar proposal was passed out of the committee in the 87th Congress. It was not acted upon by the House because we ran

out of time in the closing days of the session.

For several years we have had a health benefits program for active Federal employees, including those in the legislative and executive branches. These employees customarily have deducted from their pay an amount which is matched by the Government, and they receive certain health and medical benefits. At the time this legislation was enacted there was no provision for those who had already retired. Today there are some 415,000 former Federal employees.

Congress passed an act in September 1960 which gave medical and health benefits to employees who had retired after July of 1960. These people received a Federal annuity and from their pay is taken each month $3 if they are single, or $6 for a family. This is matched by contributions from the U.S. Treasury, and for this they receive these benefits.

In this little bill we are talking only about the 415,000 retired Federal employees. We are not talking about those who hereafter retire. They are covered under their present plan and will continue to have coverage.

The purpose of this bill and all it would accomplish is this: It would remove from the existing law a provision which limits the portion of the Government's contribution which the Civil Service Commission may use for administrative expenses for this act. This amount is now limited to 2 percent. This 2-percent limit would be eliminated by this bill. I should say that this legislation was reported unanimously from the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I know of no Member of the House who is here today to object to it.

The 2-percent limitation formula was first applied during the fiscal year 1963. Our committee report indicates that the amount available on the basis of 2 percent of the Government's contribution for fiscal 1963 would be $282,000. This was based on 2 percent of the estimated Federal contribution of $14,118,000. However, the actual amount appropriated for Government contributions during fiscal 1963 was only $12,807,000, rather than the $14 million requested. This resulted in an amount being available for the administration of this important act of only $256,000. This $256,000 was not sufficient for proper administration. The actual costs in the last 3 or 4 years have been as follows: In 1961, $412,000; in 1962, $474,000; in fiscal 1963, estimated, $393,000. Thus it has become readily apparent in the administration of this act that the 2-percent formula does not give enough room and does not provide the necessary funds.

Thus, the Civil Service Commission has a serious budgetary problem in trying to carry out the responsibilities we have given them. A way was found out of it, a temporary way, during the current fiscal year. The Independent Offices Appropriation Act actually authorized $375,000 and appropriated that amount rather than the $256,000 which would have been available under the 2-percent limitation. The budget proposal for fiscal year 1964 calls for $392,000. Thus we have provided temporary relief in the appropriation acts while the legislative provisions governing the administration of this Retired Federal Employees' Health Benefit Act has a 2-percent limitation.

The question might be asked, Why have the costs of administration exceeded the 2-percent formula that the Congress thought would be adequate when the act was passed? Basically there are three reasons.

The first is that participation by the annuitants has been substantially less than was expected. The House and the Congress thought that perhaps 95 percent of the retired Federal employees would take advantage of this fine program. Actually about 60 percent have applied and are participating. Lower participation, of course, means a correspondingly smaller Government contribution and a correspondingly smaller amount available for administrative purposes.

Secondly, dealing with these older retired people, many of whom are unfamiliar with this law, are unfamiliar with the benefits, has proven to be more costly than was expected; especially in dealing with thousands of elderly people on a subject that is new to them, and that is somewhat complex, has required a great deal of correspondence and additional staff that was not anticipated. It is really difficult for the Civil Service Commission to communicate as effectively with these people as with active Federal employees. This was not fully anticipated.

The third reason is that the program involves a closed group which can only decrease with the passage of time. This group will never grow. It covers just those who retired prior to September 1960, and as deaths occur this group will gradually be reduced until the whole program is closed out. Yet the natural decrease in the size of the group will mean a gradual reduction in both the Government contribution and the administrative costs. But the characteristic of this group, they being elderly people, is such that it will decrease at a more rapid rate than the administrative cost. Thus the committee has come to the conclusion that there is no real possibility of the administrative costs being retained within the 2-percent limitation. We had a patchwork kind of correction for this situation last year, but the only permanent relief is to pass this bill.

You might ask what will happen if we defeat this bill and the law is not changed? I should anticipate some kind of temporary relief would be asked for from the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations. They have been very cooperative. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has helped to work out a plan for this difficult period. But this is a program that has been authorized by the Congress and we should not put the Civil Service Commission or the Appropriations Committee in a position of having to adjust a patchwork formula to make sure that these 415,000 people receive the benefits that Congress has authorized.

I think it would be shortsighted economy to defeat this bill. It would only cost $100,000 for this year and it is anticipated that the extra cost above the 2-percent limitation would not go much beyond that in the years to come.

I would emphasize again that the bill has bipartisan support, that it came out of a subcommittee of which the ranking minority member was the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL]. It was approved in the full committee. I know of no one who is opposed to it today.

Mr. Speaker, I should hope that this bill will receive the prompt and favorable attention of the House today.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as pointed out by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], this legislation was approved by our committee unanimously. It certainly is not controversial. This bill, H.R. 3517, was on the Consent Calendar for several weeks but an objection to it made it necessary to call it up under suspension of the rules.

Actually, the only thing that the bill does, in the final analysis, is to eliminate an awkward administrative procedure. It will permit the Committee on Appropriations to exercise some discretion in appropriating necessary funds to administer the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act. Back in 1960, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service made, I believe, a major contribution by encouraging business and private industry generally to do something to help solve the problem of medical and hospital care for our elderly citizens. In 1960 we provided that all retired Federal employees could come under the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act which was similar to a measure Congress approved for active Federal employees in 1959. When we enacted this law in 1959, we provided that Federal employees who retired in the future could continue their medical and hospitalization benefits. But we did not provide for those who had retired in previous years. So we came back in 1960, as I said, and enacted a new law that did provide for all retired Federal employees to have medical and hospitalization protection. We hope, or at least this Member hopes, that this will encourage all business and industry to provide a similar type of program for all of their retired employees so that no blanket Federal aid for medical care would be necessary to take care of our senior citizens.

When we enacted this program in 1960, we estimated that the administrative expenses would be approximately 2 percent of the Government's contribution. That was a reasonable estimate and an accurate estimate provided as large a number of retired employees participated in the program as we estimated. As was pointed out by the gentleman from Arizona, there were 415,000 retired Federal employees who would be eligible to participate in this program. On the basis of a 90 percent participation by retired Federal employees in the program, the

Federal annual contribution was estimated to be approximately $21 million. Certainly, 2 percent of that contribution would amount to approximately $420,000 annually which was the cost of administering the program as estimated by the Civil Service Commission and by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. However, we were mistaken in our estimate because we found that only approximately 60 percent of those retired employees exercised the option of participating in the program. So the purpose of this legislation is to remove this 2 percent administrative limitation from the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act and to permit the Committee on Appropriations, as I said earlier in my remarks, some latitude and discretion in appropriating funds for this purpose. At the present time, it is necessary to include a corrective provision in the appropriation bill each time. It is really an awkward situation. In a sense we are invalidating an act of Congress in doing what we are doing now. In this legislation we are asking the Congress to amend this particular provision of the original act so that we can have a much more orderly administrative procedure. This is not going to cost a nickel more in the final analysis. In fact, the actual cost of administering the program is going to diminish over a period of years because this act only applies to those who retired in former years.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will overwhelmingly approve this legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to point out that the two gentlemen who have spoken in support of this bill have properly explained it. This is nothing but a matter of bringing administrative procedures into harmony with the actual facts of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman in urging that this bill be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arizona that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 3517.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

RETIREMENT INEQUITY—ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5377) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2251(c)), is amended by inserting "the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol," immediately following "official duties,".

(b) Section 2(c) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 22(d)), is amended by inserting "(other than the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol)" immediately following "congressional employee".

(c) Section 2(d) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2252(d)), is amended by inserting ", except as provided under subsection (f)," immediately following "temporary congressional employee".

(d) Section 5(d) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2255(d)), is amended by striking out "to the Architect of the Capitol or any employee under the office of the Architect of the Capitol,".

SEC. 2. The provisions under the heading "CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85-844), shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall not apply in the case of employees retired or otherwise separated prior to the date of enactment of this Act. The rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if such amendments had not been enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5377 was reported unanimously by your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and should be enacted to correct an inequity in the law which adversely affects the civil service retirement rights of employees of the Architect of the Capitol.

The employees covered by the bill are in every sense congressional employees. The Architect of the Capitol has been defined by the Comptroller General of the United States, in several decisions, to be an officer of the Congress, and the Office of the Architect of the Capitol likewise has been defined to be a part of the legislative establishment. All of the duties and responsibilities of the Architect and of employees of his Office are devoted to the service of the Congress.

The Congress in 1954, recognizing the unique conditions of congressional employment, enacted legislation to provide a carefully planned and practical retirement program for congressional employees. The same unique conditions apply to employment in the Office of the Architect of the Capitol. Like other congressional employees, neither the Architect has nor do his employees have civil service or other protective status. Yet neither the Architect was nor his employees were included in the congressional employees' retirement program enacted in 1954.

As a result, although they are truly congressional employees and direct all of their working time and energy to serving the Congress, their retirement benefits are considerably inferior to those of their fellow congressional employees. The omission of these congressional employees from the congressional employees' retirement program apparently was due to an oversight. There is no record of any consideration being given to them when the 1954 legislation was being developed and approved. Possibly a contributing circumstance to their omission from the program is the fact that their salaries are the same as those under the Classification Act of 1949, an act which applies generally to executive branch employees. However, that is merely a matter of administrative convenience and in no way alters the status of the Architect and his employees as congressional employees.

This legislation extends no civil service retirement rights to anyone not already entitled to retirement rights. It simply alters such rights for the employees covered to make them equal to rights now available to other congressional employees. The bill can affect no more than 1,175 individuals. In fact, since the retirement act already provides for the Architect to exclude employees whose tenure is temporary or of uncertain duration, and also requires a minimum of 5 years of congressional service to qualify for any benefits under the congressional employees' program, it is very probable that the number of individuals covered will be substantially less than 1,175. Over two-thirds of the 1,175 employees are specifically subject by statute to congressional committee or congressional commission control under present law.

Mr. Speaker, this is very worthy legislation and I hope it will receive the prompt approval of the House.

Positions under the Architect of the Capitol

Appropriations	Wage board positions	Unclassified positions	Classification Act positions	Statutory positions	Total positions
Salaries, Architect of the Capitol	1	3	26	3	33
Capitol Buildings and Grounds	96	44	16		156
Capitol Grounds	49		6		55
Senate office buildings	286	54	21	8	369
Legislative garage	7				7
House office buildings	284	76	21		381
Capitol Power Plant	78		4		82
Library buildings and grounds	57		2		59
Subtotal	858	177	96	11	1,142
Care of the building and grounds, Supreme Court	31		2		33
Total	889	177	98	11	1,175

Hearings of 1964—Breakdown of regular force under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol engaged in structural and mechanical care of the Capitol Building and Grounds, Senate and House Office buildings, Capitol Power Plant, Library of Congress buildings, U.S. Supreme Court building, and legislative garage

Capitol Power Plant: Engineers, mechanics, helpers, and laborers	82
Electrical substations and transformer stations (located in Capitol, Senate Office buildings, House Office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and U.S. Supreme Court building): Operators, mechanics, helpers	12
Air conditioning—operation and maintenance: Engineers and mechanics	62
Structural care of buildings and operation of miscellaneous equipment: Maintenance mechanics and helpers (plumbers, electricians, carpenters, painters, sheet-metal workers, heating room attendants, public address system operators, subway operators)	170
Elevators—maintenance and repair: Mechanics and helpers	29
Elevators—Operation: Elevator operators	143
General domestic care of buildings: Laborers, full-time	201
Charwomen, part-time	300
Capitol Grounds—Care and Maintenance: Gardeners and laborers	49
Legislative garage—care and operation: Superintendent and helpers	7
House garage (old building)—care and operation: Superintendent and helpers	10
Professional, administrative, and office force: Architect, engineers, administrative and clerical assistants, and miscellaneous	110
March 1963, total employees	1,175

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], in support of this legislation, H.R. 5377. As he pointed out, this was approved by a unanimous vote of the committee.

In substance the bill brings all of the employees of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol under the same retirement system that all other employees of the legislative branch of the Government now enjoy. In fact, two-thirds of the employees of the Architect of the Capitol already are subject to congressional committee or congressional commission control under present law and, therefore, they should be treated the same as all other legislative employees.

There are approximately 1,175 employees who would be brought under the congressional employees retirement system as a result of this act. The Comptroller General has ruled that the Architect of the Capitol and all of its employees are employees of the legislative branch of the Government. They have no connection whatsoever with civil service insofar as civil service status and job security protection is concerned. I believe the reason the employees of the Architect of the Capitol were not included in the present act when it was approved by the Congress in 1954 was the result of an oversight. No one suggested that they be included, and no one had any opportunity to object to their being included.

Interestingly enough, some employees of the Architect of the Capitol are already under this legislative retirement system.

As a result of the ruling of the Comptroller General, employees of the restaurants of the House and Senate are already included. Perhaps the reason why all employees of the Architect of the Capitol have not been included is the result of confusion, since they are paid under civil service Classification Act salary scales.

There is a chart on page 5 of the report which shows the difference between the present retirement benefits of employees of the Architect of the Capitol, which is the same as those in the regular civil service and the proposed benefits which are identical to the retirement benefits now enjoyed by other legislative employees.

We are preventing any windfall under this act. Those working part-time or more or less temporarily will not receive the benefits proposed by this legislation because we require that they be employees of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol for 5 years before they can come under the provisions of the bill.

This legislation merely seeks to eliminate an inequity where one group of employees was treated one way and another group another way. The cost is estimated to be approximately $315,000, which is a moderate cost to take care of this inequity, the very serious inequity that has existed over the years. This legislation would correct the inequity and I hope my colleagues will join in overwhelmingly supporting the passage of this legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER].

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee appointed to consider this legislation, I join with my colleagues in support of it. It has been thoroughly explained, and, therefore, further explanation is unnecessary.

The full committee agreed that this bill would correct an inequity.

I hope the House will pass it overwhelmingly.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5377.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5932) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees's Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(a) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 710; 5 U.S.C. 3002(a)) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided,* That no teacher in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, whose salary is established by section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 521), as amended (sec. 31-1501, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), shall be excluded on the basis of the fact that such teacher is serving under a temporary appointment if such teacher has been so employed by such Board for a period or periods totaling not less than two school years."

SEC. 2. Section 2(a) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 736), as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091(a)), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and in no event shall any teacher in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, whose salary is established by section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 521), as amended (sec. 31-1501, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), be excluded on the basis of the fact that such teacher is serving under a temporary appointment if such teacher has been so employed by such Board for a period or periods totaling not less than two school years."

SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins not later than the sixtieth day after the date of its enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5932 is the result of an official administration request that was submitted to the Congress by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. I was privileged to serve on the subcommittee which held hearings on the measure at which favorable testimony was received from the government of the District of Columbia and from representatives of the District of Columbia Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. There was no adverse testimony received from any source and the bill was reported by a unanimous vote of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

This legislation will correct a very inequitable situation that now exists with regard to schoolteachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia who are serving under so-called temporary appointments. Enactment of this legislation will permit these temporary teachers, if their service aggregates 2 or more school years, to elect coverage under the Federal employees

health benefits program and the Federal employees group life insurance program. They are now excluded from both of these programs by reason of their so-called temporary status.

Of the nearly 5,000 full-time schoolteachers employed in the District of Columbia public school system, approximately 1,700 have temporary status. These temporary teachers are employed on a yearly basis—their appointments by law cannot extend beyond June 30 of the fiscal year in which appointed—and the appointments are renewable each year and they may also be terminated at any time with or without reason. Generally these teachers are serving in a so-called temporary status either because they may fail to meet one or more of the detailed technical requirements and, therefore, have not taken the necessary qualifying examinations, or because they do not expect to remain long in service and so do not wish to attain permanent status. In addition, there are a number of teachers who must be employed on a temporary basis to fill temporary positions and to replace permanent teachers whose job rights must be protected while they are on leaves of absence.

I would like to emphasize that all temporary teachers must meet certain minimum qualifications such as possessing a bachelor's degree from a recognized college or university; being a citizen of the United States; and being of good moral character. However, some of these teachers may lack a technical requirement for appointment on a permanent basis such as not possessing credit in college work closely related to the subject field in which they teach, not possessing the master's degree that is required for teaching in senior high school, or not meeting the age requirements. For example, many fine teachers are employed in a temporary status because they are above the 50-year age limit for appointment on a permanent basis. These, generally, are the teachers who have returned to the profession in later years, after having raised families.

The temporary schoolteacher is most definitely an important part of the District of Columbia school system. Of the approximately 1,700 temporary teachers now employed, 700 have served for 2 or more years, 270 have more than 5 years of service, and some have taught for 15 and 20 years. Under the provisions of the Federal Employees Health Benefits and Group Life Insurance Acts and the regulations of the Civil Service Commission issued pursuant thereto, employees serving under appointments limited to 1 year or less are excluded from participating in these two programs. Temporary schoolteachers of the District of Columbia, therefore, because of the nature of their yearly appointments and even though many have served and dedicated a number of years of their lives to the public school system are precluded from enjoying these benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of H.R. 5932 will correct this most inequitable situation. It amends both the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 and the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to provide that no teacher in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia serving under a temporary appointment shall be excluded if such teacher has been so employed for a period or periods totaling not less than 2 school years.

The cost of this legislation is very nominal. It is estimated that the additional cost of the District of Columbia Government would be approximately $39,000 a year which would be absorbed from regular appropriations in the normal course of operations.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of fairness and equity, I urge the adoption of this most worthwhile legislation.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, again I am happy to state that I am supporting legislation which was approved unanimously by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It certainly indicates we have a very harmonious committee. Unfortunately we do have some legislation which is considered by that committee that is not quite as noncontroversial as the legislation we have here under a suspension of the rules today.

This bill, H.R. 5932, Mr. Speaker, provides an amendment to the Health Benefits Act of 1959 and the Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to provide health and life insurance benefits for certain teachers in Washington, D.C. At the time the Congress approved and passed those acts we provided that the benefits would extend only to those Federal employees who had appointments of a year or more. We found that this excluded approximately one-third of the schoolteachers of the District of Columbia from the benefits of either the life insurance or health insurance acts. There are 1,700 of these 5,000 schoolteachers in the District of Columbia who fall into the classification of temporary appointees. They can only be appointed on a school year to school year basis. I think they are appointed for the term to start in September and end in June of each year and, because of certain technical reasons they cannot obtain a permanent appointment. Those technical reasons fall into many categories. In the first place, they have to have a master's degree to teach in senior high schools. They may lack certain college credits along the lines of the subject that they are teaching. They might be over 50 years of age. They might not be able to pass an examination, but yet they are good, sound, qualified teachers and have been teaching in the school system for a number of years. As pointed out by the gentleman from New Jersey, over 700 of these teachers have been teaching in the District of Columbia school system for more than 2 years.

They must have a bachelor's degree in order to teach. They must be of good moral character. They must be citizens of the United States. So these are good teachers. But because of certain technical reasons they are not able to receive an appointment on a permanent basis and must be appointed on a year-to-year basis.

All this legislation does is to amend the acts of 1954 and 1959 to permit teachers in the District of Columbia School System whose service aggregates more than 2 school years to qualify for health benefits and life insurance benefits.

The cost is very nominal. It is estimated to cost approximately $38,000 a year. It has the support of all segments of the District of Columbia Government. Again, as pointed out by the gentleman from New Jersey, there was no opposition whatsoever to the legislation when we conducted hearings on the bill a few weeks ago. This will not affect the part-time employees, the so-called substitute teachers. We will still carry out the act as originally intended, that persons must be on a somewhat permanent basis before they can qualify for the health and life insurance benefits.

I hope the Members will approve this legislation overwhelmingly.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5932?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to apologize to those Members who feel that they have been unduly inconvenienced by my actions of the past few days, in objecting to certain unanimous-consent requests in connection with extensions of their remarks in the body and Appendix of the daily RECORD where such extensions involved the inclusion of extraneous material.

I want to reemphasize at this point, however, that nothing that I have done has had the effect of limiting any Member in the extension of his own remarks in any manner whatsoever, and there has been neither any intention nor the effect of limiting debate or limiting the space in the RECORD which might be utilized for the expression of the personal opinions of any Member. Particularly would I emphasize the fact that this action in objecting to the extension of remarks in the Appendix to include extraneous material, in more than one instance on any single legislative day, and in objecting to the inclusion of extraneous material in the body of the RECORD, was not motivated by any vindictiveness on my part. Inasmuch as no other person was responsible, either directly or indirectly, for my action, I want it understood that I, and I alone, accept any and all responsibility for any inconvenience that was occasioned by this action.

I hope that I have pointed up not only what I consider to be an abuse of a privilege that is available to all Members, only through unanimous consent, but that I have called attention to an extravagant practice that is costing the taxpayers of this Nation hundreds of

thousands of dollars each year, and have also pointed out how a lax interpretation and enforcement of the rules of the House can result in an unnecessarily large expenditure of funds. In the extension of these remarks I will point out how I believe the laws and rules for publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are not being enforced. Because reprints of these laws and rules are readily available from the Joint Committee on Printing, I will not ask for permission to have them printed at this point in the RECORD, though from time to time excerpts from them are printed as filler material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say at this time that it is not my intention to continue with this solo crusade to bring some semblance of reasonableness in the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which, as I understand it, is supposed to be as far as practicable a verbatim account of the proceedings in the two Chambers of the Congress. I recognize that the rules of the House supersede the course of conduct in the allowances now taken to depart from this original design, and for that reason I believe that there should be rules in the form of guidelines to assist Members in conforming to a reasonable practice. At this time we do not have such rules, and while in the past Speakers of the House have enunciated certain practices which would be observed and which have been observed in the absence of unwritten rules, it has been some time since this House has had the benefit of such guidelines.

It will be recalled that at the outset of this short campaign I issued a call for volunteers to assist me. I have received encouragement from many Members who have stated privately, and I might add rather quietly, that they consider that I have been performing a meritorious service; many say they believe there should be limitations, and I have found no one who is willing to defend the practice of permitting unrestricted use of either the body or the Appendix of the daily RECORD for the inclusion of extraneous material, when such use by any one Member exceeds more than $25,000 for any one session, more than the salary of any Member. But, I must admit that my call for volunteers who were willing to stick their neck out, fell on deaf ears. In this instance, at least, no one seems willing to give even lip-service to economy. While I am not promising to completely abandon my efforts to bring about some semblance of reasonableness, which would result in the savings of hundreds of thousands of dollars, let us say for the time being, I have accepted a self-imposed suspend fire, which I reserve the right to reimpose if and when the abuses appear to reach the proportions that have been indicated in the past. I will continue to endeavor to seek relief through committees of this House, the Joint Committee on Printing, and continue to seek the cooperation of the Speaker and individual Members of this body.

By studying the changes that have occurred in practices in conection with the granting of unanimous consent requests for extensions both in the body and in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, there has developed a tendency to approve unanimous consent requests, the exact nature of which are not revealed to other Members of the House, or even to the Speaker. The use of the word "extraneous" material can cover a wide variety of material. For instance, the practice has grown up whereas it has become an accepted procedure for a Member to ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks to include extraneous material, and when there is no objection and the request is approved, the Member then yields back the balance of his time without making any statement on the floor, and without indicating either the subject that he proposes to discuss in his 1 minute speech, or the nature of the extraneous material that is to be offered. On the following day other Members read in the RECORD a long dissertation, often on a controversial subject, accompanied by newspaper articles, editorials, or sometimes even speeches by controversial figures who are not Members of Congress, yet whose remarks have been given the same status as if they were uttered by responsible Members of this body. I say that this is contrary to the spirit and letter of the law. It would seem to me that when a Member requests permission to address the House he should at least indicate the subject on which he proposes to speak even if he elects to remain silent. Also, I would think that other Members are entitled to know the nature of the extraneous material that he seeks to include. Some years ago when a Member made such a request, he indicated that he desired to include an article from a specific publication dealing with a specific subject; or that he wished to include a resolution from a specified organization, supporting or opposing a specific issue that was being considered in the Congress. Many Members with whom I have talked think it might be well to reestablish these customs of the past. Certainly, there should be a little argument against requiring that a Member be on the floor and make his own requests, rather than have them all lumped in one wholesale package at the end of the day, when no one has any idea about what subject any Member wishes to extend his remarks. It is possible that some other Member might want to respond at the time an original statement is made rather than to wait over a weekend.

I would like to quote from the law which gives the Joint Committee on Printing control over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Title 44, section 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; arrangement, style, content, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, ch. 23, sec. 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

As stated earlier, I will not burden the RECORD with printing the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing, but would recommend to all Members a reading of the same. I would point out, however, one rule that appears to have been violated on many occasions:

10(a). Appendix to Daily RECORD.—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Providing*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We all are familiar, I believe, Mr. Speaker, with the fact that there are certain space limitations, in connection with rule 11, which states that:

No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, etc.

During the time I have been a Member of this House, I cannot recall a single instance when objection was made to such a request, notwithstanding the cost, which quite frankly, in many instances, has exceeded what I would interpret as a reasonable request.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose a limitation on the use of the RECORD for the extension of extraneous material, which while it might appear to be more generous than some Members might feel would be justifiable under the terms of a rule or reasonableness, nevertheless, would in my opinion, result in great savings to the taxpayers. I would propose that each individual Member be limited to an average of not more than 2 pages of extraneous material during each week that Congress is in session, but not require that this limitation be imposed on a weekly basis, but over the entire session. Figuring a session of 42 weeks, this would amount to a total of 84 pages that could be used during the session, which would limit the cost to be incurred by any one Member to not more than $7,560. I doubt if more than 10 percent of the Members would use this entire amount, for the RECORD indicates that the large percentage of the Members use this privilege only on rare occasions, and use some discretion and selectivity in requesting the publication of extraneous material. I believe such a rule would not impose an undue or unreasonable hardship or inconvenience on many Members, and would certainly result in the savings of a great amount of money, not to mention the fact that it would serve to make the RECORD more nearly an accurate recording of the proceedings.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I express the hope that the Members will realize that I have attempted to be objective in my thinking, rather than merely acting in the role of an objector, who seeks to impose his personal views, under the rules of the House which do permit the action which I have taken. I

have not relished this role. It has not been easy. Again may I say there has been no spirit of vindictiveness on my part. I have attempted to be both fair and consistent. I am constrained to believe that a majority are sympathetic to the purpose I have been attempting to attain, although I realize there are many who resent the manner in which I have proceeded. I have pointed out the problem; I have suggested one of many solutions; I am ready to abide by the decision of the majority.

TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE, INSURE DOMESTIC TRANQUILLITY

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, "to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity."

Among the declared objectives of the Constitution of the United States these two stand together in its preamble—in this sequence.

In the current racial controversy in our country these two goals now appear to be arrayed against each other in open conflict.

It is made to seem that we cannot have either one without the sacrifice of the other.

Insofar as they are so arrayed in opposition it is an unnatural conflict.

Justice and tranquillity belong together. Each urgently needs the other.

There can be no true or lasting domestic tranquillity without justice.

And tranquillity is the climate required for justice to flourish.

How, then, has this tragic conflict and dilemma come to pass?

Perhaps because the denials of justice to some of our Negro citizens are greater and graver than some of his white fellow citizens have recognized or been willing to acknowledge.

Perhaps because some white citizens have mistaken domestic tranquility for preservation of an unjust status quo or a comfortable escape from vexatious problems—meanwhile forgetting that tranquillity cannot be maintained indefinitely if injustice is indefinitely tolerated.

Perhaps, also, because some of our Negro fellow citizens have, in rash impatience or in their own intolerance, discounted gains already made, ignored opportunities for added gains, and sought to impose still other gains which can only be earned and cannot be enforced.

Perhaps because some of our citizens, both Negro and white, forget that protracted disruption or domestic tranquillity—even in a supposed quest for justice—does not and cannot provide a solid and permanent foundation for justice. And that such disruption instead ultimately insures only complete chaos for everyone.

Perhaps it is all of these things—and more.

In the pursuit of explanations, and of answers and solutions, let us consult each other—and our own consciences—on these matters.

But let us not make these explanations, however valid or warranted, the basis for mutual recriminations. "Let us judge not, that we be not judged."

And how is the conflict to be resolved and the rightful partnership of justice and domestic tranquillity restored in our land?

By more laws, more apparatus and power of government?

Perhaps—though all of us can be losers to an all-powerful government.

More likely, I suspect, it can be accomplished by more vigorous and effective leadership, Negro and white, in and out of government, nationally and locally—and within both races.

Are we to rely for decision of the issue on more "in the streets" mass demonstrations, more boycotts, or additional pressure tactics and coercive measures?

I very much doubt it even though I see little prospect of early acceptance of what to me seems the wiser counsel against these methods. The fever is upon us.

But when this troubled and turbulent phase does finally pass—as it surely will after needless casualties to justice and domestic tranquillity alike—I firmly believe that it will be mutually tolerant and generous negotiations and meaningful communication that bring us to our true goal.

And that goal is cordial, sensible, voluntary acceptance of each other in mutual good will, with an understanding that justice is for all—and that responsibility is for all as well.

And then justice and domestic tranquillity will once again stand together in genuine partnership—not only in our Constitution's preamble but in the life and affairs of our beloved country.

BILL NUNLEY NAMED DRIVER OF THE YEAR

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to an outstanding individual who has recently been selected as the American Trucking Association's "National Driver of the Year."

I am speaking of William C. Nunley whose outstanding record of driving safety, courtesy, and heroism and community and company service has overwhelmingly earned him the title of "Driver of the Year."

This Thursday, the Oklahoma congressional delegation will have a breakfast to honor Mr. Nunley and Mr. Fisher Muldrow, the executive vice president of the Associated Motor Carriers of Oklahoma—the organization which nominated Bill Nunley for the national award. We are looking forward to meeting this outstanding person.

But Nunley's career as a truckdriver stretches over the past 30 years. In that time, he has driven more than 2,225,000 miles without a single accident.

For the past 26 years, he has been an employee of the Yellow Transit Lines out of that firm's Oklahoma City, Okla., office. During this period of more than a quarter of a century, Bill Nunley has hauled an estimated 328 million pounds of valuable freight without incurring as much as a scratched fender.

His outstanding record has been rewarded with many honors. In 1962, he was named the "Driver of the Year" by the Associated Motor Carriers of Oklahoma and on two previous occasions he was selected as the "State Driver of the Month."

His record of driving safety speaks for itself. In addition, Mr. Nunley has been cited for his efforts in assisting many motorists in trouble.

For example, when a crippling ice storm had highway traffic tied up all over the State, Mr. Nunley encountered an Army officer whose car had broken down near Adair, Okla., while he was taking his seriously ill wife to a hospital. Realizing the hazards an ambulance would face on the icy roads and the importance of time, Bill Nunley assumed the risk himself and towed the couple in their vehicle to Pryor, Okla., where the woman was able to receive medical attention.

Bill Nunley has also taken an active part in company safety activities. His work in the research and development of safety devices was instrumental in the installation of safety belts in Yellow Transit's extensive truck fleet. Mr. Nunley has also been a driver-trainer for the past 10 years and his students have amassed a cumulative safety record running into hundreds of thousands of miles.

Mr. Nunley also actively participates in community affairs. In addition to his busy schedule on the job, he finds time to work with young people as a youth baseball and basketball coach. He has also made frequent radio and television appearances for safety causes in the Oklahoma, Missouri, and Kansas region.

This native of Tennessee, resident of Kansas, and truckdriver in Oklahoma and Texas is indeed a credit and an outstanding example of the men and women in the trucking industry. My sincere congratulations go to Bill Nunley on his most recent honor of being named "Driver of the Year."

THE PLIGHT OF THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last weekend marked the 22d anniversary of the first mass deportations from the Baltic States which took place on June 14, 15, and 16, 1941.

Generation after generation of the Baltic people have withstood the influence of their adversaries even though they were physically overcome. The people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have never lost their identity and have preserved their cultural heritage and their individuality throughout centuries of vicissitudes despite superimposed regimes.

It is ironic that the latest effort to overcome the Baltic people and to destroy their nationality and their long-preserved identity should have come from Russia within the generation of those who in establishing the Soviet Government proclaimed "the right of the peoples of Russia to free self-determination up to and including separation and formation of independents states."—International Conciliation, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, March 1963, page 11n.

How long will the Soviet Union continue this denial of a cardinal principle upon which it was founded? How long will the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia remain in bondage or in exile? The suffering of those who were deported cannot be expunged. But the principles for which they stood, the heritage which they preserved will live on as reminders that for people who truly believe in independence of spirit there can be no denial of the right of self-determination. The spirit of liberty is alive in the hearts of the Baltic peoples and will not be extinguished by totalitarian oppression.

THE DAVIS-BACON ACT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which is designed to improve the Davis-Bacon Act and its administration by clarifying much of the present ambiguous language of the act, insuring uniformity of implementation among the various Federal agencies concerned, and establishing an independent administrative review procedure.

The bill is a result of and largely based on the findings and recommendations of the recently published subcommittee report on the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act. The report points up the needed improvements to the act, among which are first, legislative clarity for proper administration; second, language to insure uniformity in interpretation, application, and enforcement by various Government agencies; and, third, a formal review procedure which would afford an appeal from a decision of the Secretary of Labor as a matter of right.

The bill would clarify some of the language found to be ambiguous: "Laborers and mechanics," "city, town, village, or other civil subdivisions of a State," "projects of a character similar to the contract work," "employed directly upon the site of the work." The bill would remove the present uncertainty and lack of uniformity in the interpretation and enforcement of the Davis-Bacon Act among the various Federal agencies by centralizing enforcement functions in the Department of Labor. A Davis-Bacon Appeals Board would be established to provide impartial review to interested parties on determinations made by the Secretary of Labor. The Board would be composed of three members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The members would serve for terms of 3 years. Other changes made in the Davis-Bacon Act by the bill would authorize the Secretary of Labor to impose debarments for a discretionary rather than an absolute period of time as is now required under the Davis-Bacon Act and would allow a contractor to be removed from the debarred bidders list upon a showing by the contractor of present responsibility.

Enactment of the amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act, as proposed in my bill, should solve many of the problems that have arisen in the implementation and interpretation of the act. The subcommittee will hold hearings on the bill later in the session.

ANTIDUMPING ACT

Mr. BAKER. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921 by providing for its more effective operation. I have been concerned for some time about the need to plug loopholes and to improve procedures with regard to its administration.

As we know, the purpose of the Antidumping Act is to prevent a foreign manufacturer from disposing of merchandise in the United States at prices bearing little relation to its true costs of production. Dumping takes place when merchandise is sold in this country at prices below those charged in the exporting country; in other words, as the law specifies, when it is sold "at less than fair value."

Our Antidumping Act and those of other major trading countries are specifically authorized by the International General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and are in consonance with the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Historically, the threat of dumping and its destructive effects has existed for many years. An unfair international trade practice which followed closely upon the industrial revolution, it is pertinent to note that dumping was complained about by Alexander Hamilton in 1791 in his "Report on the Subject of Manufacturers" and the threat of dumping has continued to plague legitimate competition to the present day.

It is high time that this unfair international trade practice be stopped. To do so, however, several serious inadequacies which militate against this objective must be overcome. Procedural and technical overhaul is vitally needed and administrative interpretations, which at times have frustrated the purpose of the act, have tended to contravene the intent of Congress.

Clearly, remedial action to curb injurious price discrimination in world trade is not a partisan matter. It is, on the other hand, a significant issue on which groups with widely divergent interests can and, in fact, have joined in efforts to stamp out its cancerous effects. Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, capital and labor, domestic manufacturers and importers—in fact, all Americans devoted to the perpetuation of the private enterprise system upon which our economy has flourished—should press for consideration of this amendment by the Committee on Ways and Means and, I would hope, for its enactment by the House and Senate at this session.

It should be stressed that an identical bill to the one which, after careful consideration, I am introducing today was introduced prior to his recent and untimely death by our colleague, the respected and distinguished Representative from Pennsylvania, Mr. Walter, and it is most heartening to note that, included among the 23 Republicans and Democrats who have sponsored the amendment in the House as of this date, six are members of the Committee on Ways and Means. The bipartisan nature of the proposed amendment is further exemplified and the substantive worth of its provisions is given added weight by the fact that a similar bill has been cosponsored by 27 Senators, seven of whom are members of the Senate Committee on Finance.

It is my understanding that one of Mr. Walter's last official acts was to direct a request to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS], in which Mr. Walter reaffirmed his long-standing conviction as to the need to amend the Antidumping Act without further delay. In urging Chairman MILLS to introduce an identical bill, Mr. Walter expressed his firm hope that the proposed amendment be given early consideration and endorsement by the committee in order to permit sufficient time for necessary action to be taken by both Houses of Congress.

In view of the overriding importance of this legislation to the fair and equitable conduct of international trade, in view of the intensive review and deliberation which have characterized the development of the proposed bill, and in

view of honoring the resonant and oft-repeated request of a great American who served this body with such distinction for 30 years, I am introducing this amendment to the Antidumping Act today. In so doing, I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with me in introducing and supporting similar bills in order that adequate consideration may be given its provisions by the Committee on Ways and Means in the near future. I know that many of you share Mr. Walter's fervent wish that we enact a sound and workable measure of this type which will improve the effective operation of the Antidumping Act. It was his hope and it is mine that this laudatory objective may be achieved before the close of this session of the Congress.

SUPERSONIC COMMERCIAL AIR TRANSPORT

Mr. HARRIS. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the President has sent up a communication in which he is requesting Congress to provide a program to initiate the development and construction of supersonic commercial transport aircraft. There has been a lot said about this program for the last several weeks. Consideration has been given to the advisability of this type of aircraft for the last 5 or 6 years.

I think this is a most important program in view of the fact that a joint undertaking by the British and the French is in process of developing such a commercial aircraft. Our committee will hold hearings on this request and we will develop the authority and to just what extent there is present authority under the law.

We will initiate these hearings Thursday afternoon at which time we will go fully into this program with a view as to what we should do and how we should do it in the best interest of our country and continued leadership in the aviation community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the executive communication may be included with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
June 14, 1963.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Congress has laid down national aviation objectives in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. These include the development of an air transportation system which will further our domestic and international commerce and the national defense. These objectives, when viewed in the light of today's aviation challenges, clearly require the commencement of a national program to support the development of a commercial supersonic transport aircraft which is safe for the passenger, economically sound for the world's airlines, and whose operating performance is superior to that of any comparable aircraft.

Our determination that the national interest requires such a program is based on a number of factors of varying weight and importance:

A successful supersonic transport can be an efficient, productive commercial vehicle which provides swift travel for the passenger and shows promise of developing a market which will prove profitable to the manufacturer and operator.

It will advance the frontiers of technical knowledge—not as a byproduct of military procurement, but in the pursuit of commercial objectives.

It will maintain the historic U.S. leadership in aircraft development.

It will enable this country to demonstrate the technological accomplishments which can be achieved under a democratic, free enterprise system.

Its manufacture and operation will expand our international trade.

It will strengthen the U.S. aircraft manufacturing industry—a valuable national asset—and provide employment to thousands of Americans.

The cost of such a program is large—it could be as great as $1 billion for a development program of about 6 years. This is beyond the financial capability of our aircraft manufacturers. We cannot, however, permit this high cost, nor the difficulties and risks of such an ambitious program to preclude this country from participating in the logical next development of a commercial aircraft. In order to permit this participation, the United States, through the Federal Aviation Agency, must proceed at once with a program of assistance to industry to develop an aircraft.

The proposed program, though it will yield much technological knowledge, is principally a commercial venture. Its aim is to serve, in competition with others, a substantial segment of the world market for such an aircraft. While the magnitude of the development task requires substantial Government financial participation, it is unwise and unnecessary for the Government to bear all of the costs and risks. Consequently, I propose a program in which (1) manufacturers of the aircraft will be expected to pay a minimum of 25 percent of the development costs, and, in addition, (2) airlines that purchase the aircraft will be expected to pay a further portion of the Government's development costs through royalty payments.

The requirement for cost sharing by the manufacturers will assure that the cost of the program will be held to the absolute minimum. In no event will the Government investment be permitted to exceed $750 million. Moreover, the Government does not intend to pay any production, purchase, or operating subsidies to manufacturers or airlines. On the other hand, this will not exclude consideration by the Government of credit assistance to manufacturers during the production process.

Although the Government will initially bear the principal financial burden in the development phase, participation by industry as a risk-taking partner is an essential of this undertaking. First, the development of civil aircraft should be a private enterprise effort, a product of the interaction of aircraft manufacturers and their prospective customers. We wish to change this relationship as little as possible, and then only temporarily. If the Government were the full risk-taker, the degree of control and direction which it would have to give to the program, to the expenditure of funds, to the selection of designs, to the making of technical decisions, would of necessity be too great. If however, private industry bears a substantial portion of the risk, the degree of Government control and the size of the Government staff required to monitor the program can be held to a minimum.

Second, our objective is to build a commercially sound aircraft, as well as one with superior performance characteristics. This will require, at a relatively early stage, a determination whether the aircraft's cost and characteristics are such that it will find a commercial market. This is a difficult task, and our decision that we have succeeded in developing such a commercially sound aircraft will, in large measure, be attested to by industry's willingness to participate in the risk taking.

If at any point in the development program, it appears that the aircraft will not be economically sound, or if there is not adequate financial participation by industry in this venture, we must be prepared to postpone, terminate, or substantially redirect this program.

Our first concern, however, must be to get the program launched. I am convinced that our national interest requires that we move ahead in this vital area with a sound program which will develop this aircraft in an efficient manner. For that reason I commend this proposal to your early attention.

I will shortly submit to the Congress a request for funds to meet the immediate requirements of this program, such as the detailed design competition. Then we will be started on the task of marshaling the funds of Government and the ingenuity and management skills, as well as funds, of American industry to usher in a new era of commercial flight.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

REPORT ON PARIS AIRSHOW AND MEETING WITH BRITISH/FRENCH OFFICIALS

Mr. HARRIS. Last week I had the privilege of traveling with three members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and two members of the Appropriations Committee to Paris, France. We made the trip aboard one of the FAA's C–135 flying laboratories. The purpose of our trip was to observe the inflight procedures of this aircraft as it checked the accuracy of the navigation aids used to guide our commermercial and military aircraft on their flights along the airways of the world.

It also gave us the opportunity to visit the Paris International Air Show. Here, where most of the latest aircraft produced in the world were on display, we had an opportunity to observe firsthand the spectacular advances made by European aircraft manufacturers during the past few years.

We also held a meeting with the principal executives of the French SUD Aviation Co. and the British Aircraft Corp., to discuss their plans for the joint production of the British/French supersonic Concorde commercial transport aircraft. This airplane, which is being financed jointly by the French and British Governments, developed and built jointly by the French SUD Aviation Co., and the British Aircraft Corp., will probably fly twice the speed of

sound, have a range of some 3,250 nautical miles, carry approximately 104 passengers, and have the capability of flying nonstop between London or Paris and New York in approximately 3 hours.

This is no paper airplane. Tooling has already begun and the first prototype is scheduled to fly in 1966.

I will discuss our meeting with the representatives of these two companies, and describe in some detail the information we were able to gather. But first, I should like to remark briefly on the operations of the FAA C–135 jet aircraft in which we made our trip. The FAA operates two of these large four-engine jets which are a version of the 707. They are packed with highly complex electronic equipment which is able to check the accuracy of the radio navigation stations which guide planes by signals from the ground. The tasks they perform are truly prodigious. As an example, in our 7-hour, 15-minute flight between Washington, D.C., and Le Bourget Airport in Paris, France, we checked the accuracy of the ground navigation aids, in a band 300 miles wide, along the path of our flight while over the American Continent. When flying over the air routes of the North Atlantic, we checked the accuracy and strength of the communications and radar facilities on Ocean Ship Charlie and Ocean Ship Juliet.

Although the FAA has only two of these aircraft, they have a schedule which requires the flight checking once every 6 months of the ground navigation aids used for guiding our civil and military jet aircraft along the air routes throughout the United States and the areas of the free world into which our aircraft fly. While we remained in Paris to meet with the representatives of the French SUD Aviation Co. and the British Aircraft Corp., this aircraft flew on to Germany where it flight checked the navigation facilities at three major U.S. Air Force Bases.

The SUD Aviation Co. and the British Aircraft Corp. had gathered representatives of their top management for our meeting. Our discussions were wide-ranging, candid, and frank. It soon became entirely apparent that in spite of any problems the British and French may be having about the admittance of Britain to the European Common Market there was no discord between the two nations or these two companies in their cooperative efforts to produce the Concorde supersonic civil transport airplane.

We found that a great deal of work has been accomplished already. The program has been underway for over 18 months. Most of the basic engineering has been completed. An engine capable of producing the speed range at which the Concorde has been designed to fly is an actuality. Certain long-lead items such as castings for the main landing gear are now being fabricated. The complete details as to which company will fabricate each part and where it will be assembled into complete airplanes has been determined. The companies have embarked on an intensive sales campaign. Our indications are that cooperative efforts between the two nations to pool technical and economic resources to capture 30 years of U.S. preeminence in aviation will continue and intensify.

Projects of such magnitude as Concorde by necessity require Government support. No manufacturer or combination of manufacturers in any country could finance the total research and development costs of a supersonic transport airplane.

We learned that the development cost for Concorde is now estimated to be approximately $425 million. This would give them two flying prototype models, one to be assembled in Britain, and one to be assembled in France. They were quite candid, however, in admitting that this sum was an estimate and that research and the developmental costs of any aircraft, particularly one entering areas yet unknown, had an alarming habit of rising beyond predicted levels.

At this time there is no reason to believe that if we begin our supersonic program with all due haste that the Concorde will be seen more on our domestic airways than aircraft which bear the label "Made in U.S.A.," but the threat is there, it is real, and it will grow more real with every delay on our part.

Our airlines will and must buy the best product they can get at the lowest possible price consistent with safety requirements when it makes economic sense to do so. This is true whether that product be of United States or foreign manufacture. So far as the economics of airline operation is concerned, it matters very little in what country the airplane is manufactured. The airlines will buy airplanes, regardless of who builds them, which are designed to make fare levels both acceptable to the traveler or the shipper and profitable to them.

The challenge to the U.S. aviation industry is not solely confined to the area of supersonic aircraft. At Le Bourget—first ground that Lindbergh touched after his historic 33½-hour flight from Long Island in 1927—we saw assembled a stunning display of tangible evidence of the tremendous strides the nations of the world have made in the technology of flight. After an inspection of these exhibits, it is obvious that no one nation can claim preeminence in creativity. Many foreign manufacturers and Governments, including Poland and Czechoslovakia, participated in the show. The products they had on display were of excellent or superior design and workmanship.

It was also obvious that the efforts of the Europeans to capture potential markets was not confined to the British/French Concorde supersonic transport effort. For example, the one aircraft in the world now flying and ready for the market which appears to come closest to meeting our requirements for a replacement for the DC–3 is French built.

At the Paris Air Show we saw evidence on every hand that the U.S. aviation industry must redouble its efforts to retain its preeminence in the aviation field. A part of the European effort to topple us from our lead position is the pooling of resources, both financial and technical. The first major example of this is, of course, the agreement between the British/French to jointly build the Concorde supersonic transport. There were a number of other cooperative projects. I found particularly revealing the cooperation of the British, French, German, and in some instances, U.S. companies, in funding and developing certain military aircraft and components. This was undoubtedly the result of the long and vast U.S. effort to promote the maximum effectiveness of the NATO nations for the benefit of the free world.

This Nation can be very proud of the U.S. products and aircraft displayed at the airshow. The United States leads in number of aircraft on exhibit with a total of 55. However, the number of foreign aircraft on exhibit this year is much larger and more varied than it was 2 years ago. Those of us who had the opportunity to view the products and aircraft on display and discuss with SUD Aviation and the British Aircraft Corp. representatives the Concorde program have been made forcefully aware that in the past decade Europe has produced a new era of prosperity and a vastly increased technical competence and capability. This prosperity and capability has now become a major and ever-present challenge to our position and stature in world aviation. We must face up squarely to this fact and take the measures necessary to retain our 30-year preeminence.

If we delay or are indecisive we may well find that the United States has become a follower rather than the leader in world aviation.

We must not allow this to happen.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS IN RELATION TO THE BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. 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 be interested, I include a summary of the action in the appropriation bills down to date in the current session and an approximation of the portions of the President's obligational authority budget yet to come before the House for consideration. It is a revision of similar information presented earlier in the session.

Summary of the appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess., as of June 15, 1963

[NOTE.—Excludes permanent appropriations. And does not include any "backdoor" appropriations.]

Fiscal year and bill	Budget estimates to House	House action		Budget estimates to Senate	Passed by Senate	Enacted	Bills at latest stage compared to budget request
		Reported by committee	Passed				
FISCAL 1963							
Supplemental, Agriculture (shifted from original 1964 budget request)	[1] $508,172,000	$508,172,000	$508,172,000	$508,172,000	$508,172,000	$508,172,000	
Supplemental, 1963	1,641,507,106	988,756,506	1,438,691,506	1,652,300,456	1,488,683,841	1,467,430,491	−$184,869,965
Public works acceleration	(500,000,000)	(————)	(450,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(450,000,000)	(450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)
All other	(1,141,507,106)	(988,756,506)	(988,691,506)	(1,152,300,456)	(1,038,683,841)	(1,017,430,491)	(−134,869,965)
Total, 1963	[2] 2,149,679,106	1,496,928,506	1,946,863,506	2,160,472,456	1,996,855,841	1,975,602,491	−184,869,965
FISCAL YEAR 1964							
Interior and related:							
Appropriations	998,009,000	929,690,200	922,625,200	998,009,000	979,693,400		−18,315,600
Borrowing authority	13,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	13,000,000	6,000,000		−7,000,000
Contract authority	17,500,000			17,500,000			−17,500,000
Total, Interior	1,028,509,000	935,690,200	928,625,200	1,028,509,000	985,693,400		−42,815,600
Treasury-Post Office and related	6,146,842,000	5,997,026,000	5,997,026,000	6,146,842,000	6,069,466,250	6,045,466,000	−101,376,000
Labor-HEW and related	5,759,489,000	5,449,988,000	5,449,981,000				−309,508,000
Agriculture and related:							
Appropriation	6,368,755,000	5,979,457,000	5,979,457,000				−389,298,000
Borrowing authority	855,000,000	855,000,000	855,000,000				
Total Agriculture	7,223,755,000	6,834,457,000	6,834,457,000				−389,298,000
Legislative (excludes Senate items)	148,580,245	140,038,919	140,038,919				−8,541,326
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary, and related	2,159,891,900	1,851,269,900					−308,622,000
Grand total reductions to date on portions of budget processed through the regular appropriation bills (based on latest action on each bill)	24,616,746,251						−1,345,030,891

[1] Shifted from budget for 1964 (which was reduced accordingly).
[2] This accounts for virtually all the supplementals for 1963 specifically projected in the January 1963 budget except the $2,000,000,000 borrowing authority for the Export-Import Bank submitted as a "backdoor" proposition and now pending.

Mr. Speaker, we will report the defense bill this week. Hearings on the other bills are either completeu or well advanced. Some bills are delayed pending consideration of the related annual authorization bills which under the rules must precede the appropriation bills.

There are no further supplemental bills for fiscal 1963. There is pending, however, a $2,000,000,000 back-door appropriation in the bill for the Export-Import Bank. As may be noted from the table included, the House has considered $24,616,746,251 of the new appropriation budget requests for fiscal 1964 in the six regular bills reported to date.

AMOUNTS YET TO BE CONSIDERED

The President's January budget proposed $107,927,000,000 in new obligational authority for fiscal 1964, of which $11,781,000,000 is for permanent appropriations recurring under prior law, principally interest on the debt, thus leaving in round figures, $96,146,000,000 proposed for consideration in the present session applicable to fiscal 1964. The President has subsequently submitted several revisions to the January budget for fiscal 1964 totaling approximately $1,123,000,000 in reductions, principally the $508,172,000 agriculture item switched over to fiscal 1963 and the $419,700,000 downward revision in foreign aid; there are approximately $195,000,000 in other downward adjustments. Thus the current total new obligational authority proposed by the President for 1964 for action in the current session is, again approximately, $95,023,000,000. And the January budget identifies about $2,727,000,000 of that—the figure has not since materially changed—with propositions of legislation for new programs initially for consideration in legislative rather than appropriation bills; therefore it remains uncertain how much of that will eventuate in formal budget requests for actual appropriation. And some portion of the remaining $92,296,000,000 will probably also be affected as the Congress processes the annual legislative authorization bills for such major items as space, military construction, and foreign aid; any change will presumably also affect the budget request for actual appropriation.

So that, Mr. Speaker, while we cannot, even at this date, give the precise budget amounts yet to come before the House in the appropriation bills, on the basis of what is now pending before the committee the magnitude and character is approximately this: Defense bill $49,014,000,000; independent offices bill, $14,560,000,000; public works bill, $4,558,000,000; military construction, $1,978,000,000; foreign aid bill, $4,840,000,000; District of Columbia bill, $34,000,000; and, as usual, a closing supplemental bill, amounts now unknown.

Mr. Speaker, a precautionary word for anyone who may take the time to balance out these figures with the budget totals. The budget concept of new obligational authority is slightly different from the traditional appropriation concept—for instance, an appropriation to liquidate prior contract authority is counted as an appropriation but it is not new obligational authority. And whereas in the foregoing tabulation the Post Office appropriations are counted, as heretofore, on a gross basis, in the budget only the estimated postal deficit, chargeable to the General Treasury, and being the excess of the appropriations over the estimated postal revenues, is reflected as new obligational authority.

REVISED SUMMARY OF NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY REQUESTED BY THE PRESIDENT

For the fiscal year 1963, ending this month, the President's January budget estimated total new obligational authority, including supplementals to be submitted to the present session, aggregating $103,192,000,000. Subsequent revisions from the President thus far increase that figure by the net amount of approximately $272,000,000—to a new total of $103,464,000,000; there have been formal downward revisions of $236,495,000, more than offset by the $508,172,000 switch to fiscal 1963 from the 1964 budget for the Commodity Credit Corporation. A few small increases submitted by the President and not specifically identified in the January budget for fiscal 1963 are chargeable to the contingency allowance within the overall total.

For the fiscal year 1964, the revised total new obligational authority request, after adjustments as noted, is approximately $106,804,000,000; that is, the original January budget of $107,927,000,000 reduced by the adjustments of $1,123,000,000.

Comparatively, then, the President's adjusted recommendations for new authority to obligate the Government for fiscal 1964 are as follows:

1964 total budget request exceeds currently adjusted 1963 total by	+$3,340,000,000
1964 revised request exceeds fiscal 1961 by	+20,129,000,000
1964 revised request exceeds fiscal 1954 by	+44,039,000,000

And as previously documented, using official budget and Treasury figures, approximately 53 percent of the recommended increase, 1964 over 1963, is for "Other than national defense"; approximately 49 percent of the recommended

increase, 1954 over 1961, is for "Other than national defense"; and approximately 60 percent of the recommended increase, 1964 over 1954, is for "Other than national defense."

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY VERSUS BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Mr. Speaker, we have said this before but when reciting these fantastic amounts it is well to repeat that a source of much confusion is the matter of just what set of figures correctly measures the size of the budget on which the Congress acts. Contrary to widespread impression, the House does not act directly on the more generally familiar $98,802,000,000 January spending budget for fiscal 1964 which, incidentally, is now slightly outdated though it is the last official estimate from the President. The House acts on the new obligational authority budget of $107,927,000,000 for 1964—that is the 1964 total of the propositions submitted, and currently revised to about $106,804,000,000. The grant of authority to obligate is the significant point of decision in the appropriation process. The actual expenditure in payment of the obligation necessarily follows in due course of time. If you do not appropriate, no obligation can be created. If no obligation is created, then no expenditure—disbursement—is made. The $98.8 billion spending budget is the checking account budget—it represents the checks drawn to pay the bills. The new obligational authority budget represents the authority to create the obligation. That is the key figure to keep in mind. An increasingly higher obligational authority budget and appropriation signifies, inevitably, a higher disbursement or expenditure budget.

Members of the House, the press, and others from time to time during the year, and especially in the closing weeks and days of the session, inquire as to what Congress has done to the spending budget. Unfortunately, we cannot tell them because the figures are not available. And they cannot be precisely and authoritatively compiled here. The House will have opportunity to vote on only approximately $44,668,000,000 of the $98,802,000,000 spending budget figure for fiscal 1964—principally for two reasons. And even this diminished total will be fragmented among some 14 or 15 appropriation bills and numerous legislative bills, handled on a piecemeal basis throughout the session. About $42,353,000,000 of the spending in 1964 will be from obligational authority already voted in past years by previous Congresses. Then, roughly $11,781,000,000 will ensue from permanent appropriations recurring automatically under prior law and therefore not required to be voted on in the current session. These total $54,134,000,000, or over 54 percent of the 1964 spending budget of $98.8 billion not directly before the House this session.

As to the remainder, a portion is related to propositions of new legislation first for consideration in sundry bills in the legislative committees, or, on the other hand, if such be the decision, to be cut from the budget by failure to report or enact the new proposals. The separately identifiable January budget total for these new propositions of legislation, within the $107.9 billion total new obligational authority request is $2,727,000,000 of new obligational authority for fiscal 1964, of which, according to the budget, $1,202,000,000 would be expended in 1964 and therefore included in the $98.8 billion bill spending figure for 1964.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. LENNON), for 15 days, on account of illness.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (at the request of Mr. RYAN of New York), for Monday, June 17, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. CAREY (at the request of Mr. RYAN of New York), for Monday, June 17, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. RYAN of New York), for Monday, June 17, 1963, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. JENSEN and to include a message by him to the World Food Conference.

Mr. GOODLING to insert the Memorial Day exercises which took place on the national cemetery at Gettysburg on Memorial Day, and include the remarks of the Vice President of the United States.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 603. An act relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 79. An act to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 13, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells;

H.R. 1561. An act for the relief of Melborn Keat;

H.R. 2439. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use in the 1964 National Jamboree, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter; and

H.R. 4349. An act for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson.

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE APPENDIX OF THE DAILY RECORD

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] have permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but I want to point out that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] made a speech earlier today in which he objected to the printing of certain agricultural bulletins and yearbooks, and said that the Congress could save a lot of money if we refused to send them out. He is asking permission to extend his remarks in five instances. Already this year he has included enough material in the RECORD to total $13,000 plus. It seems to me that if he really wanted to save money he ought to cut down that way and not try to cut down on useful publications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair. What happened to this bill that was under suspension, H.R. 4638?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the bill was not called up.

Mr. GROSS. I submit that it is an unusual procedure, in light of the fact that it is 1:20 o'clock in the afternoon, to abandon the last bill scheduled for consideration under suspension. This bill was put on the whip notice on both sides of the aisle to be called up this afternoon. Moreover, I have been hearing the last few days that it was in the nature of an emergency to get the bill under consideration on the floor. I do not understand why this bill, H.R. 4638, is being shelved when an afternoon remains in which to consider it.

The SPEAKER. The bill has been withdrawn and there is nothing unusual about that. It is not an unusual situation.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr.

SHORT] that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may have permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the daily RECORD and to include therein extraneous matter in five instances.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I revise the request to one instance.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. The gentleman from Texas was on the floor this morning and could have made his request at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] in one instance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will object to all of these second-hand requests.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that these requests for permission to insert remarks and material in the Appendix of the daily RECORD will all be objected to, I will not mention any more of the requests.

REQUESTS FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE BODY OF THE RECORD

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BROMWELL] may address the House for 30 minutes on June 18.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

POINT OF ORDER OF NO QUORUM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 18, 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:

933. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the April 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.

934. A communication from the President of the United States, relative to the development of an air transportation system which will further our domestic and international commerce and the national defense, which includes the development of a commercial supersonic transport aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

935. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 618)"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

936. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

937. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend sections 3288 and 3289 of title 18, United States Code, relating to reindictment after dismissal of a defective indictment"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

938. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 12, 1963, the following bill was reported on June 14, 1963:

Mr. ROONEY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7063. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes: without amendment (Rept. No. 388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted June 17, 1963*]

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. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2827. A bill to extend until June 30, 1966, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory; with amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2651. A bill to extend for 1 year the period during which responsibility for the placement and foster care of dependent children, under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, may be exercised by a public agency other than the agency administering such aid under the State plan; without amendment (Rept. No. 390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6246. A bill relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay; without amendment (Rept. No. 391). 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. 392. 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, pursuant to the order of the House of June 12, 1963, the following bill was introduced on June 14, 1963:

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 7063. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

[*Introduced and referred June 17, 1963*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 7064. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 7065. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that, in computing annual income for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain pensions, certain payments received on account of disability shall be excluded; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 7066. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 7067. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to permit civil actions for damages in the case of water pollution affecting fish and wildlife; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 7068. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 7069. A bill relating to the interest rates on loans made by the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 7070. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend for an additional 3 years the period during which construction funds must be received, and to put the National Cultural Center on a sound, businesslike basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 7071. A bill to amend section 3012 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment to those survivors not entitled to death compensation, dependency and indemnity compensation, or death pension, compensation and pension accrued to a veteran at the time of his death and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 7072. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to assure fairness in editorializing by radio and television station licensees in support of or in opposition to candidates for public office by making the equal opportunities provisions of section 315 applicable thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 7073. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 7074. A bill to amend paragraph 1537 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to certain footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 7075. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7076. A bill to require that all State or local programs supported with Federal funds shall be administered and executed without regard to the race or color of the participants and beneficiaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 7077. A bill to facilitate the transmission in the mails of certain educational kits containing laboratory apparatus for the use of blind persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 7078. A bill to amend section 415 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the exclusion from annual income in entitlement determinations to dependency and indemnity compensation of those amounts paid by a dependent parent for medical and dental expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 7079. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans in existence and to authorize the loan of a naval vessel to a friendly foreign country and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7080. A bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 7081. A bill to amend section 21 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U.S.C. 887), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 7082. A bill to regulate agricultural and forestry imports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 479. 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. BARRY:

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution congratulating the American Veterinary Medical Association on its centennial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. Con. Res. 181. Concurrent resolution to request the President to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to gaining the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Res. 404. Resolution extending greetings and felicitations of the House of Representatives to the people of Millbury, Mass., on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of their community; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII:

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing thanks for courtesies extended to Chaplain Alphonso Jordan on his recent visit to the Nation's Capital, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 7083. A bill for the relief of Elsie Anita Jardim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 7084. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liliana A. Barsoum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 7085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isabel Whittaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7086. A bill for the relief of Clarence Earle Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 7087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Hanna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7088. A bill for the relief of Joseph Di Ciccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 7089. A bill for the relief of Esber, Sabahat, and Sumru Koprucu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 7090. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Haia Cervonogura Wolfe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 7091. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Ioannis Tsakiris (husband), Thomae Dimitrios Tsakiris (wife); and two children, Ioannis and Athina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 7092. A bill for the relief of Renato Magliocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 7093. A bill for the relief of Alfred Stewart McCorkle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 7094. A bill for the relief of Reginaldo Salvatore Colella; 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:

159. By the SPEAKER: Petition of C. D. Brownell, president, National Association of Plumbing, Heating, and Cooling Contractors, Washington, D.C., relative to requesting that the utmost be done toward opposing the enactment of Senate bill 757 and House bill 2029, and that continued support be given the Small Business Administration programs which have done so much to aid the small businessman in the construction industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

160. Also, petition of Joseph Scaramella, chairman, Board of Supervisors of Mendocino County, Calif., relative to expressing support for Senate bill 1275, relating to Federal-State conflict over water rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 17, 1963

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

Rev. C. S. Mueller, pastor, the Lutheran Church of St. Andrew, Wheaton, Md., offered the following prayer:

Into your hands, most blessed Lord, we once more place, in prayer, our Nation, our leaders, and our people, asking for your continued care.

We this day give thanks for the abundance of your many blessings, especially those of freedom, plenty, and opportunity. Undeserving as we are of these gifts, You have graciously given into our hands all that is necessary, that we might truly "have life and have it more abundantly." May we use, and never abuse, these gifts.

In this spirit of thanksgiving and humble acknowledgment, we make bold to ask that today and every day these mercies be renewed and placed at the disposal of this Nation, her people, and her leaders, with the matching grace of wisdom, courage, understanding, and true sympathy. May what You have given to us touch the lives of all men, for good, through us.

Upon this Senate and all who work that decisions here made be just, beneficial, and effective, let your spirit of guidance rest. May the men and women who deal so intimately and directly with the destiny of our Nation and our world know the peace of calling You Father and the assurance of being your child.

These things we ask in the name of our Redeemer, Jesus Christ, through whom we have the privilege, in prayer, of calling on You for more and more, and yet more. Hear us, we humbly pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 13, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the

House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 74) for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6755) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 79) to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6755) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

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

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET, 1964, FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (S. DOC. NO. 23)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1964, involving a proposed provision for the Department of Labor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMERCIAL SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

A communication from the President of the United States, relating to the proposed development of a commercial supersonic transport aircraft; to the Committee on Commerce.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN VIRGINIA AND WEST VIRGINIA

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Johns Creek, Va., and Upper Deckers Creek, W. Va. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON 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 defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the month of April 1963 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROVISION OF QUARTERS AND EQUIPMENT TO CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED RIGHT-OF-WAY ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN STATE OF VIRGINIA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected right-of-way activities of the Federal-aid highway program in the State of Virginia, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated June 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF AUGUST 9, 1955 (69 STAT. 618)

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 618) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 3288 AND 3289 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO REINDICTMENT AFTER DISMISSAL OF A DEFECTIVE INDICTMENT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 3288 and 3289 of title 18, United States Code, relating to reindictment after dismissal of a defective indictment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEES PAYABLE TO THE PATENT OFFICE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PLANS FOR WORK OF IMPROVEMENT IN ALABAMA, ARKANSAS, OKLAHOMA, AND TENNESSEE

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Cheaha Creek, Ala., Poteau River, Ark., and Okla., and Middle Fork-Obion River, Tenn. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina; ordered to lie on the table:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION —

"Resolution thanking the Senate and the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress and the members of the North Carolina congressional delegation for courtesies extended to Chaplain Alphonso Jordan on his recent visit to the Nation's Capital

"Whereas the Reverend Alphonso Jordan, chaplain of the house of representatives of the North Carolina General Assembly visited the Congress of the United States on Thursday, May 23, 1963; and

"Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, and in particular the Members of the North Carolina congressional delegation to the U.S. Congress, extended many courtesies to Chaplain Jordan during his visit: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives:

"SECTION 1. The house of representatives expresses its appreciation to the Congress of the United States, and particularly to the Members of the North Carolina delegation to the Congress of the United States, for the many kind courtesies extended to Chaplain Jordan.

"SEC. 2. The secretary of state shall send copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of the North Carolina delegation to the U.S. Congress, and to Chaplain Jordan.

"SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective upon adoption.

"Adopted June 6, 1963."

JOINT RESOLUTION OF MAINE LEGISLATURE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], I present, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fish products. I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

"JOINT RESOLUTION —

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fish products, and for other purposes

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 101st legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas it has been recognized that the agricultural economy of the country requires the transportation of bulk agricultural commodities at the lowest possible rates consistent with the financial status of the carriers; and

"Whereas the Nation's railroad carriers have heretofore been hampered in the set-

ting of minimum rates for the transportation of bulk agricultural commodities by reason of time consuming and arbitrary standards imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

"Whereas it is absolutely essential for the continued development of agricultural production in the State of Maine that the producers of agricultural products be able to reduce transportation costs on feed and other ingredients; and

"Whereas other agricultural areas of the country are now the recipients of greatly reduced transportation costs of such ingredients to the detriment of and discrimination against Maine agricultural producers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the memorialists, recommend and urge to the Congress of the United States that the document entitled 88th Congress, 1st session, H.R. 4700, a bill to obtain the aforesaid objectives, be passed by the Congress in order to accomplish the aforesaid objectives; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of State, be immediately submitted by the secretary of State to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

"Read and adopted in senate chamber, June 7, 1963.

"CHESTER T. WINSLOW,
"Secretary.

"Read and adopted in house of representatives, June 10, 1963.

"HARVEY R. PEASE,
"Clerk."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H.R. 1819. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 251).

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

S. 622. A bill to improve and encourage collective bargaining between the management of the Alaska Railroad and representatives of its employees, and to permit to the extent practicable the adoption by the Alaska Railroad of the personnel policies and practices of the railroad industry (Rept. No. 256).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 1492. An act to provide for the sale of certain reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain real property owned by Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart (Rept. No. 252).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1326. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property (Rept. No. 253).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1154. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Christmas Lake, Inc., and Karlson Development Corp. (Rept. No. 254).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 614. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make water available for a permanent pool for recreation purposes at Cochiti Reservoir from the San Juan-Chama unit of the Colorado River storage project (Rept. No. 255).

By Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 851. A bill to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande (Rept. No. 257).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 3574. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range, Calif., for defense purposes (Rept. No. 258); and

H.J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project (Rept. No. 259).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1185. A bill relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc. (Rept. No. 260).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated June 6, 1963, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

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. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. LONG of Missouri):

S. 1721. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to prohibit certain discriminatory practices by business enterprises receiving assistance under such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1722. A bill to amend section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to insure fair and equitable treatment under collective-bargaining agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. MOSS):

S. 1723. A bill to require contractors and subcontractors engaged in the construction of projects under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to conform to certain licensing laws of the State in which any such project is located; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1724. A bill to amend section 368 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the definitions of the terms "reorganization" and "a party to a reorganization"; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1725. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

S. 1726. A bill to consent to the Lower Niobrara River and Ponca Creek Compact between the States of Nebraska and South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1727. A bill to permit donation of surplus agricultural commodities to State and county penal and correctional institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1728. A bill for the relief of Max Kahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 1729. A bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to improved methods of education of students with epilepsy in public and private schools and institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1730. A bill to prevent the use of arbitrary and inappropriate measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCARTHY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of a Congressional Medal of National Honor to Carl Sandburg; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES BY BUSINESS ENTERPRISES RECEIVING FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to stop the Small Business Administration from making loans to firms that discriminate because of race, creed, or color, by refusing either service or employment to certain persons. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 1 week, to enable other Senators to join in sponsoring it.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, almost all Americans recognize that discrimination is based on bigotry and hate.

We only disagree on how far the Federal Government should go to eliminate it.

This body will predictably be divided on the question of whether the President's civil rights bill to use Federal sanctions to prohibit discrimination in various business establishments that are in interstate commerce is wise public policy. I think the President is right. I will support him. But some Senators will argue that this should be left to the States or to private determination; that it is none of the Federal Government's business. I disagree. But I understand the basis for these objections—based, as they are, on States rights doctrine.

But, Mr. President, when it comes to discrimination financed by Federal funds, that is something else again.

A firm that borrows from the Small Business Administration is asking all Federal taxpayers to finance its operation. The Federal taxpayer's money—the money of the white man, of the Negro, of all taxpayers—is involved. The use of these funds by such a firm, to enable it to expand its discriminatory policies, is wrong; and there is no moral, political or financial justification for it.

Mr. President, Small Business Administration loans are helpful to small business. Often they determine whether, in fact, a small business will be able to grow and develop. This is a good program that is warmly supported by the American people.

But no one can argue that small business loans are as necessary as aid to dependent children, to the blind, or to the mentally and physically ill.

On the other hand, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has introduced, and I am cosponsoring, a bill to stop Federal participation in the various welfare programs if the programs practice discrimination. This bill is sound, although it may indeed cause heartrending hardships among dependent children and persons who suffer painfully from lack of food, clothing, or shelter.

The bill I have introduced, however, will simply prevent the businessman from obtaining such a loan from the Government until he has discontinued any discriminatory practice he may be following. If he needs the money badly enough, he will have to discontinue denying persons their rights as Americans. If he chooses not to do so, why should the Federal taxpayer finance his defiance of basic American rights?

The Civil Rights Commission—composed of prominent men, southerners as well as northerners, who for many years have studied the race problem in our country—has proposed that the Federal Government stop all payments to a State that practices discrimination. My bill, which confines its effect to a Federal agency, does not go nearly that far.

My bill also has the virtue of assuring a firm which discontinues discrimination—often at considerable sacrifice—that at least its competition will not be able to take its business away, through using Federal tax money. Unless this bill is enacted, tax money paid by an employer or a firm which, at great sacrifice, has ceased discrimination, may be loaned, through the Small Business Administration, to a firm which may use the money to expand its facilities, so that it can take business away from the firm which has ceased discrimination.

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

The bill (S. 1721) to amend the Small Business Act to prohibit certain discriminatory practices by business enterprises receiving assistance under such act, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. LONG of Missouri), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMBERSHIP IN LABOR ORGANIZATION AS CONDITION OF EMPLOYMENT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, commonly referred to as the Taft-Hartley Act. My amendment would nullify those provisions of any collective bargaining agreement which require membership in a union as a condition of employment in any case where the contracting union maintains an exclusionary policy with respect to membership based on race, creed, color, or national origin.

For the past 30 years, labor unions have been the recipients of many special privileges, rights, and immunities enjoyed by no other form of private organization in our society, and conferred on them by Federal law. Among the most substantial of these union advantages is the power to contract with the employer to compel membership in the union as a condition of employment.

In 1935, Congress adopted the Wagner Act which the trade union movement refers to as its Magna Carta. A fundamental principle of the Wagner Act was that no employer could lawfully discriminate against an employee because of his membership or nonmembership in a labor union. This basic principle was embodied in section 8(3) of the Wagner Act which made it an unfair labor practice for an employer "by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization."

If section 8(3) had stopped right there, every form of compulsory union membership agreement would have been rendered unlawful. To avoid this, the Congress conferred a special immunity on labor unions by including a proviso to section 8(3) which permitted unions and employers to enter into compulsory union membership agreements without violating the law.

It was clearly recognized that this exception was in direct contradiction to the act's fundamental principle that an employee's job status was to remain completely unaffected by reason of his membership or nonmembership in a union.

In 1947, Congress recognized the need to narrow this broad and powerful immunity it had granted to labor unions 12 years earlier. Although in enacting the Taft-Hartley Act, it continued to permit employers and unions to enter into compulsory union membership agreements, it narrowed the permissible scope of such agreements. Moreover, it also made explicit by writing into the new statute a principle which had previously been part of the unwritten law, to wit, the so-called right-to-work principle. Section 14(b) of the amended National Labor Relations Act specifically authorized the states to prohibit all forms of compulsory union membership. To date 20 States have enacted such right-to-work laws.

Nevertheless, in the remaining 30 States, unions continue to enjoy the special privilege of lawfully being able to compel employees to join the union if they wish to hold on to their jobs. It is my firm conviction that this special privilege should be withdrawn from any labor union which denies fair and equitable treatment to qualified employees and applicants for employment.

For that reason I am introducing this bill which, simply stated, merely renders null and void any provision in a collective bargaining agreement requiring union membership as a condition of employment, if the union which is a party to such an agreement, discriminates with respect to membership therein because of race, creed, color, or national origin. If a union wishes to assert the prerogatives of a private organization to pick and choose its own members in any way it sees fit, it is inequitable for the Federal Government to grant it the special privilege of contracting for compulsory membership where the union exercises its prerogative unjustly and arbitrarily.

In closing I would like to point out that my bill would not apply in any way in those States which have or enact right-to-work laws. Inasmuch as the bill merely nullifies compulsory union membership contract provisions under certain conditions, it can obviously have no application in any State where such provisions are already prohibited by State law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, and also that the bill be permitted to remain at the table for 3 days.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Texas, and will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1722) to amend section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to insure fair and equitable treatment under collective bargaining agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by adding the following subsection:

(g) Any agreement, as authorized in subsection (a)(3), requiring membership in a labor organization as condition of employ-

ment, shall to that extent be unenforcible and void if such labor organization, because of race, creed, color or national origin, denies membership therein to any individual on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to and with the same rights and privileges generally and uniformly accorded to all members of such labor organization.

CONFORMATION TO CERTAIN LICENSING LAWS OF STATES BY CONTRACTORS AND SUBCONTRACTORS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Bureau of Reclamation of the U.S. Department of the Interior spends vast amounts of the taxpayers' money on a variety of projects each year. The work of the Reclamation Bureau in constructing irrigation, drainage, waterpower and other projects is well known and requires no review at this time.

In a construction operation as massive as that carried out by the Bureau numerous problems are bound to arise. Among the difficulties that accompany the building of a large dam or irrigation project are those connected with the complex contracts between the Bureau and the contractors and between the various contractors and subcontractors themselves. At each Reclamation Bureau project a number of individuals and companies are involved in supplying or paying for material and labor. Disputes about the work to be done or the amount of payment to be made naturally arise from time to time.

Unfortunately, some of the individuals and firms working on reclamation jobs sometimes fail to meet their obligations. In cases where a contractor or a subcontractor cannot or will not pay his debts complicated legal procedures must be resorted to by the creditor. In many instances, the law and the courts of the State in which the dispute arose may not be utilized by the local supplier or other party who is forced to sue to recover what he has lost. However, the wronged party does have an alternative remedy under the Federal law.

The Miller Act was enacted to provide a substitute for mechanics' liens which are not recognizable by the Federal Government for the settlement of obligations between contractors and those furnishing labor or material to prime and subcontractors. Under the act all Government construction contracts exceeding $2,000 require that the prime contractors furnish the Government with performance and payment bonds. The amounts of the payment bonds vary from one-half the amount of the contract in cases where the contract amount is less than $1 million to $2,500,000 for contracts in excess of $5 million.

Many of the claims which arise from reclamation projects are adequately handled through the processes of the Miller Act. However, on large Federal contracts there are many second, third, fourth, or even more tier subcontractors. The present law does not adequately protect those who furnish equipment or labor to these subcontractors. For, it is the general contractor, not his subcontractors who must post the performance and payment bonds.

A further complication to this problem is the fact that contractors engaged in Federal construction are not required to be licensed under the laws of the States where the construction projects are located. The result of this situation is that a number of contractors who have no licenses to operate within a State are nevertheless able to work on construction projects sponsored by the Federal Government and located in that State. This vacuum in the law has resulted in abuses.

Mr. President, some contractors who have earned poor reputations within certain States and have had their licenses removed by the local authorities have been permitted to work on Reclamation Bureau projects within the same States. The registrar of contractors of the State of Arizona, for example, may find a certain contractor unfit to do business in Arizona for reasons dealing with his reliability or his credit rating. Nevertheless, the registrar must sit back and watch this same contractor awarded a portion of a Federal contract located in our State. When this contractor fails to pay his Arizona suppliers and the suppliers seek redress of their grievances, the State of Arizona is powerless to help them.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and I believe that this condition must be corrected. As a means of closing this loophole in the law we are introducing a bill to require contractors and subcontractors engaged in the construction of projects under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to conform to the licensing laws of the State in which any such project is located. The requirement set forth in the bill would provide all persons dealing with such contractors with a direct remedy for the abuses that I have discussed.

I do not contend, Mr. President, that this proposed legislation will solve all of the problems in this area. Nevertheless, this is a step in the direction of seeing that financial responsibility is insured on all matters related to projects of the U.S. Government.

Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk and ask permission that it appear at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING 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. 1723) to require contractors and subcontractors engaged in the construction of projects under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to conform to certain licensing laws of the State in which any such project is located, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. Moss), 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 any contract entered into by the Secretary of the Interior after the date of the enactment of this Act with any contractor for the construction of any project under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (including the Act of June 17, 1902, and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto) shall provide that such contractor (including any subcontractor working on such project) shall, as a condition to the performance of such contract, conform to all applicable provisions of law of the State in which such project or part thereof is to be constructed requiring the licensing of contractors within that State whose principal contracting business is in connection with (1) fixed works for irrigation, drainage, water power, water supply, or flood control, or (2) the construction of generating facilities or transmission lines. The requirements of this Act shall apply only to the performance of any such contract and shall not apply to the submission of bids with respect to any such contract or to the entering into of any such contract.

LOWER NIOBRARA RIVER COMPACT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in 1961 the two great sister States of Nebraska and Wyoming concluded a compact pursuant to consent granted by the Congress of the United States as provided in the act of August 5, 1953—Public Law 191, 83d Congress, first session, chapter 324, 67 Statutes 365—and the act of May 29, 1958—Public Law 85-427, 85th Congress, S. 2557, 72 Statutes 147.

This compact undertakes to apportion the waters of Ponca Creek and the tributaries of the Niobrara River common to the two States. It is designated as the "Lower Niobrara River and Ponca Creek Compact."

It has been ratified by the legislatures of both States and has been approved by the Governor of South Dakota and the Governor of Nebraska.

In 1961, I introduced a bill which sought the consent of Congress to this compact. Unfortunately, the departmental reports were not received in time to enable the committee to act on the bill.

Therefore, on behalf of myself and my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] as well as the two Senators from the State of South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. McGOVERN], I introduce a bill for this purpose and ask that it be appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 1726) to consent to the Lower Niobrara River and Ponca Creek Compact between the States of Nebraska and South Dakota, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNIQUES LEADING TO IMPROVED METHODS OF EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH EPILEPSY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to improved methods of education of students with epilepsy in public and private schools and institutions of higher learning.

Epilepsy affects an estimated 1,800,000 citizens, yet it remains one of the least understood of human ailments. Discrimination against those who suffer from it is still common. This is reflected in unnecessary obstacles to their employment and to their educational opportunities and in State legislation which in some cases prohibits or restricts their right to marry. In 13 States the law permits administrators of State institutions to sterilize inmates with epilepsy, although in practice it appears this is not widely imposed on those who suffer only from epilepsy.

More serious in some ways is the general misunderstanding by the public about the nature and effects of epilepsy and, consequently, the stigma placed on the persons afflicted.

Epilepsy is a disorder of the nervous system. In many cases the cause is unknown but in some instances it arises from injury to the brain and from infections such as encephalitis which damage the brain. It is not contagious. It is not usually disabling. It does not cause mental deficiency, and those suffering from epilepsy have about the same range of IQ as the whole population.

Great progress has been made in medical research for the treatment and control of epileptic seizures. It is estimated that 50 percent of all afflicted persons become seizure-free, while another 30 percent have substantial reduction of seizures as a result of modern medical and surgical techniques.

One of the principal needs today is to provide better educational opportunities for children afflicted with epilepsy and to help them develop their talents so they can lead constructive lives. There is a need to overcome false fears and misunderstanding and to approach this problem in the same sympathetic way that we have learned with respect to other afflictions. In some areas children with epilepsy are automatically barred from schools and in other instances they suffer discrimination and do not properly develop academically because of the lack of knowledge of methods and techniques. Training programs to assist school personnel in the use of appropriate methods would enable many children with epilepsy to fit into regular school classes and carry normal schoolwork without any special school facilities.

The bill which I am introducing today authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for projects and demonstrations for training school personnel in techniques for educating students with epilepsy. Persons employed or preparing for employment as teachers, school nurses, school administrators, school psychologists and counselors would be eligible for training projects, as determined by the Secretary. The bill also authorizes the Secretary to provide technical assistance programs in cooperation with appropriate groups in a joint effort to meet this educational problem. Finally, the bill provides for the establishment of the President's Committee on Epilepsy to serve as an advisory group to assist the Secretary in carrying out the terms of the act.

The authorization is for a 3-year program. Private groups, particularly the Epilepsy Foundation, have done excellent work, but this is an example where Federal grants can be used to develop training programs with great beneficial effects. It will do much to improve the educational opportunity of handicapped children. The effort to meet this specific problem will also help the public understand the disorder and to remove the false fears and misunderstanding which for so long have limited the development of those afflicted with epilepsy.

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

The bill (S. 1729) to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to improved methods of education of students with epilepsy in public and private schools and institutions of higher learning, introduced by Mr. McCarthy, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PREVENTION OF USE OF CERTAIN MEASURING DEVICES IN POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prevent the use of arbitrary and inappropriate measuring devices in the postal service.

I do not believe that industrial work measurement systems and the philosophy behind them can properly and effectively be applied to the Federal service. The guidelines system, inaugurated under the previous administration, has had ample time to prove its worth. In actual fact it has proved itself cumbersome, costly, and destructive of good personnel relations and employee morale. I do not believe that there is any place for an arbitrary and unrealistic "speedup" system in the postal service nor do I believe that the expenditure of $11 to $12 million annually in an attempt to enforce such a system is in the public interest.

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

The bill (S. 1730) to prevent the use of arbitrary and inappropriate measuring devices in the postal service, introduced by Mr. McCarthy, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. MILLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1163) to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CHURCH submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1276) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendments when submitted by Mr. Church, which appears under a separate heading.)

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to announce that public witnesses will testify in open session on Friday, June 21, beginning at 10 a.m., on the bill (S. 1276), the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, in room 4221, New Senate Office Building. Those who have not already evidenced their wish to appear may do so by getting in touch with my committee staff.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of W. Michael Blumenthal, of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

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 June 4, 1963:

S. 1651. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to place an embargo on certain fish and fish products: Mr. Hartke, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Smathers.

Authority of June 4, 1963:

S. 1676. A bill to amend section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code to extend for an additional 2 years the period within which the Federal Government may enter into agreements with the States for controlling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising on rights-of-way adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways: Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Keating, Mr. Lausche, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Morse, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

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. DIRKSEN:

Flag Day speech delivered by Senator Morton before the General Federation of Women's Clubs in Milwaukee.

OPPOSITION TO POLICY PERMITTING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO MAKE FIRST ANNOUNCEMENT OF ALL DEFENSE CONTRACTS AWARDED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last week I wrote the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, calling his attention to the danger of the present policy of the Defense Department wherein Members of Congress are allowed to make the first announcement of all defense contracts awarded within their respective States.

For the information of the Senate, I shall read the letter into the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., June 13, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing you in connection with a serious problem which concerns both your Department and Congress; and that is, the policy under which the Defense Department permits Members of Congress to make the first announcement of all defense contracts that are being awarded to companies in their respective States. I appreciate that this policy did not originate with your administration, although it is becoming evident that the policy is now being implemented to a far greater extent than ever before. Unless this political farce is checked, however, I am afraid it will develop into the greatest era of influence peddling we have ever seen.

My concern over this situation is the misunderstanding which is rapidly developing on the part of many contractors and the American people in general that the way to get a Government contract is to see their Members of Congress. Defense contractors in some States are now being openly told that the easiest way to get Government contracts is to elect as their Representatives in Congress men who have the closest ties or relationships with the administration. Allegedly, Government contracts will be obtained for their States on the basis of the influence of the Member of Congress rather than on the contractors' ability to underbid their competitors.

One dangerous aspect of this policy is the tendency of National or State political organizations to capitalize on the influence their candidates will have in Washington as an excuse to collect larger political contributions from these defense contractors. Of course, the inevitable result would be for these contributions to be added to the cost of the next Government contract, and again the taxpayers will pay.

We both fully recognize that when Members of Congress use their political influence to obtain Government contracts for their States or for their favored constituents it is wrong. Likewise, should your Department award a contract to a particular contractor solely on the basis that an influential Member of Congress from his State had interceded, rather than on the basis that the company was the lowest responsible bidder, that too would be highly improper if not actually illegal.

At the present time high ranking officers are being detailed as messenger boys to hand deliver advance notices of these contracts to Members of the congressional delegations. In my opinion, it is an insult to these officers, most of whom earned their ranks on the battlefield in the service of their country, to now delegate them to the status of messenger boys.

A glaring example of just how far this policy is getting out of hand was called to my attention sometime ago. In that particular case, a sizable contract was being awarded in a State where both U.S. Senators and the Congressman of the affected district were all very friendly with the administration, and apparently the Defense Department wanted to be sure not to show partiality. Therefore, three high-ranking officers were dispatched to the Capitol with a notification for each of the three Members. To make sure that there was no partiality shown, the officers even synchronized their watches and by prearranged plan, entered the offices of their designated congressional Member on the exact minute.

All of these precautions and the utilization of the services of these three officers were being taken to allow some Members of Congress to claim credit for something with which they had nothing to do; in fact, in this instance not one of them even knew that the company in question was bidding on the contract. And had it been true that some Member of the delegation had been interceding or using his influence to get this contract for his State it would have been improper.

Actually, under this system the laziest Member of the congressional delegation is the one who will be able to get out the first announcement of the contract to the constituents of his State. This is true because that Member of Congress who neglects his committee work, neglects his duties on the House or Senate floor, and just sits back in his office with his feet propped on his desk will always be on hand to take the message and thereby be able to relay it back home before the working Members of the delegation return to their offices. To make matters even worse the telephone calls to relay these messages back to the State papers and radios are ofttimes charged as official business, which means that the taxpayers are paying for this political farce.

But in addition to creating a false impression as to how contracts are awarded and burdening the taxpayers with unnecessary costs, there is another bad result that can develop from the continuation of this farce in that it would make it possible for the administration in power to use this "advance notice method" as an inducement, bribe, or club to keep a Member of Congress in line and to make him take orders from the White House as to how he should vote on certain legislative requests under the threat that the advance notice could be withheld from his office should he refuse to cooperate.

I am sure that we are both in complete agreement that Government contracts should always be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder and that under no circumstances should they ever be awarded to any State or any congressional district on the basis of political intervention or on the basis of how that State voted in the general election.

This problem is being called to your attention in the hope that you too recognize the serious danger of allowing this policy to continue, and in the hope that you will establish a new policy wherein the Defense Department itself will in the future make direct to the press its own announcements of the awarding of all defense contracts.

In calling this to your attention I again emphasize that I am not placing all the responsibility for the present policy upon you or upon any other administration. Like Topsy, the policy started and has been allowed to grow, and I am very fearful that unless a correction of this policy is made it will ultimately result in the development of a major scandal that could make the old 5-percent mink-coat operations look like a Sunday school picnic.

Any suggestion that is allowed to remain that Government contracts can be obtained through the enlistment of congressional intervention is both wrong and dangerous.

In order that you may get not only my opinion on this problem but the reaction of the other Members of Congress as well, I am writing this as an open letter, and next week I will place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read.

I shall await your reply with interest.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

AMENDMENT OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last Thursday the Senate passed S. 777, a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees. At the time the bill was considered the leadership was unaware that any Senator desired to debate the proposal. Subsequently the interest of two Senators was brought to the attention of the leadership. In order to accommodate those Senators and others who may be interested, I ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate in passing S. 777 and in tabling a motion to reconsider that action be now reconsidered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate in agreeing to the committee amendments to the bill be reconsidered, and that the bill be returned to the Calendar in the status it occupied prior to its passage last Thursday.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to make a unanimous-consent request at this time which may be a little unusual. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 777.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consulting with the Senators most vitally interested in the proposal, I ask unanimous consent that on the basis of two amendments which will be offered, the time be limited to 30 minutes on each amendment, 15 minutes to each side, and that, in addition, one-half hour of debate be allotted on the bill.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator from Montana correctly understand that, on the basis of the unanimous-consent agreement recently agreed to by the Senate, at the conclusion of the 1½ hour debate on the bill, there will be a vote on the bill; or, if the time is yielded back and less time is needed, there will be a vote at that time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct; the vote will occur at the conclusion of the time allocated.

AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME, KANSAS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it is a pleasure today for me to call the attention of Senators to the progress being made in my State of Kansas to construct the Agricultural Hall of Fame. This is to be a national institution.

The idea for this hall of fame was first discussed in 1957, but it was not until 1959 that an active national effort was made to determine a suitable location for the project.

After much spirited competition among many of our agricultural cities, a 275-acre site was chosen near Bonner Springs in the rolling, scenic hills of northeastern Kansas.

This location is within easy driving distance by new superhighway to the Eisenhower Library and Museum at Abilene, Kans., and is only a few minutes from the Truman Library at Independence, Mo. Also within an easily traveled radius of the hall of fame site are the two Kansas universities at Lawrence and Manhattan. In addition, the hall of fame will be near the proposed Prairie National Park, adjacent to the recently dedicated $80 million Tuttle Creek Reservoir. It is easy to visualize many thousands of visitors annually to this area when the hall of fame is completed.

I am most happy today to be able to report that actual construction will begin on the Agricultural Hall of Fame within the next 2 months.

I congratulate those farsighted men who have devoted their time and money to this idea during the past 5 years. It is a tribute to their desire to guarantee this Nation a centrally located Museum of Agricultural History.

The future of this project has the devoted and active support of all surrounding communities, which is evidenced by the acquisition of an adjacent 350 acres by Wyandotte County for establishment of an attractive park for visitors. The State of Kansas will add another 70 acres to the area, insuring easy and convenient access to the hall of fame grounds from the Kansas Turnpike.

Mr. President, I would note again at this time that the Agricultural Hall of Fame is a national project and will by no means be a local shrine. I mention this point specifically because the composition of the hall of fame's board of directors comprises 36 men from varied business fields and locales across the Nation.

Further, this initial construction is being undertaken with donated funds and all future additions will be built with private financing.

The first building to be erected will include a museum, library, meeting room, and offices. Eventually, the site will have a model farm community, and an Indian village. For the city youngsters, a full-scale children's farm complete with farm animals on display. As the project grows, display halls for agricultural products from each State are planned, as well as exhibit areas to show the relationship between agriculture and industry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional minute.

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

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, as this program moves forward to completion, it will offer a resting place for historical documents and equipment related to the development of our great agricultural system in this country. Many irreplaceable relics will be on display for visitors to the hall of fame, and these exhibits will contribute a public preservatory for those books, documents, and machines relating to American agriculture.

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

Mr. PEARSON. I yield to the senior Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas for bringing to the attention of Senators the commencement of construction on this important project, the Agricultural Hall of Fame. Once this program gets underway and construction begins, not only will it result in greater interest in agriculture, but also it will be a great addition to preserving many memories of agriculture, which has been so important in the Nation's history.

ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC GROWTH DOES NOT SUPPORT TAX CUT AS WISE POLICY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a careful analysis of economic growth in recent years by Mr. George Shea in this morning's Wall Street Journal calls into serious question the administration's proposal to increase long-term economic growth with a tax cut, including a deliberate deficit.

Mr. Shea analyzes precisely what has happened, and why, in economic growth in this country since 1947. This analysis, in my judgment, devastatingly repudiates the administration's case for a tax cut.

Mr. Shea's careful and balanced discussion makes this interesting conclusion:

> All of this raises a very critical question about the administration's claim that a one-shot tax cut within 2 years would so stimulate business that the growth thereafter would be on a lastingly higher rate. And it raises the further question whether growth rates are wholly or even largely matters of Federal fiscal policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE OUTLOOK: APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

The current debate over Federal economic policies, including whether to cut taxes, centers around two claims. One is that economic growth has slowed down sharply since 1957; the other that Federal measures can give the growth rate a lasting acceleration. Both claims are questionable.

Walter W. Heller, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, in a speech late last week referred, as he has many times before, to changes in growth rates. He said that from 1947 to 1956 the rate averaged 4 percent a year, whereas since then it has fallen to 3 percent. His figures, of course, are correct, but they need to be read in the light of fluctuations in growth rates within those periods.

This has become especially easy through a study by the National Industrial Conference Board, a nonprofit group. The study presents the growth rates of U.S. gross production, adjusted for price changes, from any quarter-year in the whole period 1947–62 to any other quarter in those years. For instance, it shows a growth from the second to the third quarters of 1950, when the Korean war started, at the huge annual rate of 18.6 percent. And it shows a decline in gross national product between the third and fourth quarters of 1953, in the 1953–54 business recession, at the disheartening rate of 7 percent.

More important, the study makes possible the examination of growth rates in such a way as to eliminate almost completely distortions from recessions and recoveries. The ideal way to do this is to look at growth between tops of booms—or, alternatively, between the bottoms of recessions.

When the figures are looked at in this manner, they show in the first place that there was rapid growth in the late 1940's and early 1950's because Korean wartime spending was superimposed on a strong business expansion. In the second place they show that the growth slowed down sharply from 1953 to 1957 because a decline in defense spending partially offset another strong business expansion. And in the third place they show that since 1957 the growth rate has improved again.

This pattern is wholly different from the one arrived at by comparing only 1947–56 and the years since then. The first of those two segments is a period in which the growth figure is pushed up by starting with 1947, a year before the 1948 end of the first postwar boom, as well as by Korean wartime spending.

In contrast, the true fluctuations in growth rates are revealed by examining what's happened in each of the last four down-and-up business cycles. In the first of these, from the top quarter of 1948 to the top quarter of 1953, the growth rate was 5.2 percent annually. In the next, to the top quarter of 1957, the rate fell to 2.3 percent. But from then to the 1960 top it improved again to 2.7 percent. And from 1960 to the end of 1962 (which as shown in the chart (chart not printed in RECORD) was not yet the top of the latest recovery) the rate improved further to 3.1 percent.

The influence on these growth rates of Government defense spending was critical. Such spending rose enormously in the first of the foregoing four cycles, from $12 billion in fiscal 1948 to $50 billion in fiscal 1953. In the second cycle defense spending fell back, to as low as $40 billion in 1956, with a recovery to $43 billion in 1957. Since then it has risen gradually to $53 billion this year.

These facts suggest that, while it is true a sharp increase in Federal spending can bring a higher rate of economic growth, the influence of the spending tends to diminish unless the spending itself continues to expand. Such spending in the latest 1960–62 cycle has been somewhat higher than the highest defense spending rate reached in 1948–53, and total Government spending has also been higher, but the growth rate of the economy has been considerably lower.

All of this raises a very critical question about the administration's claim that a one-shot tax cut within 2 years would so stimulate business that the growth thereafter would be on a lastingly higher rate. And it raises the further question whether growth rates are wholly or even largely matters of Federal fiscal policy.

Greatly varying governmental policies mark nations such as Japan, Germany, France, and Russia, which in recent years have grown much faster than we have. But they have had one advantage in common. That has been the opportunity to copy what we have done, because their economic systems have been less advanced than ours. They started much lower and they are still considerably lower.

The reason that has been such an advantage for them is that growth is not merely a matter of steel and other metals, nor even of autos, toasters, and other products that are already known. Today's growth would be impossible if we had only the scientific and productive knowledge of the horse-and-buggy days. Growth is a matter of new ideas.

Nor are the ideas needed only in the realm of production and manufacturing. The supermarket and the shopping center have also been ideas that have contributed to U.S. growth, and which are only now beginning to be copied abroad.

A nation which can copy ideas from elsewhere can surely grow faster than the nation which is at the head of the parade and thus must generate most of the new ideas for its own growth. And there is also another factor, which is that in periods of rapid growth such a nation uses up in part its stock of ideas accumulated during a previous fallow period, such as the depression 1930's and the World War I years.

None of the foregoing is intended as an argument that a tax cut would not be beneficial. Such a cut doubtless would make usable some new ideas barred by present tax rates. What is questionable is the double claim that the United States has been stagnating, and that acceptance of the Government's proposals would automatically push the growth rate up to a much ligher level on a lasting basis.

GEORGE SHEA.

UNFAIR COMPETITION FROM OIL TAX GIVEAWAY FOR OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the best and most neglected arguments in favor of the administration's plea for modifying, moderately, the oil depletion giveaway was revealed in the Wall Street Journal this morning. The Wall Street Journal, in a front-page article, pointed out how some oil firms are entering the real estate field, and how the tax credit boosts profits.

The article states, in part:

Oil companies can deduct from taxable profits up to 27.5 percent of gross income from producing wells, to cover depletion of oil reserves. They also can subtract capital spent on drilling for new wells. If these credits exceed total profit from oil operations they can be charged against income from other activities—such as land developments.

The article also says, about Sunset International, a real estate-oil firm:

Mainly because of land development revenues sheltered by oil tax credits, Sunset's profits rose to $3.2 million last year from $500,000 in 1959. Last year Sunset garnered 72 percent of its $16 million in operating revenues from sales of houses and homesites. But while it's now emphasizing land development, Sunset will remain active in the oil business, says its president, Morton A. Sterling, because of the tax advantages.

The Wall Street Journal points out that this is not an exceptional practice. It is very common among oil companies.

What does this kind of competition do to normal real estate operations which cannot rely on the oil tax bonanza? How can an ordinary business compete under such circumstances?

In the debate which I anticipate will occur in the Senate on the administration oil depletion reform proposal—which I shall, of course, support—this unfair impact on other businessmen should be considered.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal may be printed in the RECORD.

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

SOME OIL FIRMS ENTER REAL ESTATE FIELD—TAX CREDITS BOOST PROFITS—HUMBLE TEAMS WITH DEL WEBB TO DEVELOP SPACE-AGE CITY—TREES CAMOUFLAGE OLD WELLS

(By Lawrence Lynch)

LOS ANGELES.—For years oil companies have been searching for wealth under the surface of the earth. Now some of them are taking advantage of their special tax status to bid for profits above ground, in real estate development.

Sunset International Petroleum Corp. is developing planned communities at Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Diego, and Sacramento. Christiana Oil Corp., Los Angeles, is investing millions in ocean-front homesites in southern California. And Humble Oil & Refining Co. is helping finance a new city near the U.S. Manned Space Craft Center at Houston, Tex.

Like many other real estate developments, such ventures by oil companies have been prompted by rapid population growth in some areas. But unlike most other land developers, oil companies often can shelter profits from their real estate operations with tax credits that might otherwise be lost.

Oil companies can deduct from taxable profits up to 27.5 percent of gross income from producing wells, to cover depletion of oil reserves. They also can subtract capital spent on drilling for new wells. If these credits exceed total profit from oil operations they can be charged against income from other activities—such as land developments. Although President Kennedy has recommended tightening depletion allowance provisions, oilmen believe that any changes will be minor, and probably won't come during this congressional session.

COMMUNITY CORE

Oil companies turned developers usually begin in building a community core—a number of homes and commercial structures. Then, while they continue construction themselves, they also try to sell much of the surrounding land to other builders at a profit.

Thus Sunset International sold 391 homes and 360 homesites in its 1960 fiscal year, its first year of development activities. In 1962 Sunset sold only 245 houses but the number of homesite sales jumped to 605.

Mainly because of land development revenues sheltered by oil tax credits, Sunset's profits rose to $3.2 million last year from $500,000 in 1959. Last year Sunset garnered 72 percent of its $16 million in operating revenues from sales of houses and homesites. But while it's now emphasizing land development, Sunset will remain active in the oil business, says its president, Morton A. Sterling, because of the tax advantages.

Christiana Oil has formed Huntington Harbour Corp. to develop its ocean-front land in southern California. Christiana owns 80 percent of Huntington; outside investors own the rest. L. W. Douglas, Jr., president of Christiana, says development costs and other expenses will total about $35 million. He predicts that over the next 6 years the 877-acre development will yield gross revenues of $102 million. About 140 homes ranging in price from $50,000 to $100,000 will be completed by July, he says.

Sunset and Christiana both acquired the land for surface development since 1960. Some other oil companies are breaking ground for homes on land that was purchased long ago, when oil companies could buy clear title to vast acreages at relatively low prices.

TEAMING UP

Humble Oil, a subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), is building its community near Houston on 30,875 acres it purchased in 1938 to get at oil discovered there. Last year the Government decided to build the Space Craft Center on a 1,700-acre tract of Humble property. Humble then brought in a construction firm, Del E. Webb Corp., to help fashion what it envisages as a city of 180,000 persons.

Humble, which retains a majority interest in the venture, and Webb have invested $9 million in the first section of their Texas community, due to open in August. It includes 12 model homes, 44 apartments, a shopping center, a community center, golf course, motor hotel and industrial building. Next year they expect to begin pumping $25 million a year into the development.

The involvement of oil companies in real estate development often means now homes are going up near eyesores presented by old oil wells. In such cases, surface pumps generally can be concealed behind foilage.

Huntington Beach Co. in Los Angeles, 64 percent owned by Standard Oil Co. of California, holds title to 1,500 acres south of Los Angeles encompassing 850 producing wells and 2.5 miles of beach. The company is negotiating with a developer and hopes to begin homebuilding next year. Oil wells near residences would be landscaped out of sight says William E. Foster, engineering supervisor for Huntington Beach.

SENIOR CITIZENS?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in recent days there has been a conference in Washington of so-called senior citizens.

Who is a senior citizen? A report issued by the President's Council on Aging is a refreshing exception to the tendency to refer to older people as a special group, as senior citizens.

In 1870, nearly 100 years ago, Otto Von Bismarck proposed a social security law in Germany and at that time fixed the age for retirement at 65 years. Nearly 100 years have elapsed since that time. The life span has been greatly extended by the advance of science. Life expectancy has become much greater now than it was even 20 years ago. Insurance companies, which are still basing their rates on old longevity tables, have prospered unduly because of that fact.

Yet some industries in this country still are so unrealistic as to fix the age of arbitrary retirement at 65, whereas all of us know some men of 55 are older in appearance and in action than are other men who are 65 years of age.

Frankly, it seems to me that the name "senior citizens" should be discarded. It

should certainly be discarded as applying to those between the ages of 65 and 75.

There are 18 million elderly men and women in this country. Each is an individual. Their circumstances, abilities, and wealth vary widely. Included in this number—these so-called senior citizens, an appellation which the junior Senator from Ohio very definitely does not like—are three ex-Presidents, nearly 10 percent of the population of the United States, nearly 1½ million men and women living on farms, more than 1 out of 4 U.S. Senators, almost 2 million people working full time, and 2 of 9 U.S. Supreme Court Justices.

Also, there are more than 10,000 people in the United States who are more than 100 years of age. There are over 12½ million people receiving social security benefits—men and women who paid premiums into the social security insurance fund and now are receiving retirement benefits based upon what they had paid in. There are more than 2,300,000 war veterans over 65 years of age. There are more than 3 million people, men and women, who migrated from the old countries to this country who are over 65 years of age.

Therefore, it seems to me, if we are going to term these various individuals in any one class or category, it is high time to discard the appellation "senior citizens."

REGULATION OF SMOKING PRODUCTS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, earlier this month I introduced a bill to put smoking products under the authority of the Federal Food and Drug Administration. My bill (S. 1682) which is cosponsored by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] would give to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the same authority to promulgate rules and regulations in labeling smoking products as he now exercises regarding food, drugs, and cosmetics.

Since my bill was introduced, the American Heart Association has announced that, on the basis of a study made since 1960 on the effect of cigarette smoking on heart disease, the association has adopted a stand to discourage smoking, particularly among teenagers.

In a study completed before 1960, the association called attention to the statistical relationship between smoking and illness or death from coronary heart disease, but it was not until the new evidence came to light that the association determined to try to dissuade young people from acquiring the smoking habit.

I ask unanimous consent that two news accounts of the association's stand and findings be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 9, 1963]

CIGARETTE LINK TO HEART DISEASE IS REPORTED IN SCIENTIFIC STUDY

NEW YORK, June 8.—The American Heart Association said today a scientific study conducted since 1960 strongly suggests there is a relationship between cigarette smoking and heart disease.

The association for the first time adopted a stand to discourage smoking, particularly among teenagers and adults with a high risk of coronary disease, as harmful to health.

The organization's board of directors adopted the report on smoking and cardiovascular diseases prepared by a committee of physicians and scientists.

The association's latest report reviews scientific evidence collected since 1960, when a previous study called attention to the statistical relationship between smoking and death or illness from coronary heart disease.

"This statistical association does not prove that heavy cigarette smoking causes coronary heart disease," the report said, "but the data strongly suggest that heavy cigarette smoking may contribute to or accelerate the development of coronary heart disease or its complications."

The latest survey said that "no information has become available which contradicts or invalidates the 1960 report * * * (the) committee * * * expresses the feeling that interval developments since the 1960 report not only confirm but supplement the 1960 report."

It was recommended that the assoication join with other agencies "in educational programs for teenagers relative to cigarette smoking."

The committee said that strong encouragement to stop smoking be given "people who have a high risk of death and illness from coronary artery disease."

It said a high risk case was one with a family history of heart disease or stroke in middle age "and/or high blood pressure, high levels of fatty substances in the blood and other factors associated with greater proneness to atherosclerosis (hardening of the arteries)."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, June 9, 1963]

HEART SOCIETY MAPS DRIVE ON CIGARETTES

(By Alfred E. Clark)

The American Heart Association is starting a drive to discourage cigarette smoking, with emphasis on teenagers.

The association's 120-member board of directors adopted a resolution yesterday calling for "joint educational efforts with other voluntary and official health groups." The association's action was taken at its semiannual meeting at the Summit Hotel.

The move marks the first time the association, a volunteer public health agency, has decided to wage a public campaign on smoking.

A spokesman said that the first phase of the campaign would be devoted to educational work.

The Tobacco Industry Research Committee could not be reached for comment yesterday on the heart group's action.

In 1960, the association issued a report indicating that evidence was strong that heavy cigarette smoking contributed to or accelerated the development of coronary heart disease, the leading cause of death in the United States.

The report adopted by the board yesterday reviews the scientific evidence that has become available since 1960.

STATISTICS ARE CITED

"No evidence has become available since 1960 to contradict or invalidate the 1960 statement," the board said. "Moreover, the additional evidence now at hand not only confirms but supplements the earlier findings.

"The harmful effect of cigarette smoking is in the statistical relationship between smoking and mortality from coronary artery disease. A number of ancillary features also are recognized, including emphysema, lung changes that makes breathing difficult, diseases of the blood vessels in the arms and legs and of course lung cancer."

The committee recommended that "strong encouragement to stop smoking, under physician supervision be given people who have a high risk of death and illness from coronary artery disease and myocardial infarction."

Included in the latter category were persons with high blood pressure, high blood cholesterol, oversigns of hardening of the arteries, a family history of heart attacks and strokes in middle age, or a combination of any of these.

An ad hoc committee of four physicians and a layman compiled the report on which the board issued its recommendations.

The board urged that expanded biological and medical research be conducted in the following areas:

More and larger longitudinal epidemiologic studies of cigarette smoking in relation to coronary artery and other cardiovascular diseases;

Possible correlations of smoking in various population groups with diet, physical activity, heredity, emotions, blood clotting, blood fats, and other factors that may be or are known to be causally related to such manifestations of atherosclerosis as myocardial infarction and strokes.

Effects of duration and intensity of smoking on the risk of developing coronary artery disease;

Relationship of preclinical atherosclerotic lesions to smoking habits in individuals under 45 years of age;

Effects of tobacco and the constituents of tobacco smoke on the heart and blood vessels of animals and humans and on such disease processes as experimental atherosclerosis.

Studies of patients to determine the influence of smoking on known coronary artery disease and on intravascular clotting, thrombosis, including the effect of cessation of smoking on longevity and health in patients with established coronary artery disease.

Studies of the differences between the effects of cigarette and pipe or cigar smoking. The latter two presumably do not have a statistically significant association with cardiovascular diseases.

John Brundage of Montclair, N.J., an insurance executive, is chairman of the board of directors. The committee report was prepared by Dr. A. Carlton Ernstene of Cleveland; Dr. Frank W. Davis of Baltimore; Dr. Joseph T. Doyle of Albany and Dr. Henry C. McGill of New Orleans. The lay member was Felix E. Moore, Jr., of Ann Arbor, Mich.

U.S.S. "UTAH"

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I continue my campaign to have the American flag raised over the U.S.S. *Utah* and the brave men entombed in her at Pearl Harbor by asking unanimous consent to have the most recent article on this matter published by the Navy Times included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have asked the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL] to schedule hearings on my bill as soon as the committee schedule, and his own schedule, permit.

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

ON MEMORIAL DAY: A CEMETERY WITHOUT A FLAG

Fifty-four Navy men went unhonored this week as the Nation paused to pay homage to its war dead.

They've been unhonored and all but forgotten, except in the memories of their families and friends, for 21 years.

The flag they died for does not fly over their grave.

They're the crewmen entombed within the blackened hulk of the U.S.S. *Utah*, as she lies today exposed in shallow water north of Ford Island where she was sunk by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor Day.

She lies less than a mile from the U.S.S. *Arizona's* splendid memorial, but too far away to be definitely associated with *Arizona's* glory. The small plate which adorns the *Utah's* hull does not even list the names of the 54 officers and men who lie entombed within the ship. Nor are they listed within the *Arizona* Memorial.

One of the men—CWT. Peter Tomich—was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor for heroism during the Japanese attack.

This may be the last year that the *Utah's* men go unhonored.

Last December, Navy Times and Parade magazine sparked a campaign to have a simple flagpole erected over the *Utah's* hulk to honor the men within her. Senator FRANK MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, is spearheading the drive and has introduced S. 703 to provide for flying the colors over the half-sunken ship. Thirty-seven other Senators have added their names as cosponsors. The bill now awaits hearings by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Here, in response to requests received since Navy Times started publicizing the neglected *Utah* men, are the names of those entombed within her hulk, as furnished by the Navy:

Lt. Comdr. Rudolph P. Bielka, Lt. (jg.) John E. Black, Lt. (jg.) Herold A. Harveson, Lt. (jg.) John G. Little III, Lt. Comdr. Charles O. Michael, S2c. William D. Arbuckle, F3c. Joseph Barta, S1c. Virgil C. Bicham, F1c. John T. Blackburn, F3c. William F. Brunner, OC2 Feliciano T. Bugarin, S2c. George Chestnutt, Jr., S2c. Lloyd D. Clippard.

F1c. Joseph U. Connor, F1c. John R. Crain, S1c. Billy R. Davis, S2c. Leroy Dennis, S2c. William H. Dosser, S1c. Vernon J. Eidsvig, QM1c. Melvyn A. Gandre, BM2c. Kenneth M. Gift, S2c. Charles N. Gregoire, S2c. Clifford D. Hill, Bkr1c. Emery L. Houde, S1c. Leroy H. Jones, SC2c. William A. Juedas.

Y3c. John L. Kaelin, GM3c. Eric T. Kampmeyer, F1c. Joseph N. Karabon, S1c. William H. Kent, GM3c. George W. La Rue, S2c. Kenneth L. Lynch, S2c. William E. Marshall, Jr., EM3c. Rudolph M. Martinez, S2c. Marvin E. Miller, S2c. Donald C. Norman, F2c. Orris N. Norman, EM2c. Edwin N. Odgaard, CSK(PA) Elmer A. Parkey.

SC3c. Forrest H. Perry, S1c. James W. Phillips, MM1c. Walter H. Ponder, SF3c. Frank E. Reed, S1c. Ralph E. Scott, F1c. Henson T. Shouse, S2c. Robert D. Smith, S2c. Joseph B. Sousley, F3c. Gerald V. Strinz, CWT. Peter Tomich, F3c. Elmer H. Ulrich, F3c. Michael W. Villa, FC1c. Vernard O. Wetrick, F1c. Glenn Albert White.

WILLIAM C. NUNLEY NAMED "DRIVER OF THE YEAR"

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Mr. William C. Nunley, a Kansan from Baxter Springs, has just been awarded the coveted title of "Driver of the Year" for 1963 by the American Trucking Associations.

Mr. Nunley's outstanding professional career as a truck driver spans 30 years and 2,225,000 miles without an accident. He received this award from the American Trucking Associations as a representative of the trucking industry's model of safety and courtesy—and occasional heroism.

During this period of an unblemished driving record, the affable, energetic Nunley was cited by company officials for assisting "hundreds of motorists" in trouble and for "acting heroically on occasions."

For instance, in March of last year, authorities credited Nunley with saving an ambulance driver from death or severe injury at the hands of a berserk mental patient. The man, who had been sedated and secured for a hospital transfer, slipped his bonds near Wagoner, Okla., and struck the driver on the head with a metal cane, causing the ambulance to go into a ditch. The driver was able to hail the passing Nunley who helped him subdue his attacker.

In another instance, when a crippling ice storm had highway traffic tied up all over the State, Nunley encountered an Army officer whose car had broken down near Adair, Okla., while he was taking his seriously ill wife to a hospital. Realizing the hazards an ambulance would face on the icy roads and the importance of time, Nunley assumed the risk himself and towed the couple in their vehicle to Pryor, Okla., where the woman was able to receive medical attention.

To exemplify the care that Nunley, a nonsmoking teetotaler, takes in his everyday operations, company spokesmen stated he has safely hauled an estimated 328 million pounds of valuable freight without incurring as much as a scratched fender in his 26 years with Yellow Transit. During that entire period, and the 4 previous years with two other Oklahoma-based companies, Nunley has never been charged with a moving traffic violation, nor arrested for a traffic offense.

A tall man with a ready smile, Nunley and his wife are members of the First Christian Church of Baxter Springs. Hunting and fishing are his hobbies, but Nunley also finds time to work with youth organizations as a baseball and basketball coach, as well as making radio and television appearances for safety causes in the Missouri-Kansas-Oklahoma region.

It is my pleasure to call this outstanding record to the attention of the Senate, as I feel that Mr. Nunley deserves the commendation of all of us.

AMISH BLACKSMITH IMPRISONED FOR RELIGIOUS CONVICTIONS AGAINST BEARING ARMS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, my attention was called today, by a letter from a prominent clubwoman of Ashland County, Ohio, Mrs. Robert L. Davis, whom I know personally and respect highly, to a very sad situation in her county. She writes:

A young Amish blacksmith has been sentenced to serve 2 years, probably on a prison farm, not because he has committed a crime, but because his religious convictions prohibit him from bearing arms against his fellow men.

He went to Cleveland under the impression that it was only for a hearing of his case. And in this busy farm season it must have been a hardship for him to close his shop for even 1 day. It is my understanding that an FBI investigator from Mansfield had visited the shop and stated that, in his opinion, this man should never be drafted into the peacetime Army. But Johnny Keim of R.F.D. No. 5, Ashland, is now behind bars.

For the next 2 years, he will be prevented from using his talent and strength as an independent member of society. Instead, he will be supported by the State; a crushing indignity for a member of the Amish sect.

Mr. President, I know that is a fact. The Amish people in Ohio and our neighboring State of Pennsylvania are fine, law-abiding, God-fearing people, who work hard and never knowingly disobey the law.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and I have introduced a legislative proposal to exempt those of the Amish faith from the operation of our social security insurance system, because Amish families have always taken care of their aged and incapacitated. They are hard-working people, men, women, and children, and they never ask for charity or help from their Government, nor for any special privileges. They have asked for no Government support and have strong religious scruples against receiving any insurance benefits, including social security benefits. Although I am a fervent advocate of our social security system, I do not believe that the U.S. Government should remain in the position of having to enforce social security laws against Amish citizens in violation of their religion.

Mrs. Davis writes:

These people ask nothing more than to be allowed to live according to their faith. They set an example that few of us would have the courage to follow. Surely it is time for legislation to make it legally possible for them to pursue their own way of life.

The Keims have not asked for assistance. It is being sought because those of us who know them value their friendship and respect them.

Then she adds—and I wholeheartedly agree with her:

Americans have no right, in my opinion, to speak smugly of religious freedom and still tolerate this injustice.

Mr. President, I shall do thorough research on this subject, and will strongly urge that justice be rendered in this case.

VALENTINA VLADIMIROVNA TERESHKOVA, FIRST RUSSIAN WOMAN ASTRONAUT IN ORBIT

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, Valentina Vladimirovna Tereshkova has made this a great day for women as well as her nation. Her achievement is a very significant indication of the place that women are being given in Russia. It is a further indication of the physical capabilities of Russian women.

Russian women have long been bringing honor and credit to their country. They won the Olympics for Russia with their excellence in gymnastics.

Back on January 19 of this year, I made a speech in which I spoke of the Russians putting a woman astronaut in space orbit in the near future. Shortly thereafter, an unidentified Air Force spokesman in the Pentagon made a statement to the press disputing and discrediting my statement. I wonder how he feels now and I wonder what the press

thinks of his authoritativeness in current intelligence and accuracy.

Today's Washington Post has an excellent editorial on the first woman astronaut. I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

VALENTINA

We salute Miss Valentina Vladimirovna Tereshkova in becoming the first woman to enter space. Regardless of what further feats she accomplishes with the Soviet cosmonaut she joined in orbit, she has brought great honor upon herself and her country and particularly upon her sex. Indeed, her achievement is so warmly numbing that it almost displaces concern for her well-being and safe return. May she land on earth with the same ease and aplomb as that with which she left it.

To be frank, pride of sex wars with incontrovertible fact in assessing the immediate impact of Miss Tereshkova's flight. If she has done irremediable damage to the male ego everywhere, she has also demonstrated the often underexploited talents of the female sex. If she has made space flight look easy ("even a woman * * *"), she has also made space technology—especially Soviet space technology—look excellent.

After all, unlike other space travelers, Miss Tereshkova is not an experienced pilot honed to a sharp edge by extending space training. She is, by Moscow's word, a nice single girl who fairly recently shifted from a cotton factory and a hobby of parachuting into the complexities and challenges of space. She is also a woman of impeccably proletarian origins and Communist upbringing. And she is said to be pretty, too.

The mission which she and Colonel Bykovsky are now conducting offers further evidence, of course, of the relative lag at the moment in the American manned-flight program. But such gray thoughts are for another day. Today belongs to Valentina. It is hers and, anxious for her comfort and safety, we cheer her on.

WASTE AND DUPLICATION IN DEFENSE PROCUREMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial from the June 3, 1963, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. This editorial pinpoints the herculean task being performed by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, to remove the costly waste and duplication in defense procurement.

Whenever an attack on waste in Government spending is announced, the public lends its moral support and hopes the attack will be successful. But when the person in charge begins making specific cuts, he runs into determined opposition from the people being affected by the cut.

This process discourages many such campaigns, and they falter and fall by the roadside. But Secretary McNamara has not faltered from his goal of saving $3.5 billion in defense procurement annually, despite what many writers have described as overwhelming opposition from the defense industry and legislators who serve the industry's interests.

Mr. President, I have the greatest of faith in Secretary McNamara, and I believe his goal will be reached. But I will not let him fight this battle alone. The recent hearing by the Joint Economic Committee entitled "Impact of Military Supply and Service Activities on the Economy" confirms the success of Secretary McNamara's program, which already has resulted in a saving of more than $1 billion in the fiscal 1964 budget.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 3, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

POWER STRUGGLE OVER DEFENSE: II—CIVILIAN CONTROL, PROFITS OF MILITARY CONTRACTORS AT ISSUE IN MCNAMARA FIGHT

(By Richard Harwood)

WASHINGTON.—Defense Secretary McNamara's felicitous relations with Congress and the military lobbies have been badly damaged in the past 12 months.

The source of the disenchantment is a series of decisions that has eliminated billions of dollars in defense contracts throughout the country and has forced the military services to bow to the practice as well as the principle of civilian supremacy in the Pentagon.

These decisions have affected the profit-and-loss ledgers of big military contractors. They have affected the economies of areas represented by powerful politicians in and out of Congress. They have curtailed the power of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to embark on billion-dollar weapons projects that have proven in the past to be impractical or duplicative.

As the knowledge has sunk in that McNamara intends to stand by these decisions, despite intense political pressures, he has become the target of a concerted counterattack.

One clash was with Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, the powerful chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

VINSON has been described by the Army, Navy, and Air Force Journal as the "acknowledged backstage boss of the Pentagon. Top military leaders have always courted his favor with unabashed ardor."

VINSON for several years has been insisting that the Defense Department proceed with the development and production of the RS-70 airplane. It would be a supersonic platform for launching air-to-ground missiles, and would cost, ultimately, several billion dollars.

McNamara doubted the practicality of this weapon. It would do nothing, he said, that a Minuteman or Polaris missile can't do better and cheaper. Therefore, he decided last year to proceed very slowly with the RS-70 project.

VINSON, however, was adamant. His committee voted $320 million more for the project than McNamara requested and this year, again at VINSON's insistence, Congress has approved $363,700,000 more for the RS-70 than McNamara wants.

This incident did more than ruffle VINSON's feelings. It profoundly disturbed the Air Force and the aircraft industry. They charged that McNamara was intent on abandoning manned aircraft. The Air Force Association equated the decision to "unilateral disarmament." Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, a reserve Air Force general, said the decision was insupportable.

The prime contractor for the RS-70 is North American Aviation, a California-based firm. But substantial subcontracts for the plane were earmarked for more than 30 States.

Under Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric stated in an interview recently that, in his opinion, the selection of the subcontractors for the RS-70 was "skillfully contrived to enlist maximum congressional support. It could have just happened that way, but I have enough of a jaundiced eye to think it was planned that way."

Last year the Defense Department phased out the production of fighter planes at the Republic Aircraft plant on Long Island, N.Y. More than 13,000 jobs were to be eliminated.

One of the most concerted political efforts of its kind ever seen in Washington was begun to prevent this job loss. The White House was bombarded with thousands of petitions from Long Island. The entire New York congressional delegation, plus Governor Nelson Rockefeller, put extreme pressure on both the White House and the Defense Department.

Finally, New York Representative EMANUEL CELLER was able to announce: "The extraordinary congressional, State and local effort to prevent a 13,000-plus employment cutback at Republic has resulted in an overall $80 million subcontracting program to Republic in the F-4-H (fighter plane) production."

Today, aircraft employment on Long Island is greater than ever.

The newest struggle for a defense contract far overshadows the Republic affair. Involved is a contract for between $6 and $7 billion for the development and production of 1,700 supersonic fighter planes for the Navy and Air Force.

The plane is called the TFX (tactical fighter experimental).

The Defense Department after 2 years of study and over the objections of both the Navy and Air Force, awarded the prime contract to General Dynamics Corp. instead of its competitor, Boeing Aircraft.

This decision brought down upon Secretary McNamara the concerted wrath of the military, the aircraft industry and powerful Members of Congress. The Air Force and Navy were outraged—especially the Navy—because McNamara insisted that the TFX be designed for use of both services. Each wanted a separate plane, tailored to its own specifications.

McNamara and Gilpatric regard the TFX case as the supreme test thus far of civilian authority in the Pentagon and of the power of the military-industrial complex.

Close working relationships between particular services and particular companies were explored 3 years ago by the Hébert investigating committee in the House.

The committee discovered that high-ranking Pentagon officers were flocking into the offices of defense contractors immediately after retirement. General Dynamics Corp., the successful TFX bidder, had 27 generals and admirals and 186 officers of lesser rank on its payroll at the time of the inquiry.

Lockheed Aircraft had also hired 27 generals and admirals and 171 field-grade officers. Fifteen general officers had been employed by Radio Corp. of America, 14 by International Telephone & Telegraph, 11 by General Tire & Rubber.

The committee concluded, "the coincidence of contracts and personal contacts with firms represented by retired military officers and retired civilian officials sometimes raises serious doubts as to the complete objectivity of some of these decisions."

The Hébert committee found instances of expensive entertainment of active-duty officers by major contractors, including a trip to the Bahamas for 26 officers who were guests of the Martin Co., an aircraft producer.

Senator CASE, of New Jersey, has introduced legislation to require that public records be kept of every communication between Congressmen and the Defense Department in regard to contracts. CASE also favors a permanent Senate watchdog committee to oversee defense-contract awards.

So long as the defense program involves big money and vitally affects the economy of every State and virtually every congressional district, it will, in McNamara's words, in-

evitably generate political pressures on Defense officials.

If the TFX investigation or some other development should cast a political shadow on the decisionmakers their public support would quickly evaporate.

That is the great problem facing Secretary McNamara today. And he is being tested in a congressional climate already infected with cynicism toward politics and defense.

PRESIDENT'S EQUAL RIGHTS SPEECH OF JUNE 1, 1963

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the President's speech appealed eloquently to the emotions but completely disregarded reason, human experience, and true equality under the Constitution.

The fact that every citizen has the same right to own and operate a swimming pool or dining hall constitutes equality. The use of Federal power to force the owner of a dining hall or swimming pool to unwillingly accept those of a different race as guests creates a new and special right for Negroes in derogation of the property rights of all of our people to own and control the fruits of their labor and ingenuity.

The outstanding distinction between a government of free men and a socialistic or communistic state is the fact that free men can own and control property, whereas statism denies property rights.

The phrase "from each according to his ability and to each according to his need" may have greater emotional appeal than "work hard to acquire property and the law will protect you in its enjoyment." However, Marxism has not worked and can never work because it does not take human nature into account. To rebut the emotional appeal, we have the hard, undeniable fact that in our free enterprise system we have plenty, whereas the Marxists—though they have never been able to apply literally their avowed creed—all suffer from scarcity and privation.

Our American system has always rejected the idea that one group of citizens may deprive another of legal rights in property by process of agitation, demonstration, intimidation, law defiance, and civil disobedience.

I do not believe that the American people will be easily frightened into discarding our system for adventures into socialism that have been discredited wherever tried.

The highest office of the land should symbolize respect for law, whether it be legally enacted ordinances of the meanest hamlet in the land or the written word of our national charter—the Constitution.

I was, therefore, shocked to hear the President justify, if not encourage, the present wave of mass demonstrations accompanied by the practices of sitting or lying in public streets and blocking traffic; forming human walls before the doors of legal businesses and assaulting with deadly weapons officers of the law whose only offense was undertaking to maintain order and protect private property.

The South has its shortcomings as well as other areas. But a calculated campaign waged by the metropolitan press, television and radio, has magnified the unfortunate occurrences in the South while crimes of violence in other areas have been minimized. This has generated bitterness and hatred against the white people of the Southern States almost amounting to a national disease. It is also encouraging a condition bordering on anarchy in many communities. These terrible conditions are sure to further deteriorate with increasing disorder unless the President of the United States desists from using threats of mass violence to rush his social equality legislation through the Congress.

No American citizen has the right to select the laws he will obey and those he will disobey.

The President of the United States has a higher call to leadership than to use threats of mass violence and disregard of reasonable local laws as a means of securing action in the courts and Congress, however desirable he may regard it to be.

The Congress of the United States, by an enactment of March 1, 1875, declared that all persons were entitled "to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters, and other places of public amusement." The Supreme Court of the United States on October 15, 1883, declared this Federal restriction upon the use and control of private property to be unconstitutional.

When white citizens protest against the Supreme Court decision in the school cases, they are immediately told that those decisions are the "law of the land" and that, if they protest too vigorously or violently, the armed might of the United States will be summoned to subdue them. Our Negro citizens, who are conducting daily demonstrations against the "law of the land" as established by the Supreme Court in the civil rights cases in 1883, are encouraged to increase the velocity of their demonstrations by the belief that the Attorney General, the FBI, the hundreds of U.S. marshals, and the Armed Forces of the United States will protect them in their demonstrations. The President of the United States cites these demonstrations are reasons for a legislative stampede to change this "law of the land." All this in the name of American equality and justice.

The President and the Attorney General now say that they will predicate this new thrust for race mixing on the already tortured commerce clause of the Constitution. If the commerce clause will sustain an act to compel the white owner of a dining hall to accept a Negro against his wishes, it can be used to sustain the validity of legislation that will compel his admittance into the living room or bedroom of any citizen.

I believe in equality before the law for every American. In equal measure, I reject the idea that Federal power may be invoked to compel the mingling of the races in social activities to achieve the nebulous aim of social equality.

Every Negro citizen possesses every legal right that is possessed by any white citizen, but there is nothing in either the Constitution or Judaeo-Christian principles or commonsense and reason which would compel one citizen to share his rights with one of another race at the same place and at the same time. Such compulsion would amount to a complete denial of the inalienable rights of the individual to choose or select his associates.

I hope that the American people will not be swept further down the road to socialism by the present unprecedented wave of propaganda. To me, the President's legislative proposals are clearly destructive of the American system and the constitutional rights of American citizens. I shall oppose them with every means and resource at my command. I do not believe a majority of the Congress will be frightened by thinly veiled threats of violence.

NEED FOR INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS STUDY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, one of the leading citizens of Kansas, the Honorable Alf M. Landon, continues not only to study serious domestic and international issues of the day, but seeks to give voice to his experience and continuing interest by speaking out in deserving praise or constructive criticism.

That the subject of his analysis, or his opinion upon an issue, may be controversial, never deterred either his willingness or his desire to speak out.

On June 8, 1963, in Wichita, Kans., Mr. Landon addressed himself to the need for an industrial relations study. I ask unanimous consent that the address be inserted in the RECORD, so that the students of the same may understand his viewpoints and the reasons thereof.

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

THE NEED OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS STUDY

(Address by Alf M. Landon, Midwest States Conference of Machinists, Wichita, Kans., June 8, 1963)

Today we are facing explosive conflicts in the world at large—and the Western Hemisphere in particular. At home, explosive racial conflict—and a rigid punitive attack on organized labor through miscalled right-to-work legislation.

It is a time for all good Americans to start thinking and seeking the answers for our complex and perplexing labor-industry problems.

Since the days little girls in pigtails worked in sweatshops in the East—and little boys in knee britches worked on the breakers in the coal mines—I have believed that labor had the right to organize and bargain collectively to protect its own rights and the rights of its women and children. I have had no reason to change my mind.

The problems of the past have grown out of all proportion in the last few years. Automation—the pace of our modern civilization—have so changed all of our old concepts that we need a fresh beginning. The impact of the machine has affected not only production methods but it has changed the accompanying problems of man's relations with each other.

Now we have all of the old labor-management problems—time, wages, working conditions—and we also have an entirely new set

of problems that outmode present practice in many areas of cooperation and controversy.

These new problems are not going to be solved by attempting to weaken labor organizations by laws such as the miscalled right-to-work proposals. Equity in labor relations can only be delayed by such attempts to impose hobbles by law.

You men and women are here today to plan the union course for the next year. That is your way—the American way—to handle the collective-bargaining technique. By such methods, you make it simple for management to respond. If management knows what labor wants—and the precise position of the rank and file—it simplifies management's problem of isolating what it is they can give.

Labor needs to know what it is that management will and can give. With this information available to both sides, sensible bargaining can proceed with a minimum of friction in the interests of both industry and labor—and the public.

There is a crying need for more such practical commonsense approaches to these problems. I am favorably impressed by the proposal in steel and autos to open negotiations a year in advance of contract termination to define problems and areas of conflict in an atmosphere free of tensions and emotionalism of round-the-clock discussions and a midnight deadline.

That is thoughtful and responsible industry and union leadership at its best. That is the way in which to achieve lasting good relations with the public.

I have been impressed by several of the actions taken by the Machinists Union and its leadership. Under the wise guidance of Al Hayes, your president, and Ray Siemiller, your ranking vice president—there has been a whole new concept of labor-management techniques set up in the aerospace industry.

The aerospace conference—consisting of all of your machinists lodges concerned in this new industry—studies the problem—defines the issue. That parallels action by the Aerospace Industries Association, so that both labor and management are ready to meet on a prepared agenda when the time for new negotiation arrives.

I am also much interested in the recently concluded meeting of your automation foundation, which organized jointly with U.S. industries, to deal with this basic labor problem. I have no doubt that, if we could find a solution for the problem of automation, we would solve most of the present difficulties bedeviling our industrial age.

The solution will not come easily. But it certainly cannot come if no attempt is made to find it.

I congratulate the Machinists Union—its leaders and its counterparts on the side of management—for a reasonable and reasoning approach to this fundamental problem.

I congratulate also the leaders of industry and unions on the way they are working together to combat the spread of communism in the great countries to the south of us.

That is a responsible approach based on intelligent self-interest—and public interest.

That is the way of true industrial peace.

But there are those on the side of management who do not see eye to eye with such methods. There are—on the side of labor organizations—a few selfish misguided leaders who see labor organization as a means to personal power. Both do great harm to our wonderful country.

I would like to address myself to the public in these areas for just a moment.

There are some 17 million men and women in the ranks of organized labor in this country. That is a tremendous cross-section of our population. Here are the men who labor with their hands—the women who use needles—the workers who tap the resources of our mines and oil wells. In fact, everything which is produced, shipped or serviced goes through the hands of these Americans.

These Americans may have a little less money—a little less leisure—than others. But they put on their pants one leg at a time and they are not 9 feet tall. In short, they are human beings with all the strengths and frailties of human beings.

The point I am making is that, by and large, union members and their leaders are responsible members of society. They are entitled to the same respect, the same protections, that other citizens of our great country receive. They should not be the object of punitive legislation. They should be governed no differently than other citizens.

The Wagner Act begat the Taft-Hartley Act. The Taft-Hartley Act begat the Landrum-Griffith Act. These were regulatory acts. Their administration is another matter. They are not punitive in nature. But we have in the country today a philosophy which seeks to impose a compulsory open shop on labor. It is punitive legislation—bad legislation. These are the so-called right-to-work laws which now burden labor in some 20 States.

That is legislation which hits at the right to contract. That is legislation that strikes at the basis of union security, which is, in turn, the foundation of strong, dedicated, responsible labor leadership. That's what we need. That's the kind of thing I was talking about earlier in this speech.

The so-called right-to-work laws ban progress in good labor relations and industrial development in our great State and, in the long run, they benefit no one.

The proponents of this legislation—when campaigning in Kansas—said such a law would solve all of our problems of industrial growth and would attract new industry to our State. That has not proved out. Governor John Anderson, in a report to the legislature recently, revealed that Kansas has lost nearly 15,000 jobs of production workers in manufacturing in the years since so-called right-to-work went into effect. Four thousand Kansans lost their jobs in industry in just 1 year. Of course there were other factors involved.

But it is evident that the right-to-work law has not attracted new industry to Kansas. It was more emotional than realistic. It should be repealed.

Many responsible newspapers and leaders in the State also consider that the law should be repealed.

That is not an easy step. For the right-to-work amendment in Kansas was frozen into our constitution. That hampers efforts in seeking better ways to establish workable and equitable industrial relations of great and vital public interest. It does not make economic sense, or political sense, to short-circuit democratic processes by taking away from a State legislature its responsibility to enact legislation that fits changing conditions of an expanding complex industrial economy.

Only recently the President of the United States appointed a Committee under authority of the Taft-Hartley Act to study labor-management problems and suggest solutions. The workings of right-to-work laws in actual practice certainly should be studied and reported by that Committee.

Last February, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz said, "Neither the traditional collective-bargaining procedures nor the present labor-dispute laws are working to the public's satisfaction, at least as far as major labor controversies are concerned. It doesn't matter any more, really, how much the hurt has been real, or has been exaggerated. A decision has been made, and that decision is that if collective bargaining can't produce peaceable settlements of these controversies, the public will. I agree with that decision." And I will add that I agree with the Secretary, also.

But right-to-work legislation settles nothing. It is stagnation in a rapidly changing industrial era. Disillusionment is growing among those who thought Government could be it all.

I call upon the President's Labor Affairs Committee, created under the Taft-Hartley Act, to take our bewildering maze of Federal regulations—right-to-work laws—court decisions—under study, and come up with an informing, comprehensive, factual report covering the best way—or at least alternative ways—for settlement of industrial disputes in the interest of the rank and file of labor, management, and the general public that will forge a stronger connecting link in the interminable fight against communism's tyrannical dictators.

ANNIVERSARY OF BALTIC DEPORTATIONS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this year marks the 22d anniversary of one of the most inhuman actions perpetrated by the Soviet Union during its long history of oppression and slavery. On June 14, 15, and 16, 1941, thousands of men, women, and children were forcibly deported from their homelands to unknown parts of Siberia. This barbaric act took place in the Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, which the Soviet Union had occupied in clear violation of nonaggression pacts with all three.

The Baltic States gained their independence during the years immediately following the First World War. Each nation based its sovereignty on the Wilsonian principle of self-determination. All three eventually joined the League of Nations in order to better cooperate with other European nations in building a just and secure political and economic order. The League of Nations foundered, thus intensifying the trends leading to the Second World War. In the European power politics of this era, the destinies of smaller nations were determined by the expansionary dreams of ruthless dictators.

In 1940, the Baltic nations lost their independence and were absorbed into the Soviet Union. The human cost of Communist land hunger was enormous: 60,000 Estonians, 34,000 Latvians, and 45,000 Lithuanians were either murdered or deported on the charge of political unreliability. Among these unfortunates there were hundreds of children aged less than 1 year.

We, the citizens of the free world, should pause and remember the tragic history of the Baltic people. Above all, we should recognize that the perpetrator of these crimes—the Soviet Union—has not ceased to be a threat to our lives and liberties.

THE ARTS AND NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as chairman of the temporary Subcommittee on the Arts of the Committee of Labor and Public Welfare in the 87th Congress, I should like to direct our attention to the report released today and submitted to President Kennedy by Mr. August Heckscher, the President's special consultant on the arts.

Mr. Heckscher has completed his special assignment, entailing more than a year's highly constructive labor, and will be returning to the Twentieth Century Fund to resume his duties there. President Kennedy has accepted Mr. Heckscher's resignation with deep regret, and has extolled his report as opening up a "new and fruitful relationship between government and the arts."

I heartily applaud the results of Mr. Heckscher's most comprehensive study. He has contributed significantly to our understanding as we move ahead in the Congress to implement vitally needed legislation in promoting, inspiring, and assisting artistic achievement.

Senator HUMPHREY's bill, the National Arts and Cultural Development Act, which I have had the privilege of cosponsoring, gives us all immense impetus as we strive toward our goals. I hope we may be able to hold hearings on this bill soon.

Mr. Heckscher states:

There has been a growing awareness that the United States will be judged—and its place in history ultimately assessed—not alone by its military or economic power, but by the quality of its civilization.

I would like to emphasize the truth inherent in these words, as well as the benefits which will accrue to our Nation in proportion as we incorporate our talents and abilities into an imaginative and forward-looking program for all forms of artistic accomplishment.

Mr. President, in paying tribute to Mr. Heckscher's work, I ask unanimous consent that his valuable report, entitled "The Arts and the National Government," be printed in the RECORD, together with the White House correspondence pertaining to Mr. Heckscher's resignation.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
June 10, 1963.

Mr. AUGUST HECKSCHER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AUGIE: I accept your resignation with great regret. As special consultant for the arts, you have initiated a new function in the Executive Office of the President. The best tribute to the success of your work is the decision to establish this function on a full-time and, I hope, permanent basis. I am sorry that you cannot take on the continuing assignment yourself; but I know your desire to return to your duties at the Twentieth Century Fund, and I am grateful for your willingness to stay until a successor has been named.

I have long believed, as you know, that the quality of America's cultural life is an element of immense importance in the scales by which our worth will ultimately be weighed. Your report on "The Arts and the National Government" opens up what I am confident will be a new and fruitful relationship between Government and the arts. Government can never take over the role of patronage and support filled by private individuals and groups in our society. But Government surely has a significant part to play in helping establish the conditions under which art can flourish—in encouraging the arts as it encourages science and learning.

We have much to learn in this complex and delicate area. Your report will guide your successor and the President's Advisory Council on the Arts in their study of these problems. I am glad to have your assurance that you will serve on the Council when it is appointed, and I have no question that your work in these past months will be regarded as a milestone in the process by which our Government has begun to fulfill its responsibilities to our culture.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

MAY 28, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to submit the attached report covering my activities as special consultant on the arts since my appointment in March 1962. The report describes briefly the functioning of an office new to the Government, evaluates the impact of existing Government programs and policies upon the arts, and makes recommendations for action in various areas.

In submitting this report, I submit my resignation, having already served a good deal longer than the 6 months which we originally envisaged.

The major part of the report deals, as was suggested in your letter to me of December 5, 1961, with activities of the Federal departments and agencies as they relate to the arts; also with general policies, such as taxation, as they impinge upon this field. It has seemed wise, in addition, to consider ways in which the relationship of the Government to the private institutions of the arts and to the whole cultural life of the Nation could be made more explicit and helpful.

In the course of the work it became evident that Government policies and programs affecting the arts are far more varied and extensive than is generally supposed. It is not enough to look at labels or to judge by declared objectives. Many Government policies ostensibly having nothing to do with the arts affect them in a substantial way—often adversely. Conversely, many agencies which seem removed from this field have responsibilities which they have been endeavoring to carry out, frequently with little recognition and inadequate support. This report casts its net widely and groups activities related to the arts under functional, rather than departmental, categories.

In many of the areas surveyed the major need is for greater awareness of the possibilities for esthetic improvement and of a more sharply definied responsibility to the arts. Increased expenditures are secondary. Elsewhere new programs and additional funds should be authorized, if Government's concern with the arts is to be effectively expressed. Even these sums are comparatively small—yet a relatively small amount of money may make all the difference between mediocrity and excellence.

The period during which I have served as special consultant has been immensely challenging, the more so because of the widespread popular support evoked by your interest in this aspect of our national life. To have been able to help within your administration in shaping a new approach to the arts has been an opportunity for which I shall always be grateful.

Sincerely yours,

AUGUST HECKSCHER.

THE ARTS AND THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

(Report to the President submitted by August Heckscher, special consultant on the arts, May 28, 1963)

(NOTE.—In the writing of this report, as in all the work of the office of the special consultant on the arts, I am immensely indebted to my assistant, Miss Barbara Donald. Without her constant and effective help it would have been impossible to fulfill even a part of the assignment. Mrs. Nancy Newhouse also deserves my thanks for her valuable assistance.—A. H.)

INTRODUCTION

Growth of the arts

Recent years have witnessed in the United States a rapidly developing interest in the arts. Attendance at museums and concerts has increased dramatically. Symphony orchestras, community theaters, opera groups, and other cultural institutions exist in numbers which would have been thought impossible a generation ago. The artist, the writer, and the performer hold new positions of respect in our society. Good books are bought in large quantities, as are recordings of good music and reproductions of the great art of all ages. The crafts are developing new standards of creativity.

The causes of this widespread popular interest lie, it appears, deep within the nature of our society. What might be taken at first glance as a fad, a passing enthusiasm, is actually related to some of the basic currents of the sixties in America. An increasing amount of free time, not only in the working week but in the life cycle as a whole; a new sense of the importance of cities; a recognition that life is more than the acquisition of material goods—these have contributed to the search for a new dimension of experience and enjoyment.

At the same time there has been a growing awareness that the United States will be judged—and its place in history ultimately assessed—not alone by its military or economic power, but by the quality of its civilization. The evident desirability of sending the best examples of America's artistic achievements abroad has led to our looking within, to asking whether we have in fact cultivated deeply enough the fields of creativity. We have come to feel as a people not only that we should be stronger but that we should have a higher degree of national well-being in proportion as the arts come into their own.

Despite this new enthusiasm, despite favorable social and political tendencies, the condition of the professional arts in the United States is not in all regards satisfactory. The very demands which changing public tastes have made upon established artistic institutions have strained the financial resources available to them. Older forms of patronage have not in all cases been adequately replaced. A longstanding weakness in what might be called the cultural infrastructure has led to institutions inadequately supported and managed and, as in the theater, to a lack of the stability and continuity which provide the grounds where talent can develop and mature. Often inadvertently, government has imposed obstacles to the growth of the arts and to the well-being of the individual artist.

The role of government

Government in the United States has not in the past showed consistent concern for the state of the arts. There have been moments, particularly the formative period of the Republic, when statesmen possessed the clear realization that the forms of art reflected the inner ideals of the social order. The planning of cities and the construction of public buildings were expected to match the concepts of order and human dignity inherent in the country's laws and institutions. This awareness was dimmed during most of the period of westward expansion and industrial progress. But in the 20th century American Presidents again began to sense a relationship between government and the health of the cultural life. Before Franklin Roosevelt inaugurated immensely fertile experiments in this field, Theodore Roosevelt had brought to the White House artists, scholars and poets; William Howard Taft had established the Commission of Fine Arts.

Since the Second World War the role of government in the arts has been repeatedly stressed. In 1958 Congress passed legislation establishing the National Cultural Center. A report on "Art and Government" requested of the Fine Arts Commission by President Harry S. Truman surveyed the field methodically and formed a starting point for much of the work done by the special consultant in recent months. Significantly, too, when President Eisenhower established a Commission on National Goals, the cultural life of the United States was one of the areas subjected to inquiry.

A new phase

These two trends—mounting popular enthusiasm for the arts and a growing concern on the part of the Government—came together at the start of the present administration. Attendance at the inaugural ceremonies of outstanding artists, writers, and scholars was understandably hailed as signaling a new partnership in the national life. Reconstitution of the White House as a dramatic symbol of America's cultural heritage, and the hospitality provided to outstanding representatives of the intellectual and artistic community, carried further the idea that government and art have a basic relationship.

Against this background the first special consultant on the arts was named. It was understood that he would be concerned with the progress of the arts primarily as they affect, not our international posture, but the well-being, the happiness and the personal fulfillment of the citizens of our democracy. In this sense the appointment, modest in scope and tentative in form though it was, marked the beginning of a new phase in the history of art and government.

I. OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL CONSULTANT

Named in March 1962, with the understanding that he would serve part time, approximately 2 days a week, and for approximately 6 months, the special consultant has had a small White House office with one full-time assistant. During this period work has been carried forward in the following major areas.

Collecting information on the arts

A major concern of the office has been to gather so far as possible within its time and resources information about the needs, programs and activities of individuals and organizations within the general field of the arts. This has been a field rapidly developing, with new undertakings in the communities, in the educational system, and among the more traditional forms of cultural institutions. Municipal, county, and State governments have been reexamining, and in many cases extending, their role in relation to the arts.

Legislative activities

During the last session at least 40 bills before Congress concerned the arts in some measure or other, and several major pieces of art legislation were under discussion. The office has, within its means, kept in touch with this situation.

Survey of Federal programs

A specific charge given to the special consultant was to make a survey of policies and programs within the executive departments and agencies affecting the arts, and to make recommendations for raising standards and encouraging the fullest use of the opportunities available. In this work the office secured the cooperation of the Bureau of the Budget, working with it upon a questionnaire for the Bureau's examiners which might reveal unexpected facets and supplementing its leads with personal contacts.

Advisory activities

In addition to normal duties relating to White House concern with the arts, including liaison with the U.S. Commission for the New York World's Fair and the National Cultural Center, the office has had to deal with a considerable day-to-day correspondence, with interviews and discussions, and a variety of informational and counseling activities with private organizations and individuals. This part of the work was augmented by the unexpectedly large public response evoked by announcement of the post.

Attendance at cultural functions, visits to communities engaged in significant enterprises in the field of the arts, addresses and articles have been expected of the special consultant and have seemed important as a means both of gathering information and of formulating new approaches and concepts. These activities are summarized in appendix I.

In considering the future White House role in relation to the arts these four areas should, it is suggested, be kept in view. Together they add up to a body of work which serves a significant public interest and requires sustained and continuous attention. Recommendations as to means for carrying forward activities in these areas are made in section V ("Administrative Machinery Relating to the Arts").

II. THE ARTS AND THE EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

The Federal Government touches the arts at many points. By its programs and activities it can affect the cultural life of the country in important ways. If all is done well, much will have been accomplished, not only in making the Government a setter of standards but in giving support to creative talent.

In this section existing Government programs and policies are reviewed and broad objectives stated. Governmental activities have been grouped not according to departmental and agency lines but in terms of broad functions. Thus, Government acquires art; it creates objects which are marked by quality and good design; it shapes the cultural environment, etc. It has seemed most useful in dealing with this wide variety of material to concentrate on general policies and objectives and avoid administrative or operating detail.

1. The acquisition of art

Government in the normal course of its operations acquires by purchase or commission a considerable number of works of art. In this way, Government is a patron of the arts. It creates a market for the work of artists; it sets an example to others, including public and private bodies, which may have an important effect on the general cultural climate. Memorials, statues, murals, fountains, historic and decorative paintings, as well as works of art for public museums, are among the objects which Government in some degree or other makes its own.

The role of Government as a patron of the arts in this sense could well be increased. Its support of the artist could be exemplified more directly than heretofore; and the resulting acquisitions could more effectively serve to make its buildings, its open spaces, its collections of art, representative of the values of a great people.[1] If the Federal Government is niggardly in this regard, can we expect any better of our States and municipalities? An important recommendation of this report, therefore, is that the Federal Government make it an objective to increase substantially the number and worth of the works of art which it acquires.

Art is now acquired in a variety of ways and through a variety of agencies. Three areas offer particular possibilities.

Government Collections of Art

The Federal institutions chiefly concerned with the acquisition of art do a splendid job within their resources and their authority of preservation, display, and research. But the National Gallery, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Library of Congress have virtually no funds, except more or less accidental private bequests, for adding to their collections. As a result, these collections cannot be truly representative either of our artistic heritage or of contemporary American art.

The Commission of Fine Arts in 1953 recommended funds for the purchase annually of American art by the National Collection of Fine Arts. This could become the one Federal collection of traditional and contemporary American art and urgently requires attention and review, not only in regard to funds but staff and space.

A National Government seriously concerned with cultural values would also find ways of making funds available to the Library of Congress and other Government museums for the purpose of adding to their collections.

Public Buildings

A current list (see appendix II) of works of art commissioned in the last 2 years in connection with public buildings suggests that the harvest has been meager, though the General Services Administration is now attempting to practice a policy of using for fine arts one-half of 1 percent of the cost of buildings over $250,000. It is well known that whenever building budgets must be cut, art is the first amenity to go. A bill before the Congress has specified that up to 1 percent of the cost of Federal buildings in the National Capital area be set aside for the commissioning of fine arts decoration. This would be a highly desirable step, and the principle should be extended to Federal buildings throughout the country and abroad. Such a policy was in effect as a depression measure during the prewar Roosevelt administration and has been recently adopted by some of our cities, notably Philadelphia. It is certainly to be hoped that in planning the new Pennsylvania Avenue, for example, sculpture will have a prominent place.

American Embassies

American Embassies are important cultural outposts. The purchase by the Government of American art, supplemented by private gifts, could lead to a collection administered by the National Gallery or some other bureau of the Smithsonian Institution and displayed, perhaps on a revolving basis, in U.S. Embassies. These works should not be considered interior decoration, but as art representing the finest of American creative expression. (They should be supplemented by special exhibitions, stressing contemporary works, loaned for short periods through such private patrons as the International Council of the Museum of Modern Art and the Woodward Foundation.

In addition, in a number of often unrecognized ways the Government is constantly acquiring art—by purchase, commission, or creation by its own designers and producers. Examples of such activities are the commissioning of official portraits, the photographic and film projects of a number of Federal agencies (for example, Department of Agriculture, USIA, and the departments of the armed services), and the continuing art projects of the Air Force and the Navy. (It is interesting in this connection that during the Cuban crisis the Navy sent an artist to Guantanamo, and an artist also was commissioned by NASA to document the landing of astronaut Major Cooper.)

---

[1] Funds from two private trust funds administered by the Library of Congress have been used for the commissioning of new musical compositions. The Federal Government could well consider whether the commissioning of music as well as the visual arts is not a legitimate objective. Could not, for example, a major work be commissioned for the dedication of an important Federal building?

Too often, unfortunately, the criteria observed are solely documentary or functional. There is every reason why the Government should also provide for high standards of artistic excellence. The distinguished quality of the Farm Security Administration photographic programs during the depression years is widely recognized as an artistic achievement of which the Nation is proud. In the selection of artists for public portraits or historic events we should as a matter of course wish to be represented by the best American talent, as we do in all other fields of endeavor, whether it be weapons, scientific developments or public buildings. Clear recognition of this principle is hardly less important than the provision of adequate funds.

2. Raising design standards

Many of Government's activities are related to the arts indirectly in that they consist of a normal part of its operations which may be done with a sense of beauty and fitness, or may be done tastelessly. Government is a printer and coiner; it strikes medals and makes stamps. It is also a builder on a grand scale. Should it not consistently promote—as Pericles said in his funeral oration to the Athenians—a "beauty in our public buildings to cheer the heart and to delight the eye day by day"?

The task throughout this area is to inject into the process of planning and execution a concern for esthetic standards, for the quality of good design and good workmanship. Different problems exist in a field so broad and varied, but across them all lie certain common approaches to excellence.

GOVERNMENT POSTERS—AN EXAMPLE

Government posters may be cited as an example of the way in which a seemingly utilitarian process—in this case the communication of simple facts or ideas—can be raised to the level of art. A group of Government posters collected for this survey by the Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress shows how frequently inferior American work is to European in this field; it also reveals the difference of quality which exists between different initiating agencies. The USIA has issued some striking posters for its exhibitions abroad; the Department of Commerce, in encouraging foreign travel to the United States, has used photographs to good effect, combined with excellent typography. The Armed Forces recruiting and training services have done consistently good work. Elsewhere, too often, the Government communicates with its citizens on a banal and commonplace level.[2]

Does it matter that the level of posters be raised to the level of the best now being produced by private enterprise and by governments abroad? It is a basic assumption of this report that it does matter. Everything done by the Government bears either the marks of excellence which we like to think characteristic of a free and great people, or else in some measure it betrays the Government and degrades the citizen.

ADMINISTRATORS ALERT TO THE IMPORTANCE OF GOOD DESIGN

The first requisite for improving design is that men in responsible positions be encouraged to concern themselves with more than practical utility in their respective fields. They may not themselves be knowledgeable in art and design, but they must have an awareness of the need for the highest quality in all that the Federal Government produces or sponsors. They must be ready to take advantage of expert advice wherever it is available. At present in Washington are numerous examples of individuals who have transformed what might have been routine and undistinguished operations. But too often public agencies seem content with the production of governmental objects which fall below the standards set by private enterprise or by European states.

RECRUITING AND ENCOURAGING TALENT

The recruiting and encouragement of talented individuals in those areas where design is carried out has not been sufficiently recognized as a policy objective. There are small incentives at present for men of ability in the arts to think of the Federal Government as a place where they can do good work. Rewards tend to go to the conventional and the mediocre.

At the same time there is slight disposition among Government agencies to make use of outside talent. Younger artists, designers, architects, etc., are rarely brought into the service of the Government for specific tasks or commissions. Competitions which might appeal to such talent are the exception rather than the rule.

The Use of Advisory Committees on the Arts

In a number of departments special committees have been created to advise on matters of art and design. (See appendix III). Such committees can play a highly useful role, depending upon their composition, their quality, and the weight attached to their recommendations. Outstanding representatives from the world of fine arts and architecture have shown themselves ready to give generously of their time when called on for these purposes.

The most notable example of such a committee has been that which advises the State Department on the design of its embassies and consulates. Composed of a small rotating group of gifted architects, ready to take advantage of talented young men as well as famous names, this committee has been responsilbe in the postwar years for buildings abroad in every way worthy of America's role in the world. In the last several years, the value of this achievement has not been fully recognized. The foreign building program of the State Department has received inadequate support and has been cut back.

The recently appointed committee advising the Post Office Department on the design and subject matter of its stamps has been less successful, judged in terms of esthetic results. This committee has not had adequate representation from among graphic artists and designers. Nevertheless, the Department has for the first time initiated competitions in stamp design.

An agency which might not have been thought to have need of an advisory art committee is the Federal Aviation Agency; yet here, under Mr. Najeeb Halaby a significant innovation has been created. A small committee composed of highly qualified individuals has worked most effectively in advising on the completion of the Dulles Airport, as well as on other airport construction and on general problems of landscaping, graphics, and decoration. A fine arts committee originally appointed to screen works of art submitted to the National Air Force Academy is now extending its jurisdiction in an attempt to save that magnificent complex of buildings from being cheapened by inadequate future planning and by inferior new construction.

Public Buildings—A Major Area of Concern

In areas where design factors are involved, the advisory committee should be adapted to special needs; thus graphic artists should advise on postage stamps, sculptors on medals, etc. These committees, perhaps under some system of loose coordination, should continue to work within separate departments and agencies. In the case of public buildings, however, a more centralized structure might well be explored.

The most striking and most enduring objects created by Government are buildings. Construction is carried on through many agencies—principally by the General Services Administration, but also by the Army Corps of Engineers, the Space Administration, the Post Office Department, etc. Here the possibility arises of an overall panel which would oversee, from the point of view of design, all Government building. It could determine occasions where competitions are appropriate and keep open ways to the use of fresh talent and novel concepts.

There are vast opportunities for an imaginative approach to architecture in military installations and in construction connected with space exploration. Philip Johnson's atomic powerplant for the Israeli Government is an example of what can be done when science and art are brought fruitfully together. In many communities the post office is the only concrete symbol of the Federal Government. As a symbol, it should be a dignified and pleasing building in which the citizen can take pride. Although most post offices are acquired on a lease construction or rental basis, the Department has both the authority and the responsibility to approve the design. Here, as in all other Government programs, the criteria should include appropriate esthetic standards as well as purely functional needs. If there are opportunities, there are also dangers that mediocrity will cover ever larger areas of the earth's surface.

An overall panel on architectural policy might help assure that the standards achieved in our best Federal buildings, such as those hitherto constructed abroad, could be made to prevail in what is built at home for all the various purposes which Government serves. Such a panel would leave to the Fine Arts Commission the authority over building in Washington which it now possesses; it would not preclude advisory committees on the arts in agencies where special problems of design and construction arise.

The implementation of the President's directive of May 23, 1962, on "Guiding Principles for Federal Architecture" is of first importance.

This directive recommended a three-point architectural policy for the Federal Government. It restated in affirmative and contemporary terms the conviction held by Washington, Jefferson, and other early American statesmen that public buildings should set an example for public taste and in the words of the directive "provide visual testimony to the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American Government." It recommended (1) the selection of distinguished designs that embody the finest contemporary American architectural thought; (2) the avoidance of an official style and the encouragement of professional creativity through competitions and other means; and (3) the special importance of landscaping and site development in relation to the surrounding area.

Positive steps should be taken to incorporate these principles in the policies and criteria governing all Federal programs concerned with construction and building. Periodic reports to measure how well we are doing in achieving these objectives might be required and could appropriately be the responsibility of the overall panel suggested above.

A basic assumption of this report is that good design is not an added embellishment or an unnecessary extravagance. In fact, the position is taken that good design is

---

[2] The following generalizations can be made in regard to Government posters: the best work is intended for audiences overseas (like our best Government buildings); the availability of displace space, as with the Armed Forces, tends to make for more effective design; the best posters are those neither designed nor executed by Government personnel but done on outside contract. Obviously the posters used by a department would come within the concern of such advisory art committees as are discussed below, p. 20.

economical. It strongly endorses that section of the directive on "Guiding Principles" which says: "The committee takes it to be a matter of general understanding that the economy and suitability of Federal office space derive directly from the architectural design. The belief that good design is optional, or in some way separate from the question of the provision of office space itself, does not bear scrutiny, and in fact invites the least efficient use of public money."

3. Impact on the cultural environment

We have been speaking of government's responsibility in the design of specific objects—from postage stamps to buildings. But government's responsibility does not stop there. Not always is it recognized how large a role government plays in preserving cultural assets and creating an environment within which cultural values can be realized. Public buildings, if they are to be genuinely significant, must not only be well designed but must be part of a setting in which life can be lived with some sense of spaciousness, dignity and esthetic delight. Again, roads are not only per se susceptible of being improved in appearance and in the esthetic experience they provide; what is even more important, they must be so conceived and carried out as not to dehumanize the landscape or run roughshod over the living community.

The scale upon which modern government acts makes it vital that this responsibility to the total environment be acknowledged. The constant tendency is to think only of the immediate task, forgetting the wider implications of governmental action. The economics of roadbuilding too often threaten to run highways across historic towns, park lands or even across a college campus. The urgency of slum clearance often means that a wrecking crew destroys in the process a humanly scaled and intricately woven community life.

Preservation of the Cultural Heritage

The Historic Sites Act, passed nearly 30 years ago, established the Government's concern with the preservation of historic sites and buildings. Under this act a program of identifying, recording and promoting preservation, by acquisition where appropriate, has been carried out.

The problem is broader, however, than can be met by such an approach. Government policies and programs directed toward legitimate and accepted ends have had the secondary results of destroying sites and buildings which ought to be preserved. It is important that in all Federal policy governing construction, highways and community development the interest of the Nation in historic preservation be given weight. This is an area where the vigilance of a consultant on the arts can make sure that such an interest is heard and adequately represented.

The phrase "historic preservation" does not fully cover the interest which is at stake. Today a single building of outstanding architectural interest (particularly if it derives from our Colonial past) may be saved from the wrecking crew; the occurrence of some outstanding event in former times may make a site immune. But the cultural heritage is more inclusive than these. It comprises areas within cities which taken as a whole express the values of a still valid past, including much anonymous and vernacular architecture. Even more broadly, it comprises a total landscape in which men have found the possibilities for balanced and fruitful lives.

Preservation in this sense requires prudence and sensitivity in administering Federal projects. It requires a willingness to give weight to views in the community which may not always be very loudly expressed but which speak for the long-range national interest. A constant preoccupation with this problem, expressed at key points in the Federal Government, can provide the guidelines for policy now too often lacking.

Shaping the Environment

To shape an environment which meets the needs of men and women for a civilized existence is a long-range Federal interest going beyond mere preservation. The national parks should be seen in this light: they are important for recreation, but also, more broadly, as a means to fulfilling the characteristic American concept of the good life. In addition the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (created in April 1962) should be a means for expressing the Government's interest in the environment and its influence upon the citizen.

Within the urban context, as well, Government policies to enhance the environment and to assist in the achievement of this objective by the private as well as the public sector should be encouraged. Through the varied programs providing financial and technical assistance to private and public housing and to community development the Federal Government has many such opportunities and responsibilities.

The Government's responsibility for good housing was clearly stated in the Housing Act of 1949 which established a national housing objective. This act declared that the goal of a national housing policy was "a decent home and and a suitable living environment for every American."

In the 14 years since that act was passed, the Government has continued and initiated many programs to carry out this aim. With this experience has come increasing recognition of the importance of environmental factors, especially the use of space. Thus the Housing Act of 1961 authorized a program of grants to help States and metropolitan areas create and preserve open space.

Urban renewal has shown itself in many instances to be the only effective and practical means of saving and redeveloping urban areas. The recognition by the Urban Renewal Administration that plans should be concerned with historic preservation, with the provision of such public services and amenities as theaters, libraries, and cultural centers, and with standards of good architectural design, is important. A recent URA policy statement makes the point that "urban renewal provides an unprecedented opportunity to rebuild major parts of our cities. Well designed, these can become great assets—functionally and esthetically. But if these areas are poorly designed, rebuilt in uninteresting and unproductive patterns, a basic purpose for the expenditure of public funds and public effort will be lost."

From an economic and investment point of view the importance of good design and the availability of amenities and public services responsive to the needs and desires of the inhabitants should not be underestimated. It may be a critical factor in preventing rapid obsolescence from lowering market values, producing vacancies and overtaking mortgage servicing. It is for this reason that the Federal Housing Administration believes that good design is important in a sound mortgage insurance program, and takes it into consideration in approving the eligibility of projects for Federal insurance.

As one means of bringing about an improvement in design, the FHA has taken steps to increase the use of professional architectural services and insure adequate architects' fees. It is giving increasing attention to research and advisory services relating to community and land-use planning and to the role of amenities and public services. It is sponsoring an experimental program of insuring mortgages on properties that include new and untried materials and methods likely to improve neighborhood design. Through design seminars for mortgage bankers, planners, architects, and FHA officials and through other methods of identifying the importance of design and environment, it is working to raise standards and formulate criteria. It should be noted that FHA criteria for sound mortgage evaluation are widely used by private industry and are thus very influential.

Public housing is an area in which the Federal Government has even greater and more direct responsibility and opportunity.

Unfortunately public housing has too often been the victim of indifference, suspicion, and even hostility on the part of officials and politicians, private builders, the general public and even the architectural profession. There is a widely held view that public housing should by its very nature be drab, standardized and functional and that materials and appurtenances should be held to the minimum type and quality necessary to build what the law describes as a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling.

The law further prescribes that such housing be developed and administered to promote serviceability, efficiency, economy and stability, that no elaborate or extravagant design or materials be used, and that economy of construction and administration be promoted. These criteria have often been unnecessarily interpreted to mean that public housing units under the law cannot be well and imaginatively designed and that essential amenities and services cannot be provided.

The Public Housing Administration should be encouraged and supported in its new efforts to improve the design of public housing and to make its projects more responsive to the needs of its tenants. It is actively working with the American Institute of Architects on improving architects' fees (which have generally been too low) and revising standard contracts. It has asked the AIA also for recommendations on ways to improve design, development and review procedures, the desirability of competitions, design award programs, exhibitions, and methods of increasing public and professional appreciation of design and environmental factors.

A consultant program has been established to aid local housing authorities and their technicians on design problems. The program includes architects, landscape architects and planners, and their function will be to consult with and advise on specific plans and designs, land use, site development and assist in the conduct of seminars. A National Panel of Design and Planning Consultants, composed of 30 or more leading architects and planners, has been set up.

Notwithstanding such steps, a distinguished U.S. Senator has recently asserted that "the Federal Government, directly and indirectly, through the laws it writes, the programs it enacts and the regulations it issues, has contributed more than its share to the ugliness of the landscape. In countless ways the Federal Government has fettered its own and the efforts of others to improve the appearance and vitality of our communities." Such an indictment indicates the scope of the work to be done by those who concern themselves seriously with the relation between the ideals of the Government and the outward forms in which these ideals are expressed.

The Renaissance state has been referred to as "a work of art." Today the whole environment, the landscape and the cityscape should be looked on as potentially a work of art—perhaps man's largest and most noble work. The power to destroy provided by modern organization and machinery is also, if it is widely used, an unprecedented power to create. To create humanely in the service of man's highest needs is a supreme task of modern statesmanship.

4. Presentation and display of art

Government responsibility is not discharged in acquiring and conserving works

of art and other objects of historic and artistic merit. To be enjoyed and appreciated by the people and to make the contribution they should to our cultural life they must be made available and accessible in a much more extensive and varied manner than they have been to date.

The Visual Arts

A large number of Federal agencies are involved in one way or another with the display and presentation of the visual and graphic arts. Chief of these, of course, are the great galleries in Washington and the Congressional Library. Some individual departments and agencies operate specialized museums and exhibit programs, for example, activities of the armed services, historic sites and buildings administered by the National Park Service, national memorials of various kinds, etc.

The quality of existing activities and the competence and dedication of the staff responsible for them was found in the cases which this office was able to study to be unusually good. On the other hand, the casual and unimportant role accorded such programs as far as policy and financial support was concerned has meant that as a practical matter they are generally inadequate and haphazard. Lack of funds, limited exhibit space, duplication and ineffective coordination and liaison between the different Government agencies involved, and above all the absence of any positive policy and program to make our national collections more available to the public have all contributed to this state of neglect.

In general, activities are restricted to the city of Washington. There are some programs which reach out to a broader audience by means of traveling and loan exhibitions; the sale and circulation of slides, reproductions, lecture outlines; the preparation and distribution of catalogs and other publications. These are generally speaking very limited in relation to both the potentialities of the Government's resources and the needs of the public. Furthermore, they are in most cases dependent on private financing.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the lack of any central system of exercising overall coordinating, recording and policy functions has probably contributed to the greatly varying character of professional care, preservation, accessibility and even knowledge of the art treasures belonging to the Government. This should be a matter of some concern.

A great improvement in facilities and space will no doubt be brought about with the opening of the new Museum of History and Technology and the renovation of the historic Patent Office Building to house the National Collection of Fine Arts and the Portrait Gallery.

The large museums in Washington, however, are not the only means through which the visual and graphic arts may be presented. As noted above, many agencies and departments sponsor exhibits and administer specialized museums. The provision of accessible and appropriate exhibit and gallery space should be a consideration in drawing up plans for new Federal buildings, not only in Washington but especially throughout the country.

The National Collections

A positive program should be adopted to expand the educational and presentation activities of the national collections. The many excellent recommendations in this regard of the report to the President submitted by the Fine Arts Commission in 1953 should be carried out. In this report the Commission urged that in addition to providing authority and funds to the national collection to make this a truly representative museum of American art, a greatly expanded program of traveling exhibitions, catalogs and publications and reproductions should be initiated.

Much more attention should be given to the production of publications of distinction and high esthetic standards.

Consideration should be given to organizing some central clearing system to coordinate such activities and to publicize their availability.

The much more extensive and imaginative use of public buildings, such as postoffices and regional office buildings, for poster and exhibit displays and even the distribution of Government publications, should be encouraged. A small pilot project to promote the sale of Government publications has just been instituted by the Post Office Department.

The basic objective is the use of the great resources of our national collections for the benefit and enjoyment of all the people throughout the country.

Presentation of the Performing Arts

The Federal Government should fulfill its responsibility for the performing as well as the visual arts. Government auditoriums have generally been built with little or no concern for this important function. The sponsorship of concerts and theatrical performances has been very limited, primarily restricted to the city of Washington, and in most instances entirely dependent on private gifts to the Government.

The programs of chamber music, literary readings, and dramatic performances taking place in the Library of Congress, the National Gallery Symphony Orchestra concerts, and the few programs, including experiments with "Son et Lumiere," sponsored by the National Park Service, are the main examples. Tours and performances sponsored by the armed services provide an opportunity for presenting the performing arts to an audience which is in a position greatly to influence the future cultural life of American communities.

The National Cultural Center

Creation of the National Cultural Center will enhance the Federal Government's role in presenting American cultural achievements and in stimulating and supporting the performing arts throughout the country. To fulfill its aim, the Center must be more than a group of splendid stages for the benefit of Washington audiences.

The general policy of the Cultural Center is outside the scope of this report; but it may be stressed here that if it is to fulfill its role of presenting the performing arts to a broad national audience it must from the start conceive a program keyed to diverse and wide-ranging interests. Not only must it be expected to present the best of orchestras, repertory theater, opera, choral and dance groups from this country and overseas; it must also reach out through competitions, festivals, youth programs, and commissioned works into the heart of the Nation's cultural life. The motion picture, that most characteristic and indigenous of American art forms, should have an important place in the program. The organization of the motion picture industry tends to emphasize the expensive commercial feature picture. The Center can provide a means to encourage both the production and the opportunity for public viewing as well as a way of recognizing the best of our documentary and shorter fine arts films.

The Cultural Center must use all means to make its presentations extend beyond the area of its halls. A program of education and dissemination activities must be central in its planning. Plans must be made for bringing the programs to the country at large through full use of television.

Promoting New Facilities

A major obstacle hindering the development of the performing arts throughout the country is the lack of proper facilities. There are a number of ways in which the Government can contribute with little or no increased expenditure of Federal funds. In many of the construction programs in which the Government exercises a financial or advisory role, auditoriums are built or could be built—and at little relative additional cost—with adequate facilities for the performing arts. It is strongly urged that the Government not overlook this opportunity.

Specifically it is suggested that the provision of facilities for the performing arts be considered in (1) plans for new Federal centers and buildings throughout the country as well as Washington; (2) urban renewal and community development programs; (3) public works programs; (4) the National Park Service; (5) business and building financial and service assistance; and (6) the school construction program and advisory service on school facilities administered by the Office of Education.

The Urban Renewal Administration has already taken steps to suggest that the provision of auditoriums and civic and cultural centers be considered eligible and desirable objectives in renewal plans. This policy should be encouraged and extended to other appropriate programs.

Although the Federal Government has no direct responsibility for the design of schools and colleges, except under the special construction program in federally impacted areas, it can exert important influence. The opportunity afforded by the enormous amount of school building forecast during the next decade should not be lost. Unless its use for the performing arts is taken into account, school auditoriums, which will be built in most schools as conventional educational facilities, may not be suitable or adequate for such performances. An increasing number of school systems are recognizing the great educational potential of including performances by professional artists in their curricula.

School auditoriums should also be increasingly conceived of as serving the needs of the community as a whole. Communities which can only afford one auditorium should at least make sure that this is suitable for the presentation of various forms of the performing arts.

It is strongly urged that the Office of Education emphasize in its advisory and counseling service on school facilities the desirability of auditoriums which can serve the performing arts.

Presentation in the International Sphere

Cultural exchange is one of the most important means by which government fulfills its role of presenting and displaying American arts. The foreign policy aspects of this program are not considered here. It must be stressed, however, that the cultural life at home is stimulated and benefited by the effectiveness with which this responsibility is carried out. The recognition American artists receive through the exhibition of their works abroad is an important element in their development. Those who have the experience of working abroad and coming to know the artists of other countries bring back fresh skills and new sources of inspiration. (It is significant, for example, that the Jerome Robbins ballet, which played at the White House in 1962, was an American group tempered by three seasons at the Spoleto Festival.)

For these reasons it is urged that an active exchange program be furthered by all Government agencies directly or indirectly involved. Despite the proven value of these international programs and the great increase in the number of new countries we are trying to reach, there has been no increase in the relatively small amount of money allocated to the circulation of art exhibitions and the touring of performing arts groups. The average cost of a symphony

orchestra tour runs to 25 percent of the budget, and the tour of the American Repertory Theatre, a company created to meet the demand for a professional American theater tour, was so costly that its repetition cannot be reasonably contemplated within present budgets. Funds for traveling art exhibitions are totally inadequate. If these programs are to fulfill their purpose in demonstrating abroad the vitality and quality of the arts in the United States, adequate funds must be made available.

International Fairs and Conferences

The Commerce Department, responsible for trade fairs and exhibitions, can also play a role in presenting before foreign publics the best work of American architects, graphic artists and designers.

Such a Federal exhibition as that at the New York World's Fair—the building, displays, landscaping, graphics, etc.—should be significant indication to our people and to foreign visitors of the kind of excellence which the Federal Government seeks to express in all its works.

The Department of Justice should make every effort to put into effect simpler and more realistic entry requirements, thus encouraging the holding in this country of international conferences, competitions and festivals. It must be hoped that ways will be found for providing the funds which other countries authorize for hospitality to foreign visitors at such gatherings. At present, due largely to legislative obstacles and stringencies, international groups rarely meet within the United States.

This failure of the United States to provide the hospitality and the funds necessary to the successful putting on of such conferences is having unfavorable repercussions on just that group of young leaders and professionals whose understanding and knowlelge of this country is of critical importance to our long-range interests. This is one of the best means of assuring other countries of our commitment to a common effort in scientific, cultural and technical development. If funds to hold 5 or at most 10 such conferences a year were available the rewards would be fare greater than the relatively small cost.

5. Education, training, and research

The Federal Government affects the arts through what it does, or fails to do, in the related fields of education, training, and research. In developing these potentialities there is opportunity for much positive and useful support. Programs in these areas are well established and recognized as a natural governmental operation. But at present, the arts are given a low priority, or are even excluded in most educational and training programs; and basic research information in this field is scarcely pursued at all. These programs could easily express toward the arts a greater interest and concern without substantial additions to their funds or personnel.

The National Defense Education Act

The major program of Federal assistance (aside from aid to special construction, vocational and minority groups) is that authorized by the National Defense Education Act. Assistance is limited to those fields of education which contribute to the national defense—specifically science, mathematics, and modern languages. Initially the act was interpreted to permit a limited program of fellowship awards in the arts, but this was later terminated as being contrary to congressional intent.

The Office of Education

The Office of Education, the chief agency of the Government concerned with education, has until recently given little attention to the arts. Recommendations for increasing the art programs of the Office of Education have been submitted after a study by a consultant who reviewed for HEW its activities in this area. A new division has been established to deal with educational needs beyond formal school programs. This division will be responsible for the library services and adult education programs and through a new Cultural Affairs Branch will give increased attention to the arts. Specialists in various fields will be added to the permanent staff. There is need, for example, for a program to strengthen and improve the educational role of museums and the training of curators and museum personnel.

It is recommended that further consideration be given to increasing the share of the Federal Government's support to education which is concerned with the arts and the humanities. This should include the same type of across-the-board assistance now given to modern languages, mathematics, and science: for example, facilities and equipment, teacher training, teaching techniques and materials, scholarship and fellowship programs. The predominant emphasis given to science and engineering implies a distortion of resources and values which is disturbing the academic profession throughout the country.

Other Federal Institutions

The activities of the Library of Congress and the several museums comprising the Smithsonian Institution are often classified as educational in nature. Those agencies do carry on a variety of educational services, but they are to a large extent dependent on private funds and volunteer staff, necessarily limited in nature and primarily restricted to Washington. A major recommendation of the Fine Arts Commission Report of 1953 was the allocation of funds to make color reproductions, photographs, slides and motion pictures available to schools and colleges on a national basis. This recommendation should be put into effect.

Research in Art Education

Encouraged by its success in stimulating the preparation of new teaching materials in science and mathematics, the Panel on Educational Research and Development (a committee sponsored by the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation and the President's Science Advisory Committee) has initiated a project on the teaching of art and music in elementary and secondary schools. One of the research studies in new educational media financed under the National Defense Education Act is to examine the potential role and function of such media in the future program of the National Cultural Center.

Generally speaking, however, no more attention has been given to research on and in the arts than to training and education in the arts. Since 1956 for example, the Office of Education has administered a cooperative research program in collaboration with state and private educational institutions. Although appropriations in 1963 were approximately $7 million and requested funds for 1964 are more than $17 million, only a handful of the approved projects have been concerned with the arts.

It is suggested that the teaching of the arts is particularly susceptible to improvement through the use of new techniques, visual and audio aids and materials, and such mass media as television and radio. It is recommended that funds and attention be directed to new research and application, especially pilot experiments.

Gathering Statistical Information

A major obstacle to the assessment of the problems and needs of the arts and the formulation of sound and realistic public policies is the lack of adequate up-to-date factual and statistical information. Professional organizations or associations of the arts have not had the resources to collect such information as is commonly collected by business, labor or other professions. None of the fact-collecting agencies of the Federal Government collect comprehensive or consistent data on any detailed or meaningful basis.

This problem is not easy, as much of the data relating to the arts is not available through standard methods of collecting information on economic and social activities. At the same time, the growing social and economic role played by the arts makes the collection of such information increasingly necessary. For example, Department of Commerce figures on recreation and entertainment show that in 1961 expenditures on admissions to legitimate theater, opera and entertainments of nonprofit institutions amounted to $400 million which is substantially more than total admissions to spectator sports. The importance of the performing arts in the employment picture has been recognized by the Department of Labor in including data in the annual Occupational Outlook Handbook of 1961 for the first time. But there is little reliable information on such elementary facts as numbers of performing groups, character of facilities, types of services, sources of financial support including State and municipal subsidies, etc. To be of value this information must be collected on a continuing, systematic and detailed basis.

It is recommended that funds be made available to both the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce so that the arts be covered adequately in both the regular census and periodic surveys.

6. Government recognition of the artist

Most of the great countries of the world have traditionally given national recognition not only to outstanding military and government service but also to individuals for distinguished accomplishment in science, the arts and the humanities. Britain has an Honors List; France the Legion of Honor and the Academy; the Soviet Union a variety of awards. Japan gives recognition by designating her artists as "living cultural assets."

In recent years there has been growing support in the United States for a system of national recognition of achievement in the arts and the humanities. Presidential recognition has been given in several different ways through special dinners, individual invitations to the White House, and occasional performances by leading professional artists or youth groups. This method, however, is necessarily irregular and personal and can scarcely answer the requirements of a formal and continuing system, though a more official system does not, of course, exclude the continuation of the various forms of personal Presidential recognition noted above, which have important values of their own.

A number of bills to establish a system of medals or awards in various fields of civilian endeavor have been introduced in Congress in recent years but have never been passed. An occasional individual, such as Robert Frost, has been honored by a medal authorized by special legislation.

Until very recently, however, there has been no system of regularly honoring accomplishment or contribution in all fields of human endeavor. As a result of legislation passed in 1959, a National Medal of Science was established and the first award made in February 1963. Also in the scientific field are the Fermi and Lawrence Awards, which include cash prizes, and are granted by the Atomic Energy Commission, as authorized in its basic legislation, for meritorious contributions to the development of atomic energy.

The highest civil honor of the United States has been the Medal of Freedom originally established by President Truman as an award for meritorious service in connection with the war. Its scope and purpose has recently been broadened, and from now

on it will be awarded on a systematic annual basis to a limited but unspecified number of persons who have made especially meritorious contributions to the security or national interests of the United States, world peace, cultural, or other significant public or private endeavors.

There still seems a need, however, for an additional system of awards in specific art fields. The schemes adopted should be chosen carefully after thorough consideration of various alternative proposals, criteria, and means of selection and consultation with the intellectual and artistic community. It is the recommendation of this report that the consideration of all proposals should be specifically assigned to the President's Advisory Council on the Arts.

The basic objective of a system of recognition should be to stimulate interest in and respect for intellectual and artistic effort and achievement.

Very careful thought should be given to the scope of the awards, the nature of the awards (should they include cash prizes or be purely honorary?), and the type of awards (should they recognize young talent, a specific achievement, accomplishments over a period of years, the winner of a specially held competition, or include several types, and perhaps on a graduated scale of prestige?). The procedures, criteria, and membership of the selection system should be weighed especially carefully. The question of whether recognition should be restricted to American citizens or in some instances extended to foreigners should be discussed.

III. THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

The city of Washington has an importance far outweighing its relatively small population of less than 800,000 people. As the National Capital of the country, it is the center of a metropolitan population of 2 million (over half of whom live not only beyond its municipal borders but in other States), it plays host to more than 15 million tourists a year (estimated to rise to 24 million in the next decade), and as a political and diplomatic capital is visited by hundreds of thousands of business and professional men, public officials, and foreigners.

It should be an example to the rest of the country, a symbol of the finest in our architecture, city planning and cultural amenities and achievements—a symbol in fact of what the environment of democracy ought to be.

A new era for Washington

For more than 150 years Washington's chief problem has been growing up to the dimensions of the L'Enfant plan. The original conception of the city was in every sense magnificent; but for long periods Washington was allowed to grow without order, design, or a true appreciation of its esthetic potentialities. Federal architecture has been largely second-rate, with the new State Department Building standing as a particular monument to false functionalism and false grandeur.

In the past decade Washington has suddenly outgrown not only the original plan but also the political and administrative system which has been relied on to date to guide its development and maintain its distinction.

In any discussion of Washington, or of the relationship of government and the arts, the responsibility of the Federal Government for Washington should be stressed. It is the Federal Government—through the executive branch and the Congress—which makes the ultimate decisions and authorizes the funds which determine the quality and character of the city.

Much of the problem is due to overlapping, conflicting or inadequate policies, agencies, and interests. In the esthetic field, we have the General Services Administration, the Fine Arts Commission, the National Park Service, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (Congress has complete authority over buildings and grounds in the 135 acres comprising the Capitol area), the National Capital Planning Commission and, if we include the metropolitan area and the Potomac River, the National Capital Regional Planning Council and the States of Virginia and Maryland.

What is needed is an imaginative new approach which will realize the concept of a Capital City fully expressing the standards and values of the Nation.

A beginning has been made in the new policy on Federal architecture contained in the President's memorandum of May 23, 1962, in the establishment of the Pennsylvania Avenue Advisory Council charged with drawing up plans for the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue as the great thoroughfare it was originally intended to be, and in the President's memorandum of November 27, 1962, establishing guidelines for the development of the National Capital region. These policies and projects should be vigorously pursued and implemented.

This report also strongly endorses the establishment of a National Capital Parks Memorial Board as proposed by the Secretary of the Interior. The passage of the necessary legislation is essential to protect the pleasing and dignified development of the Capital's park lands and open spaces and protect them from being overrun by a hodgepodge of poorly placed and ill-designed statues and memorials.

Federal policies applicable to cities should be applied with special care and imagination to Washington itself. This it is fortunate and fitting that what is potentially the country's best urban renewal project in terms of planning and design is situated within a stone's throw of the Capitol. In the same way mass transportation, arterial highways, and other public improvements should be constructed so as not only to enhance the life of Washington but to be a model to other communities.

The Fine Arts Commission

It is vitally important that the Fine Arts Commission be made capable of carrying out its mission of helping to insure that the architecture and environment of Federal buildings in the Capital be worthy of the best of our times. It should take a positive attitude toward achieving good design in the Capital. To this end it should be equipped with a full-time Director and adequate staff.

Planning the Capital region

A more difficult but equally urgent task is to create some means to eliminate the present piecemeal approach to the planning and development of the National Capital region. A plan worthy of L'Enfant, for example, would provide for the preservation and enhancement of the Potomac River as a natural resource offering amenities to our citizens as well as assuring the Capital the beautiful setting it deserves.

Cultural opportunities

The Capital should, however, be more than a collection of buildings, monuments, museums, and parks. It should also offer both opportunity and recognition to the best dramatic and musical talent, both from here and abroad, as expressed in performances of composers, playwrights, and choreographers new and old.

It has never had a stage appropriate to this role, and this is what in essence the National Cultural Center will be. It is, therefore, of utmost importance that the efforts now under way to bring to reality the Center with its several halls and stages should be given every possible encouragement.

In addition, Washington should be an example to other cities in seeing that the artistic institutions and programs needed to provide the city with a broad range of cultural opportunities are flourishing and responsive to new needs as they develop. The Federal Government's role in most communities can never be more than marginal and indirect. The real stimulus and support must come from the community itself, but in an increasing number of cases it is being found that this requires both public and private funds and closer collaboration between public and private agencies. States and cities are establishing arts councils and even executive offices solely devoted to cultural affairs. Washington could well be a laboratory for the working out of effective relationships between public agencies and private institutions.

IV. GENERAL POLICIES AFFECTING THE ARTS

There is a broad range of general Government policies which are designed to accomplish objectives not primarily or specifically related to the arts, but which do affect and concern the state of the arts and the position of the individual artist, often adversely and mainly through inadvertence. These are in such fields as taxation, copyright laws, postal rates, disposition of surplus Government property, public works, and general assistance programs.

1. Taxation

Of these, the impact of the tax laws is undoubtedly the most important, mainly because the earning and income pattern of the writer and artist differs strikingly from that of most other professions and occupations.

Our tax laws have traditionally been more concerned with providing relief and incentive to the inventor than to the artist. The argument has been that tax relief to the inventor is necessary to encourage the inventive genius essential to economic growth. It is time that the contribution of the artist and writer to the cultural growth of society be given at last equal consideration. Nor need the artist be accorded special privileges. Revisions in tax laws and administrative interpretations which would recognize the distinctive character of his income pattern would of themselves go a long distance to remedy the artist's precarious economic plight.

Income Tax

It has been widely recognized that the progressive tax rate principle affects individuals whose incomes fluctuate from one year to the next much more harshly than it does those with steady annual earnings. This result violates a basic principle of equity providing that equal incomes should bear equal tax liabilities. Existing tax laws make some provision for averaging income over a period of years but for narrowly prescribed and limited situations. For example, although the writer can qualify for a 3-year spread of income (even if his book takes 10 years to write), it appears that the performing artist cannot. Frequently the writer's earning pattern does not permit any real relief because it does not fit the specific requirements of the law. Existing law is quite restrictive and limits the benefits of averaging to a particular invention or artistic work the completion of which took 2 years or more, and requires the 80 percent of the income from the work be received in a single taxable year. The economics of book publishing and selling are such that few writers can qualify under the law.

Revision of the tax laws to create a fair-income-averaging provision which will provide realistic and equitable tax relief to the artist is of first importance to the growth of the arts.

Tax Deductibility for Contributions to the Arts

The President's new tax proposals contain a number of recommendations which affect

the tax deductibility of contributions. This report welcomes the proposed extension of the 30-percent ceiling to such nonprofit organizations as symphony orchestras, museums, libraries, and other cultural institutions. Under existing law contributions to these types of organizations are limited to 20 percent. It is strongly urged that the higher limit be applicable to all recognized cultural institutions. The proposed revision should embody this principle very clearly in its final wording.

The tax message also urges the repeal of the unlimited charitable deduction provision on the grounds that no group of taxpayers, no matter how small nor how beneficial their contributions, should be permitted to escape income tax entirely. Under present law some taxpayers need give little more than the otherwise allowable 30 percent in order to escape from the payment of any tax. Although the $10 million involved is small, relative to total philanthropic giving, repeal could seriously affect specific institutions and organizations, especially in the cultural field.

The major proposal which may adversely affect the level of private support of nonprofit cultural institutions and programs is the recommendation for a 5-percent floor on itemized deductions.

Under existing law voluntary contributions are wholly deductible and it has been frequently argued that this is the American way of providing public support and encouraging private giving to philanthropic and cultural institutions. Treasury officials have estimated for the purposes of this report that such tax concessions result now in an average tax benefit to individual and business donors to the arts of about 50 percent. With total voluntary giving estimated at approximately $8 billion annually, this 50 percent tax benefit is clearly substantial. But the amount given to the arts is very small in comparison to that given to religion, education and general philanthropy. (Indeed, an estimate of annual giving to the arts, based necessarily on inadequate data, puts the figure at probably not more than $50 million.)

In any case the tax benefit is considered of crucial importance by those responsible for the managing and financing of our cultural institutions. They state with virtual unanimity that a 5-percent floor would seriously affect contributions. To the argument of Treasury officials and other tax experts that over the years the level of voluntary giving has been unaffected by tax changes, they answer that the psychological effect of such a change introduced at this point would be severe, and that individual contributors would definitely decrease their giving.

This report strongly urges that contributions to nonprofit organizations and institutions be considered a quite separate category of personal expenditure entirely different in nature and purpose from other deductible items of personal expenditure, such as taxes, interest, employment and investment expenses. Complete tax deductibility for contributions is a method, deeply imbedded in American tradition, of support for philanthropic and nonprofit enterprise. In many ways it is a substitute for the direct public subsidy these organizations would need in the absence of private contributions. The eligible organizations and institutions are providing important services, are not run for profit, and can by their nature never be self-supporting. Government policy should be to provide the maximum positive encouragement and contributions should be wholly and not partially exempt from taxation as a matter of principle.

Admissions Tax

Other countries give positive support to their theaters; the United States by contrast penalizes the theater by imposing a 10-percent admissions tax. Such a tax has been considered a legitimate excise tax traditionally levied on luxuries. It has been defended on the ground that its remission would not necessarily have the effect of lowering ticket prices or benefiting the actor or playwright. But the theater is not a mere luxury. And it is quite possible, as the recent agreement between Actors Equity and the New York producers has shown, to insure that a tax saving will be used in ways which advance the true interests of the theater and of the acting profession.

The repeal of the Federal admissions tax on the legitimate theater, especially if combined with other acts aimed at promoting the American stage, would give a vital stimulus to this basic and enduring art form.

Professional Tax Deductions

Artists and writers often find themselves penalized by not being permitted to deduct what they consider legitimate professional expenses under existing tax laws. The issues are basically technical and frequently a matter of regulation and administrative interpretation. They relate generally to the fact that the practicing artist must often earn his living through other employment, notably teaching, and is often unable to earn any money from his creative output for years at a time.

The tax laws and their administration should be consistently responsive to these characteristics of the creative artist's profession, both as a matter of equity and of the Nation's interest in the encouragement of the arts.

Tax Treatment of Copyrights

The creator of a work of art is denied the rights available to holders of patents and other property under the capital assets tax provisions. The result of this is, for example, that while inventors and others may benefit from the lower capital gains tax, the writer and artist is subject to the higher income tax rates on income derived from copyright transactions.

This issue is controversial and it is argued that it is difficult to justify treating the value of copyrights as a capital asset. It is urged, however, that the merits of this issue be given new and serious consideration.

2. Other policies

Postal Rates

Existing special rates for organizations and educational and library materials are important to the maintenance of communications within the cultural community. The postal regulations limit eligibility for special rates to specified organizations and types of material, and the definitions sometimes exclude or are interpreted to exclude materials of cultural institutions and organizations, e.g., museums. It is important that rates for all legitimate cultural materials be kept as low as possible as a matter of principle.

Copyright Laws

The Register of Copyrights is preparing legislative proposals for the first general revision of the U.S. copyright laws since 1909. This step is long overdue. Technological developments entirely unknown in 1909 have rendered the existing laws in many respects uncertain, inconsistent, inequitable and inadequate.

It is not possible in the space of this report to go into the innumerable factors involved. It is sufficient to say that the equitable protection of fundamental rights as well as the recognition of the contribution of the creative writer, artist, composer and playwright are at stake. The outcome will be of major significance in determining the degree of encouragement or discouragement this Nation offers the creative arts.

Major issues involved include: (1) Duration of copyright whether 56 years as at present or longer (most other countries have adopted a life-plus basis); (2) proof and evidence of copyright protection; (3) extent and character of rights; and (4) existing limitations and exceptions (for example, jukebox operators) from payment of royalties. There are a number of others.

In addition, there might well be expressed a concern for the performing artist similar to that shown the composer and playwright.

A more radical proposal, the merit and feasibility of which should be seriously studied, is the suggestion that royalties on works in the public domain should be paid to the Government to be used to support and advance the arts. Care should be taken in working out a formula which would be equitable and sound in its effect on both living authors and musicians and on the cost of performing and publishing classical works now in the public domain. The suggestion has sometimes been made that such a policy be applied on a limited basis, both as to years and amounts, only on works which will fall into the public domain in the future. It could perhaps be tied in with an extension of the period of copyright protection.

Government Surplus Property

Many millions of dollars worth of surplus real and personal Federal property becomes available annually for free disposal or sale. Under present law such non-Federal and nonprofit use as schools, libraries, health, recreation, and wildlife conservation programs, etc., are eligible to acquire this property on a free or low-cost basis.

It is suggested that the importance to the public interest of such institutions as museums, theaters, orchestras, cultural and art centers, etc., all of which are educational in its truest sense, could well be recognized.

At the very least, it is urged that the President's recommendation to the Congress of May 16, 1962, to amend existing statutes to permit the sale of real property to public bodies at 75 percent of fair market value—rather than full value as at present—be approved. This recommendation has been resubmitted to the 88th Congress.

Public Works and Community Development

Although such cultural facilities and institutions as auditoriums, museums, theaters, and cultural centers are not specifically excluded from Federal public works and community development programs, very few projects of this type have been aided.

In a few instances assistance has been given to libraries, civic auditoriums and zoos. In general, however, such projects are given low priority as not meeting essential public needs or contributing to either economic growth or the reduction of unemployment.

It is suggested here that the existence of adequate cultural facilities in a community is often an important factor in plant location and therefore economic development. In any case, the concept of the public interest should be interpreted to include cultural opportunities as well as basic material needs.

Special Assistance and Service Programs

Federal programs of service and assistance have not usually taken into account environmental factors or considerations of good design. The Small Business Administration and the Community Facilities Administration could well include these considerations in their advisory services and in their planning and research assistance. Better design is not only to be desired on esthetic grounds but, as manufacturers are increasingly aware, can be important to efficiency, public relations, and sales, particularly exports. Similarly, plant location could be subjected more effectively to considerations of environmental planning, including cultural factors.

Media of Mass Communication

Government has long been recognized as having responsibility to insure that radio and television are operated in the public in-

terest. Within the scope of this authority, through exhortation and encouragement, the Federal Communications Commission has recently been able to raise in some degree the level of programing, with the result that the arts and cultural activities in general have received a better hearing. But this indirect method has definite limits. The Federal Communications Commission is a quasi-judicial body, not a watchdog on behalf of the great community of listeners. The commercial broadcasters, though not infrequently surprised at the broad appeal which programs of a high cultural level achieve, can scarcely be convinced that this appeal is numerically greater than that of popular entertainment.

The Federal Communications Commission cannot be expected to carry the burden of determining the cultural level of programs. But through other machinery it should be possible to report periodically upon the advance or decline of current programing insofar as it relates to the specific field of the arts and cultural activities. It is recommended that a panel of the President's Advisory Council regularly issue such reports based upon a review of actual developments. In this way a series of benchmarks might at least be provided, in place of the scattered and unsystematic impressions on which judgment is now formed.

A second area of general government policy related to the quality and the cultural content of programing is through the ability to increase the number and effectiveness of educational television stations. Here, as in other fields, government's long established concern with education can be properly used as a means of stimulating the arts. Educational television as it has developed in the United States is only partially geared in with the educational system narrowly defined; it is also—and not least importantly—a means of bringing to the broad public a high level of programing, with stress upon literature and the other arts. Educational television may become the kind of yardstick—testing new ideas and audience response—which many have urged be established by one means or another.

For this reason the encouragement of educational television becomes a major means by which the Government, through its regular activities, can affect the arts. Particularly to be noticed is the precedent of recent legislation authorizing Federal assistance on a matching basis to facilitate the creation of educational television facilities. Funds should be appropriated to carry out this program. There are valid grounds for similar assistance for program and network development.

Tariff Policy

It is most important that the necessary legislation be passed to implement the Florence Agreement to establish duty-free status for educational, scientific and cultural materials. This agreement is one of several international conventions drawn up under the auspices of UNESCO to promote the free flow of cultural materials. It was adopted in 1950 and has since been ratified by approximately 40 countries, including the United States.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY RELATING TO THE ARTS

Experience during recent months suggests the need for setting up continuing administrative means for dealing with issues of the arts. The public has come to anticipate that the expressed concern of the Government will be formalized in some way. It is important that nothing pretentious or heavyhanded be created, and equally important that recent initiatives not be allowed to expire. The following suggestions build upon what has already been done, and look ahead to what seems a natural development in the light of increased and deep-lying national interest in the arts.[3]

These suggested steps presuppose a constant concern with the enhancing and development of the arts through normal activities of the Federal Government. They also look forward to a more direct involvement of government through a new institutional body with operating funds. They do not envisage any effort to direct or influence the work of artists; their purpose is to keep the arts free, not to organize or regiment them.

1. Special adviser

A major recommendation of this report is that the post of special consultant on the arts be continued after the present trial period. Consideration should be given to its being full time and having the status of special adviser. Detailed day-by-day attention is necessary if governmental operations, often seemingly unrelated to the arts, are to be brought to the standards advocated by this report.

Principal areas of work for which the special adviser would be responsible have been described in the first chapter of this report. Besides the policy-planning and review functions which formed the major part of the original assignment, he should be available for advice on all matters pertaining to the arts which arise in the course of the administration's work. He should be the President's liaison with the National Cultural Center, should sit in on panels and meetings where matters of Federal architecture, design, graphics, etc., are being discussed.

In addition, the special adviser should have, as described below, a close relationship with the President's Advisory Council on the Arts.

2. The Advisory Council

Detailed recommendations relating to the establishment and functions of an Advisory Council within the Executive Office of the President have been separately submitted. This Council provides an essential part in an orderly and representative structure dealing with the arts. Its basic function is to continue and fill out the work of study and gathering information begun with the limited resources of the special consultant; to review Federal policies and make recommendations for improving design; to recommend long-range programs; and to assure the active participation of the artistic community in the Government effort.

The special adviser can call upon the Council and its specialized committees for assistance. The Advisory Council will thus become part of the machinery through which advice is provided to the various agencies of Government as they endeavor to set up art committees of their own, to organize competitions, or otherwise to raise the level of design.

The President will appoint the Chairman of the Council, who presumably will be the special adviser. Following experience in the science field, the Advisory Council should achieve effectiveness and stature through being related to the President's adviser and having its recommendations go through him directly to the President.

3. A National Arts Foundation

An Arts Foundation, on the model of the existing foundations in science and health and as already proposed in legislation before the Congress, would appear to be the logical crowning step in a national cultural policy. Such a Foundation would be a means of administering grants-in-aid, generally on a matching basis, to States and institutions of the arts. It might thus administer matching grants to States setting up arts councils. It might make available grants for demonstration projects proposed by particular cultural institutions. Thus it could consider helping support experiments designed to increase attendance, to foster creativity and introduce contemporary works to new audiences, or to offer services on an experimental basis. The Foundation would not provide subsidies to carry the deficits of such institutions, but would aim at promoting cultural diversity, innovation and excellence.

Such an Arts Foundation should be thought of as supplementing the goals of the National Cultural Center, for it would help develop and stimulate the cultural activities and institutions of the country. And these, in turn, would have for their ultimate showcase the stages of the National Cultural Center in Washington.

What is sketched here represents the beginning of what could become a permanent policy giving form to the relationship between Government and the arts. It is a limited policy; for Government's role in this area must always be marginal. It is a policy not copied after European models, but keyed to the particular conditions of diversity and decentralization prevailing in the United States.

There will always remain those who feel that art and Government should exist in different spheres, having nothing to do with each other. But in fact the Government of the United States comes up constantly against choices and decisions where aesthetic considerations are involved. In today's world, moreover, artistic talent and creativity are resources vitally important to the Nation, and the well-being of the people is related to progress in the arts as surely as to progress in fields such as recreation and education where Government's responsibility is fully recognized.

Although Government's role in the arts must always remain peripheral, with individual creativity and private support being central, that is no reason why the things which the Government can properly do in this field should not be done confidently and expertly.

APPENDIX I

MAJOR SPEECHES BY THE SPECIAL CONSULTANT ARTICLES AND OFFICIAL PARTICIPATION AT CULTURAL EVENTS, APRIL 1962 TO MAY 1963

1. Major addresses during this period include 1962: American Institute of Architects Conference on Aesthetic Responsibility, New York City, April 3; annual convocation, Yale Arts Association, New Haven, April 14; annual meeting, Milwaukee Symphony Orchestra Association, Milwaukee, May 14; Boston College Seminar, Boston, May 15; commencement address, Manhattan School of Music, New York City, May 29; annual meeting, American Association of Museums, Williamsburg, Va., June 6; Phi Beta Kappa oration, Hunter College, New York City, June 6; commencement address, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison, N.J., June 9; annual convention, American Library Association, Miami, June 17; annual convention, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D.C., June 28; annual dinner, Department of Agriculture Graduate School, Washington, D.C., September 13; founder's day address, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, October 2; Binghamton Fine Arts Society, Binghamton, N.Y., October 15; 22d American Assembly on Cultural Affairs and Foreign Relations, Arden House, N.Y., October 18; convocation, Board of Regents of

---

[3] One of the institutional steps often proposed has been the calling of a White House Conference on the Arts to assist in the formulation of a national arts policy. It is recommended that such a conference should be held only after a frame of reference has been worked out in some detail. The advisability and timing of such a conference should be a concern of the President's Advisory Council.

New York State, Albany, October 26; annual meeting, American Society of Industrial Designers, New York City, November 2; annual meeting, Association of Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C., November 14; Association of College and University Concert Managers, New York City, December 17; general meeting, National Music Council, New York City, December 20.

In 1963: Cultural affairs officers of Washington embassies, Washington, D.C., January 8; symposium, University of Pennsylvania architecture students, Philadelphia, January 11; American Council of Learned Societies, Washington, D.C., January 17; Foreign Service Institute oversea assignment course for wives, Washington, D.C., January 25; annual dinner, Society of Architectural Historians and College Art Association of America, Baltimore, January 25; Detroit Adventure Conversations in the Arts, Detroit, January 28; Pittsburgh cultural groups, Pittsburgh, January 31; Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts, Minneapolis, February 6; Yale and Vassar Clubs of Washington, Washington, D.C., February 12; Philadelphia Museum College of Art, Philadelphia, February 19; Pomona College 75th anniversary symposium, Claremont, Calif., February 21; New York Academy of Public Education, New York City, February 27; Conference of Association of Womens' Committees for Symphony Orchestras, San Antonio, Tex., March 5; P.E.N., New York City, March 11; 1963 American National Theater and Academy Assembly, Washington, D.C., March 12; Flint Institute of Arts, Flint, Mich., March 14; Allen R. Hite Memorial Lecture, University of Louisville, Louisville, March 21; Coe College Fine Arts Festival, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, March 27; AFL-CIO conference on community services, New York City, April 3; State Conference on the Cultural Arts in California, U.C.L.A., Los Angeles, April 5; Fifty Books of the Year Exhibition, American Institute of Graphic Arts, New York City, April 16; Festival of the Arts in Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, April 17; Princeton University symposium on the arts, Princeton University, April 20; American Federation of Arts annual convention, Dallas, Tex., May 23.

2. Official participation and remarks at cultural events (1962): World Theater Day, New York City, March 27; luncheon for the National Symphony Orchestra, Washington, D.C., April 4; Seattle World's Fair, Seattle, May 10; Friday Morning Music Club Foundation competition awards, Washington, D.C., May 11; annual meeting, American Academy of Arts and Letters, New York City, May 24; Lotos Club State Dinner honoring Robert Frost, New York City, May 24; luncheon honoring Arena Stage, Washington, D.C., June 5; presentation of first Carnegie Hall Award to Pablo Casals, Casals Festival, New York City, June 21; Richard Rodgers 60th birthday luncheon, New York City, June 28; Robin Hood Dell Outdoor Concert, Philadelphia, July 9; New York State Arts Council meeting, Tarrytown, N.Y., August 26; dedication of Martha Graham Dance Studio, New School for Social Research, New York City, September 20; annual dinner, Morgan Library, New York City, October 1; National Poetry Festival, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., October 17; dedication, Washington Gallery of Modern Art, Washington, D.C., October 20; dedication, Spaulding Auditorium of Hopkins Arts Center, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H., November 12; luncheon for National Cultural Center, Washington, D.C., November 26; Long Island dinner and closed-circuit television show for the National Cultural Center, Garden City, Long Island, N.Y., November 29.

In 1963: 85th birthday dinner honoring Carl Sandburg, New York City, January 6; Dimitri Mitropolous International Music Competition Concert, New York City, April 7; citation to Leopold Stokowski and the American Symphony Orchestra, Carnegie Hall, New York City, April 15; opening of National Music Week, Manhattan School of Music, New York City, May 6.

3. Articles: Challenge, "Government and the Arts," June 1962; House and Garden, "The Two Cities That Are Washington," July 1962; Saturday Review, "Public Works and the Public Happiness," August 4, 1962; Environment, "Environment and the Citizen," Autumn 1962; New York Times Sunday magazine, "The Nation's Culture: New Age for the Arts," Sept. 23, 1962; Art in America, "The Role of Government," winter 1962; Artists' Equity Newsletter, "Government and the Artist's Role," December 1962; Show, "Ordering a Cultural Explosion," December 1962; New York Herald-Tribune, "Subsidy of the Arts?" December 1962; Lincoln Center program, "Government and the Arts," winter 1962; The Critic, "Should the U.S. Government Subsidize the Arts?" December 1962; Arts in Society, "Higher Education and the Arts," spring 1963; Equity Magazine golden anniversary issue, "The Theater Tomorrow," May 1963.

APPENDIX II

LIST OF FINE ARTS (SCULPTURE, PAINTING, MOSAICS, ETC.) COMMISSIONED OR INSTALLED ON NEW FEDERAL PROJECTS FROM 1959 TO PRESENT

1. Ceramic mural frieze 5 feet high by 57 feet square, abstract high relief sculpture by Franz Wildenhain, National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Md.

2. Low-relief medallion portraits of three famous doctors (Billings, Garrison, and Fletcher) by C. Paul Jennewein, at National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Md.

3. Murals (oil on canvas) representing early Milledgeville architecture located in lobby of new post office, Milledgeville, Ga., by Frank Herring.

4. Fountain sculpture in bronze—an abstract composition suggesting the Mississippi's source and flow—by Robert Cronbach, in the lobby of the new Federal Office Building in St. Louis, Mo.

5. Wall and ceiling mural decorations painted direct to plaster representing musical instruments by Allyn Cox, in the musical instrument room of the new History and Technology Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

6. Heroic bronze sculpture fountain "Man and the Expanding Universe," by Marshall Fredericks, for the south courtyard of the new State Department Building, Washington, D.C.

7. Two heroic relief sculptures over end entrance doors to be carved in limestone blocks, by Bernard Frazier, at the new Oklahoma City Courthouse and Federal Office Building.

8. Great U.S. seals, modeled by Mr. Kiselewski for entrance doorway at the new courthouse and Federal office building in Brooklyn, N.Y.

9. Fountain sculpture in metal, by Russell Forrester, for Federal office building in Salt Lake City, Utah.

10. Ceramic tile mosaic mural in lobby, by Charles Harper, for Cincinnati, Ohio, Federal office building (under construction). Cast architectural sculpture (aluminum) to be modeled by Marshall Fredericks.

11. Artists have been selected for bas-relief stone carving bronze column at entrance and panels for interior of the U.S. courts and Federal office building (under construction) Denver, Colo.

12. Murals, a series of vignettes representing history and growth of industry at Ocala, Fla. Studies now in preparation by Professor Hollis, of University of Florida, Gainesville, for the lobby of the new post office in Ocala. (This project will be financed entirely by private funds.)

APPENDIX III

LIST OF EXISTING FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES RELATED TO THE ARTS

1. The White House: The Fine Arts Committee of the White House; Advisory Committee to the Fine Arts Committee; Special Committee for White House Paintings.

2. Commission of Fine Arts (itself an advisory body): Board of Architectural Consultants for the Old Georgetown Act; Advisory Panel on the Performing Arts (inactive).

3. Smithsonian Institution: Smithsonian Art Commission; Advisory Committee on the Arts to the National Cultural Center.

4. Department of the Interior: Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments; Consulting Committee for the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings.

5. Department of Defense: Air Force Academy Fine Arts Panel; National Music Council Overseas Touring Committee (Department of the Army); American Educational Theater Association, Overseas Touring Committee; Navy Art Cooperation and Liaison Committee.

6. Department of the Post Office: Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee.

7. Department of State: U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs; Advisory Committee on the Arts; U.S. National Commission for UNESCO; Advisory Panel on Buildings Overseas; Government Advisory Committee on International Book Programs.

8. U.S. Information Agency: Advisory Committee on Cultural Information; Music Advisory Panel.

9. Federal Aviation Agency: The Design Advisory Committee.

10. Library of Congress: Committee to Select Prints for Purchase Under the Pennell Fund; Advisory Committee to the Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge Foundation; Advisory Board to the Serge Koussevitsky Music Foundation; individual consultants and advisers.

COMMEMORATION OF THE MASS DEPORTATIONS FROM THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on June 14, 15, and 16, 1941, the Soviet Union forcibly deported close to 40,000 persons—young and old, men, women, and children—from their homes and loved ones in Lithuania and shipped them off to slave labor camps in the remote areas of Siberia and the Arctic. On the anniversary of these inhuman crimes, it is only fitting that we in the Senate should pay tribute to the brave Lithuanian people who have endured so much.

In the interval between World War I and World War II the Republic of Lithuania made an admirable record. Its constitution guaranteed to all citizens the basic freedoms of speech, assembly, religion, and communications, and economic and social progress was made. With the outbreak of World War II, the Lithuanian people bravely resisted the aggressions of both Hitler and the Soviet Union; however, they were gradually engulfed. In 1939 the Soviet Union forced a mutual assistance treaty upon the country; on June 15, 1940, the Soviet demanded immediate formation of a friendly government and occupied the country; on August of that year the Baltic States were deprived of their independence and incorporated into the

U.S.S.R. by means of force and fraudulent elections; and on June 14, 1941, the Soviet police began the deportations. Thousands of persons were executed when the Soviet forces retreated in haste under German attack, and when the Soviets retook the country in 1944 new waves of mass deportations followed.

The United States have never recognized the forceful incorporation of Lithuania and her neighbors by the U.S.S.R. We have denounced this crime of aggression and consistently refused to recognize the Communist claims to these people and their territories. This policy of nonrecognition originally affirmed by President Roosevelt was reaffirmed by the Senate when it approved the Douglas resolution in 1954 and by the Congress when it passed the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959.

Americans of Lithuanian descent have made real contributions to our country in industry, labor, music, and the arts. They are good citizens and the Chicago Lithuanian-Americans have been among the best. Let us hope and pray that the day will soon come when freedom and democracy will be restored once more to Lithuania.

LET US HAVE FAITH

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it was my great fortune and deep honor to be a participant in the 91st commencement program of Doane College in Crete, Nebr., on June 3.

Doane's alumni rolls list many distinguished names. Of especial interest to my colleagues is that of my illustrious predecessor, the late Senator Hugh Butler. He was always proud to refer to his graduation from Doane in what he termed "the class of double-aught."

In his lifetime and at its close he was most generous in his financial support of this fine Congregational college which he loved so well.

Doane is now in its 92d year. It is preparing to celebrate its centennial in 1972. The college administration and faculty, together with its board of trustees, have made long-range plans which include both the construction of buildings and significant expansions in the academic program and the faculty. These plans are based on a splendid tradition. We can rejoice in the success of this outstanding educational effort by men and women of vision and courage who lead that march of faith which means so much in the future of our country.

The president of Doane, Dr. Donald Typer, invited me to address the graduating class, at the conclusion of which honorary degrees were conferred upon the Reverend Robert W. Inglis, superintendent of the Colorado Congregational Conference, and me.

For the honor thus paid me by Doane College, I am deeply appreciative and most grateful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my commencement address, "Let Us Have Faith," be printed in the RECORD.

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

LET US HAVE FAITH

(Address of Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, 91st annual commencement, Doane College, June 3, 1963)

Dr. Typer, members of the faculty, parents, friends, and members of the student body: I am honored to share the pleasure of this day with you. The service of Doane College to the fundamental task of education has been long and illustrious. You can take just pride in recognition of the fact that Nebraska, the Nation and, indeed, wherever Doane's graduates have gone are the beneficiaries of the discipline and devotion to learning that lie behind its degrees.

To become one of Doane's alumni is, therefore, a distinction which, I assure you, the passing years will bring an increasing awareness. Let me say that to be entrusted with the responsibility of addressing the graduating class of 1963 is a privilege the memory of which I will always cherish.

My gratification at being with you today is greatly increased by the fact that this was Hugh Butler's college.

As a young man and especially during my years as a freshman Congressman I turned often to Senator Butler for counsel and guidance—and sometimes for consolation. I will never forget, and always will be grateful for, the talks we had in his office or home at the end or on the eve of a long legislative day.

Hugh Butler loved the Senate of the United States. Anyone who serves there does. But he loved Doane College more. It was not just that he was a graduate of what he called the class of double-aught or that he was appreciative of what Doane had done for him. It was something deeper than that. It amounted to a complete faith in Doane, in its past and its future.

So I consider it a personal privilege to stand today on the campus of the college which 63 years ago this week handed a diploma to Hugh Butler and sent him on to a distinguished career in business and government.

Although it may be traditional, it was never more true to observe that your generation is living in the midst of the richest, most dramatic and awesome epoch in all history. The statement is not intended to be an appeal to your ego. It is offered as a challenge to your convictions and sense of responsibility. This moment, inescapably, is pivotal for the fate of mankind. Never before in history has so much depended on the cool calculations of so few.

Even with decisions seemingly dictated by the data processing machines which fill the nerve centers of our Nation, the problems of our age have not been reduced to manageable proportions.

This period of history of mankind is unmatched for sheer quantity of power to be disposed, for issues of momentous significance not to one nation alone but to all of the nations on earth, for the possibilities either of achieving a just and lasting peace or precipitating a war that truly will end all wars—and civilization along with it.

With the suddenness by which such an era has come, it is not surprising to find opposing opinions and contradictory forecasts regarding the future. At the same time we are told that the future has a rosy glow and that it will soon climax in a mushroom cloud. In the same manner we are told that we are a nation of conforming sheep and likewise that we have no standards; that we are too liberal and too conservative; that we have cut ourselves off too much from the past and that we are too tradition-bound for a modern age.

I suppose any number of other antinomies have occurred to you. They define a condition of a very complex society and I would not try, if it were even possible, to reconcile them. Rather I make the judgment that with faith the problems of our age can be successfully met. Certainly without it, they will not.

Knowing the capabilities of this and similar graduating classes to do tremendous good for mankind, I propose simply to challenge and possibly to reinforce your own confidence. In short, I plead the case, "let us have faith."

My text is drawn from the address of Abraham Lincoln at Cooper Institute in New York in February 1860. In the final sentence of that great speech he proclaimed: "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it."

The times were fateful then, too, both for Lincoln as a possible candidate for the Presidency and for the Nation. Whatever his ambition, the man had one thought in that hour. That was for the issues which were casting lengthening shadows over the Union, threatening its dissolution. Narrowly, those issues applied only to those times. Yet they had overtones that are relevant to many of our problems today. The terms of Lincoln's approach also apply today. Let us recall the situation briefly.

Lincoln had debated Stephen Douglas across the State of Illinois on the issue of extending slavery in the national territories. Douglas would appease the South by submitting the issue to popular sovereignty in the territories. Lincoln, while leaving slavery where it was, would prevent its extension where it was not. Leaders of the young Republican Party, looking for its first candidate for the Presidency, had been impressed by the cogency and vigor of Lincoln in these debates. He was invited East for a major address on the subject so others could look him over.

Senator Seward, a major contender and one who, as Lincoln had acknowledged, had preeminent claims upon the party in terms of service to it, had just delivered his major address on the issue in Congress. Yet it was Lincoln on the evening of February 27 who said what men of deepest concern were waiting to hear.

Lincoln stated the case of the South with complete honesty and refuted it with sobriety. As the historical Allan Nevins puts it: "Unlike Seward, he did not treat the disunionist threats as so unnatural that no hand would execute them; he implied that the peril was real. He did not gloss over the great divisive issue but explicitly defined it; and instead of appealing to expedient patriotism which would ignore issues, he appealed to a patriotism of principle that would face them."

Throughout the address morality was not blurred. It was held clearly before all. The appeal to faith in the final sentence was made in the teeth of a most direct confrontation of issues, and by looking squarely at the possibility of the most adverse developments.

The faith of which Lincoln spoke was shaped by a consciousness of realities. As such, it required courage as much as anything. It was not without a trust to justify that courage, however. Hence the belief that right makes might. Such faith requires more than firm convictions. It must be followed by action. It is this what Lincoln meant when he said: "And in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Let me suggest today two things in which we can have faith; what is right for us.

I

The first is a faith in the creative possibilities of our human powers.

It is beyond our needs here to cite even a small portion of the major discoveries of your lifetime. It would be difficult even to say what the most important one has been. Developments which have not yet become known may turn out to be more revolutionary than those discoveries that have.

Consider, for example, the potential for harnessing the power of the atom itself, which less than a week ago opened a new era for Nebraska in the plant at Hallam.

In the field of medicine, the antibiotics and mycins have vastly affected us. Through chemistry and genetics the land has been made to bring forth in an abundance surpassing the Biblical milk and honey.

Major Cooper's successful flight of 3 weeks ago reduced the earth in size, to only 88 minutes around now. Television is intercontinental today; tomorrow we expect to see live pictures of the planets.

With the frontiers of knowledge of the processes of life and the nature of the universe continuously receding, is it so rash to say that we can do whatever we decide and are willing to put our efforts to?

We can have faith that such discoveries will bring to mankind a new freedom. Rid of the age-old scourges of sickness and scarcity, unrestrained by the physical barriers of ocean and air, and in touch with one another by new systems of sight and sound, we are at the threshold of achieving even greater human freedom and dignity.

Of course these accomplishments of what once were the wildest of dreams will not come easy. The tasks of tapping the potential defy comprehension. They stagger the imagination.

My purpose, however, is not to remind you of the hazards involved or even to advise you as to how to avoid them. I am content that with the keen discipline developed in your years at Doane you are well equipped to think and act for yourselves. My purpose rather is to emphasize that, whatever field you now shall enter, the future beckons. In responding, it is imperative that you utilize the creative possibilities which lie within your power.

Faith in the individual is no panacea. It is, however, the primary factor if the potential and promises of the future are to be realized.

II

At the outset I suggested that there were two things in which we should have faith. The creative possibilities of the individual is the first of these. The other is a faith in the instruments and institutions of self-government.

As you leave this lovely campus to become doctors, lawyers, clergymen, teachers, scientists, engineers, businessmen, farmers, housewives, or whatever it may be, you will be equally conscious of your role as a citizen. I hope that your sense of responsibilities as a citizen will neither be dulled nor subordinated by the preoccupations of your chosen profession or calling.

There is nothing in your future more important than active participation in self-government. I say this in all earnestness and for compelling reasons.

There are vast and vexatious concerns with which this Republic is faced and which require your most urgent attention.

The problem of peace is one. The annual expenditure of over $50 billion for military purposes is in itself burdensome enough, precluding as it does, needed constructive, nondefense activities. But the fiscal burden is not all. As a nation, we are torn between hysterical peace demonstrations and slogans like "Better Red Then Dead" on the one hand and those who would plunge us into nuclear war on the other.

The threat to peace is heightened by the ill-considered actions of those who profess to see a mellowing in the Kremlin. No greater mistake could be made. The goal of international communism remains what it has always been: world domination.

A similarly serious mistake is being made by those who favor a change in our policy toward Hungary because there have been some minor relaxations in the cruel and harsh oppressions of the Kadar regime. We had before our Senate Internal Security Subcommittee some of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters who survived the bloody and ruthless suppression of the 1956 revolt. It is unfortunate that those who now espouse a softening of our attitude toward Hungary did not hear those anguished, desperate stories.

Another problem concerns the new and emerging nations which compound our difficulties in foreign relations. Claiming their inalienable right to self-government while sometimes exploiting their own people, these governments can raise hard questions regarding their acceptance in the family of nations. And by flirting with communism as they look to the free world for support and protection, these same nations create difficult decisions as to the proper policy to follow.

Another problem is that of human rights. Not overseas, but right at home. The knowledge that the color of a man's skin may determine the extent to which he can exercise his civil rights arouses acute pangs of conscience. Mammoth protests, mass arrests, multiple lawsuits, and the movements of troops all coalesce into a discouraging picture which distorts and minimizes the progress which the last 100 years has witnessed in the field of race relations. A policy of too much talk and not enough action seems to have led us to the point where we are desperately and awkwardly searching out something—almost anything—to throw into the breached wall of our national dignity and effectiveness with our own citizens.

A fourth area of trouble is clearly indicated in the apparent obsession of some persons to enhance the public sector of the national scene at the expense of the private sector, local government, the individual and of the national well-being. This they seek to do by a large scale increase in the size, scope, and cost of our Federal activities.

With a new annual spending base of some $108 billion—33⅓ percent increase over 2½ years ago—and a host of new and expensive social programs, the course is being mapped, not only for a serious deterioration of our fiscal position, but also for a change in our methods of government.

Fortunately, awareness of these dangers is on the increase. More and more, earnest, concerned citizens are applying this test to public officials and their proposals: Do they advocate that this Federal Republic belongs to the Government? Or does it belong to the people?

We know the right answer. It is to be found in our Federal Constitution and in the thrilling progress made by the United States in making available to so many the benefits of democracy. It is these millions to whom this country belongs, and not to its Government, and certainly not to those individuals temporarily in charge of its affairs.

It is in these areas that I urge your concern—peace, emerging nations, human rights at home, fiscal responsibility, and our philosophy of government.

In the wake of tensions and crises thus generated, far too many people lose their nerve, their principles and convictions, their power to act. They lose their faith. They evidence this by yielding to the temptations to downgrade our instruments and institutions of self-government. Regrettably many go so far as to write them off as inadequate to cope with "the felt necessities of the times."

So it is that we witness again—as we did in the thirties—vitriolic attacks on the judicial system. Some call for curbs upon its powers. Others would impose upon it a super supreme court of one kind or another.

Today we observe repeated assaults on the legislative branch, both from within and without the Congress. With increasing frequency we hear cries to abolish or pack certain committees, to revise procedures or rules, to abandon or radically change well-tested, long-accepted practices.

It is popular to disparage our operations of government. It is considered fashionable to refer to Congress as the symbol or cause for the so-called deadlock of democracy.

Why these destructive outbursts? And what deadlock?

Simply this: The complainants are unable to secure acceptance and approval of their solution of the Nation's problems. Their pet programs are rejected—or what is worse—totally ignored after being subjected to such inspection and analysis long considered imperative before any new plan, program, or law is launched to apply to 50 States containing 185 millions of human beings. Hence the frustration, bewilderment, and disappointment are converted into a reckless condemnation of the system of government and its procedures which have brought so much in the way of improvement and advancement in the material and spiritual lot of Americans as well as in the freedom and dignity accorded them. And with a potential and goal of even greater progress virtually assured if only we refuse to be stampeded.

At the risk of destroying or seriously impairing a well-principled, delicately balanced, and highly beneficial arrangement of self-government, the impatience and ego of self-adjudged benefactors leads them to ill-advised excesses to gain their goals of salvation. Thus the long-range values are thrown into discard for immediate political expediency.

III

These problem areas are many and they are serious.

But let us well note that they are overbalanced many times by entries on the credit side of the ledger.

Ours is the oldest government on earth functioning continuously under a written Constitution. We are approaching the conclusion of our second century. Under that document there has been brought more liberty, dignity, material wealth, and spiritual freedom and richness than have ever been visited upon any nation before.

Ours is an open society in which we can engage in self-criticism without fear. As long as we do it respectfully we can and often do differ vigorously with our public officials—our President, our Members of Congress, our Governors, and State legislators.

All of this is healthy.

Moreover, it is to be expected in a dynamic society such as ours. We are not and have not been static. We have grown, developed, progressed; Congress has been reorganized in recent years; procedures have undergone change; old customs have yielded to new conditions.

This process is in rapid movement right now. It will continue. For some, the movement is too slow. For others it is too fast.

For the bulk of us, it is acceptable in rate, and understandable in quality.

We are still the best in the world as a nation—and getting better.

I ask that you maintain and strengthen your faith in our concept of government and the institutions which it has established for law, order, and advancement.

I ask that you reaffirm in your thinking the real source of America's greatness and strength. It is not to be found in our Nation's Capitol, nor in the halls or officials of formal government. America's greatness and strength are to be found in its people, in their diligence, productivity, imagination, creativity. In their vision and in their faith—a faith attached firmly to a conviction to act.

The officials you elect to conduct the affairs of the Nation, and those they appoint to help them in that task, are not the only ones who incur the obligation to support and defend the Constitution.

In a larger sense, the obligation to support the most profound system of self-government yet devised by man rests squarely on each citizen's shoulders—and each of you is such a citizen.

My message this morning is thus for a renewal of faith in the individual based on the belief that man was meant to be free.

The essence of my appeal is found in the words of Judge Learned Hand written 19 years ago:

"Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; no constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it. While it lies there it needs no constitution, no law, no court to save it. * * * (In) that spirit of an America which has never been, and which may never be; nay, which never will be except as the conscience and courage of Americans create it; yet in the spirit of that America which lies hidden in some form in the aspirations of us all * * * in that spirit of liberty and of America I ask you to * * * pledge our faith in the glorious destiny of our beloved country."

In the spirit invoked by Judge Hand, I express congratulations and gratitude to the faculty, administration, staff, and board of this college—and to you, Dr. Typer, as its distinguished president—for your 1963 contribution to a better Republic. It is another year of work well done.

To the graduates and their justifiably proud families, I extend congratulations and best wishes as you conclude another and very meaningful step toward a full and vital citizenship.

DENVER, IND., IS LINKED TO FARAWAY COMMUNITY IN KOREA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in an age when international cooperation is a prerequisite to the survival of all nations in the free world, it is indeed a pleasure to see the growth in friendship between the peoples of Denver, Ind., and Sonyu-ri, Korea. These people have found in their relationship the time-honored principles which underlie successful friendships throughout the world—that is, a sincere desire to learn about the cultures of other nationalities and the ability to mutually respect each other's way of life.

I, along with the people of Denver and Sonyu-ri, hope that more opportunities will arise for other experiments of this nature to take place. It has not only been a fulfilling experience for the people involved, but a step toward peace and international understanding. At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Peru, Ind., Tribune of June 6, be printed in the RECORD.

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

DENVER, IND., IS LINKED TO FARAWAY COMMUNITY IN KOREA

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—There is an interesting sidelight that has developed since Mrs. Lewis Dice, Tribune correspondent in Denver, wrote this story. The Korean girl who is mentioned in the story by Lt. Col. A. John Golden completed the scroll and planned to send it to Mrs. Edgar Lewis, project chairman of the Denver Woman's Study Club. When the mayor and other towns-people heard that the girl was going to mail it and pay for the cost of mailing herself, they persuaded her to let them pay for the cost of sending the scroll airmail to Mrs. Lewis.)

(By Mrs. Lewis Dice)

The sign post reads: Denver, Ind., 7,439.9 miles." It stands at the gates of Camp Pelham in the Republic of Korea, erected by the men in the outfit of Lt. Col. A. John Golden, commanding officer of the camp after they found that Denver is his hometown.

Lieutenant Colonel Golden sent a plea across those miles. It came in a letter to Mrs. Edgar Lewis whose interest in missions and work in church and civic affairs he had known from his youth here as the son of Rev. and Mrs. C. F. Golden. Since going to Korea in November he has become concerned about the people of Sonyu-ri, a village of some 3,000 persons crowded onto about 10 acres adjoining the camp.

In the first letter he wrote: "Sonyu-ri is extremely poor but there are a lot of fine people who are struggling to rid the town of its corruption. This in turn helps me. They have established a police force and help patrol the post to prevent thievery which was so rampant."

He was trying to help them start some small industries so that they may become self-supporting, something of their own which will continue after the military has left. He wrote:

WANT TO TRUST US

"I find the local people desperately want to trust us and to believe that we really are interested in them. They have a high regard for family life. If some way I can tie in my own community back home I feel it will accomplish something of mutual benefit." He stressed that while much was needed, most of all he wished that the people of Denver and vicinity might in some way show their friendship for the people of the village.

Mrs. Lewis presented the letter at a meeting of the Woman's Study Club of Denver and the club voted to sponsor aid to him in his efforts, and Mrs. Lewis was named chairman. Since then there has been an extensive exchange of correspondence between the two, including taped messages to Mrs. Lewis and to the club.

To start the ball rolling, Mrs. Lewis sent Golden a check for $10. Writing to tell her what a morale builder it was, he said: "The people got so excited when I told them my hometown wanted to exchange ideas, culture and friendship. You have no idea what that check will do. First I will show it to them. It means 5 meals of rice (a meal is about a peck) and about 1½ weeks' work. Ten dollars will pay a man for 9 days or 9 men for a day. Seven dollars and fifty cents will buy food for a man for a month."

PLANTING TREES

"Right now," he wrote in one of his letters, "the town people are helping us plant trees, grass, gardens and flowers. In turn we have helped build a levee and provided machinery and other help for their roads and streets and drainage.

"Tree planting is a national project for Koreans and they take great pride in it. (The Republic of Korea Government gives the people pine and locust trees but fruit trees must be purchased and are expensive.) I have received 500 trees to plant on the post and the town is planting them for us. I am buying a peach tree and presenting it to the town with a plaque indicating it is from the officers and men of Camp Pelham to the town in honor of their arbor day. I am convinced that trees know no country nor hatred of men but somehow provide a faith that there is a God who created all things and that man must strive to help his fellow man regardless of nationality.

"I am astounded at the response these people have given me to make this a better place for my men to perform duty and a better country for them as a result of our being here. I am convinced that some worthwhile evidence that my community back home is interested in their welfare will be all the more beneficial to the soldiers who perform duty here."

CLUB SENDS $80

Inspired by the letters and pictures he sent, the Study Club members have contributed about $80 which has been forwarded to Golden. A Korean food package and five school kits have been sent through CARE, to explore possibilities of aid.

Colonel Golden and men in the camp are promoting four self-help projects with citizens of the village: A school and playground, a town hall, self-sustaining projects for employment and the planting of trees.

Plans for the school have been submitted to authorities and it is believed this will be accomplished through joint United States and Korean Government effort. Some swings and teeter-totters have been built for the playground and Golden writes it is a sight to see some 500 children standing in line to take turns playing on them.

The men of Camp Pelham are cooperating to raise a fund to start the town hall which is calculated to cost about $300. The village has no public meeting place except as the town council rents a tavern. When the town hall is started the playground will be set up on a plot of ground adjoining it so that the equipment can be protected from thieves. Mothers will supervise the playground.

Golden says: "The money you have sent will go to support the No. 3 project (employment) right now, but in the minds of the people you are supporting all four. We must make every dollar count in a way to help good people stand up tall and the thieves, beggars, loafers, prostitutes, etc., unpopular."

REPAIR ARTIST SHOP

He sent a clipping from "Stars and Stripes" showing a picture of a Korean girl who has a little art shop in Sonyu-ri where she makes color portraits from black and white snapshots. She also does charcoal sketches from live models at two service clubs each week. He wrote:

"She has a tiny shop with broken windows and the most beautiful smile you ever saw. Just like you read in missionary articles of people with extreme faith to do something constructive." He gave her funds to repair her shop and buy paints and brushes. In appreciation she is making a scroll to be sent to the Denver club.

"One reason that I do not want to spend any more dollars than necessary," he writes, "is that the national policy is to conserve dollars spent overseas and second we don't have it to spend. Also the Korean Government has a responsibility to help their own people. By encouraging to spend money for them, i.e., the school. Also the people support their own community organization when they know it is helping them."

"The mayor brought over 50 people to help us put in a 6-inch sewer line. There were several women with babies strapped on their backs. We fed them dinner and supper. The men gave them different times also. One day people came from a town 10 miles away to help dig ditches and do other work that had us whipped for a while. No one talks much about it but there is a real bond between these people and the men now."

MAKE STRAW ROPES

In one of the latest letters he reports that several Koreans had been employed by the camp to make straw ropes for camouflage for maneuvers. Then the children were treated with candy, soft drinks, and milk by the men of Camp Pelham. He stated that material for the ropes and treats for the children had cost about $28.

Quoting from other letters:

"The more I learn about these people the more ashamed I am. They are really hungry but they never complain. In fact, the mayor said they have been living like this for 1,000 years and they feel sorry that we make life so complicated. Quite frankly, I often envy them. They love their little farms and are meticulous in their work. Everything is so precise and exact in their fields. The troublemakers are the same as at home—the people who make a living off people rather than work.

"The mayor of the town reminds me of my Grandfather Cunningham. He works hard day after day. He tries to help people get on their feet. He hates drifters and lazy ones, with a passion. Everyone who has trouble blames it on him. They have backed him pretty well since we got the meal for them. (150 hundred-pound bags of flour procured through the aid of the Catholic chaplain.)

He goes around collecting from the ones who have steady jobs and buys rice and flour for the really destitute. He makes the lazy ones work or they can't eat. At one time they brought pressure on him to get gasoline and material from the army but he has convinced them that those days are over and everything must be accounted for. The amazing thing is he gets no pay at all. He is selected by 15 councilmen and is actually the 16th. If they don't like him he gets fired by the simple fact that they take a vote and elect another one. He has an amazing desire to help his people but it is the same the world over, they jump all over him.

"The little town is in a battle for its life against the syndicate, Communist sympathizers, criminals and petty thieves. I had to have something to give them the courage to stay with it. That something is faith in America. When I prove to them that the civilian community that raised me is concerned with their problems—that's the missing element here. They don't understand the cars and machinery, nor do they need to. They understand life and the terrible problem it is to sustain it. Regardless of race and creed it is the same. The well person must always help the sick and helpless. The community back home is not wealthy nor perhaps even well-to-do by some American standards but it is strong and healthy. It's not enough for these people just to survive. Over here we must first earn their respect and then give them a helping hand until they get on their feet."

This his friends hope to help him do to whatever extent they are able. Pupils in the vacation Bible school at Chili where Golden's wife, Helen, and daughter, Janelle, reside are collecting used clothing to send to the Korean children. Although the club season is closed members will be on the job all summer to receive gifts for the Korean project and channel them through Colonel Golden to the village of Sonyu-ri 7,439.9 miles away.

POVERTY AND THE LAW

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum entitled "Poverty and the Law—The Constitutional Rights of Assistance Recipients," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This memorandum, which was prepared by Elizabeth Wickenden, technical consultant on public social policy of the National Social Welfare Assembly, has stirred a great deal of interest in this matter and I know Members of Congress will find it of value.

The memorandum was prepared in order to further discussion, research, and possible legal action on a problem which seems to be increasingly evident in many parts of the country, namely, actions which have the effect of depriving recipients of public assistance of their basic rights.

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

POVERTY AND THE LAW—THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS

Many critics of the contemporary social scene, including lawyers and others dedicated to the role of law in the democratic process, have recently expressed their concern over the mounting evidence that poverty itself constitutes a barrier to equal treatment under law. For example, in a recent interview on "The Law" published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Mr. Edward Bennett Williams in reply to the question, "What do you consider to be the most urgent problem in the administration of the law?" answered: "The most urgent one centers around the defense of the indigent." In a brief before the Supreme Court challenging the constitutionality of the situation created for indigent defendants in States which do not provide defense counsel in such cases,[1] Mr. Abe Fortas argues: "To convict the poor without counsel while we guarantee a right to counsel to those who can afford it is also a denial of equal protection of the laws." There are many other areas where lack of resources precludes an adequate defense, freedom from incarceration under bail, the ability to appeal an adverse decision, or access to the facilities of the law as in civil proceedings.

Recently, however, a new concern has arisen among lawyers, social workers, and others interested in protecting the constitutional rights of all Americans regardless of their economic or social status. This is the growing disposition in some States and localities to apply a different standard of law enforcement to persons because of their poverty, especially if that poverty is reflected in dependence upon tax-supported benefits such as public assistance. Examples of this trend may be seen in the following kinds of specific cases:

In three New Jersey counties mothers of illegitimate children have been subject to prosecution under otherwise rarely enforced adultery and fornication laws upon applying for public assistance. Newspaper articles have made it clear that this type of action is restricted to applicants for, or recipients of, welfare aid.

In Connecticut a mother of an illegitimate child receiving public assistance, who had recently come to Connecticut from a Southern State, was subject to deportation action by the State. Court action brought by the Legal Aid Society on a question of constitutionality (under the Supreme Court decision in the *Edwards* case) resulted in a withdrawal of this particular action but the policy is said to persist.

In many jurisdictions night raids upon assistance recipients to determine the presence of a man in the house are common practice. (This is based on the assumption that such a man is either the father of the children, who should therefore be legally responsible for their support, or his very presence presumes a moral responsibility to support the mother's children.) Recently in Alameda County, Calif., for example, a widely publicized night raid was conducted in a single night on 500 mothers receiving assistance for the support of their needy children.[2] It is maintained that no search warrant is required in these cases on the ground that these investigations are solely concerned with eligibility for a benefit conditioned by specified eligibility criteria, some of which can only be checked in this manner. Failure to cooperate by admitting such night raid investigators typically results in the discontinuance of public assistance. The constitutional limits upon the investigative process involved in determining eligibility for assistance has never been clearly established.

In each of these situations a constitutional guarantee (equal treatment under the law, freedom of movement among the States, and rights to privacy) would seem to have been denied to persons primarily distinguished by their poverty.

Dependency on public aid may also invite two other types of penalty deriving from an inequitable application of the concept of child neglect. Since the protection of children (together with their responsible parents) from destitution and their protection from neglect on the part of those same parents are both typically public welfare functions, the relationship between the two presents more complex problems which are discussed separately below. However, for purposes of identification, these two types of penalizing actions which might raise constitutional issues of inequitable treatment are—

Referral or threatened referral of mothers of children in receipt of public assistance (most commonly illegitimate children) to courts on neglect charges on a different basis from that applied to children in similar circumstances who are not receiving public assistance.

Application of criminal or civil penalties to mothers in receipt of assistance for alleged mismanagement of their assistance grants in the absence of alleged fraud or child neglect (with its concomitant obligation of protective action toward the child).

THE LEGAL BASIS OF ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE

Public welfare agencies of the States and their political subdivisions are responsible for the administration of State laws which establish eligibility for welfare benefits and hence determine the limits of possible fraud or misrepresentation in seeking or accepting such benefits. Under these State laws fraud actions are brought in State courts, typically on the basis of an initial referral from the public welfare agency with a subsequent development of evidence by the prosecutor's office.

However, in order to qualify for Federal financial participation in a State public assistance program (and the Federal share may exceed 80 percent in some cases) State law and practice must comply with a number of requirements of the Federal Social Security Act which affect individual eligibility and entitlements. The Federal law requires

[1] Declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in a 9 to 0 decision on March 18, 1963.

[2] Subsequently the constitutionality of this action has been challenged in two different proceedings. At a hearing called by the California State Board of Social Welfare the use of mass night raids was questioned as contravening both the Federal Constitution and existing State regulations. A social worker, Benny Parrish, who was discharged by the Alameda County Welfare Department for insubordination because of his refusal to participate in the night raid initiated reinstatement action on the grounds that the raid was itself unconstitutional and otherwise illegal and therefore his refusal could not be considered insubordination. If in this administrative proceeding his reinstatement is denied, this case may be reviewed in the courts.

that eligibility for assistance be based on an individual determination of needs and resources in each case but that the standards governing such eligibility determinations be equally applicable to all persons in similar circumstances in all parts of the State. Similar requirements govern the level of assistance given to persons in similar circumstances in all parts of the State. The Federal law also requires that the administering public welfare agency receive and act promptly upon all applications and that the applicant or recipient be given the right to appeal any decision.

All of these Federal requirements have the effect of circumscribing the limitations States are able to impose on eligibility for federally aided assistance, especially with respect to particular groups. This has proved especially significant with respect to needy persons whose behavior patterns, race, or newcomer status make them subject to community attitudes which might otherwise restrict their access to assistance.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Nowhere is the role of the Federal law in assuring equal access to federally aided benefits in accordance with established principles under the equal protection and due process clauses of the Federal Constitution more important than in the category of "Aid to Families with Dependent Children" (AFDC) authorized by title IV of the Social Security Act. This has become increasingly evident in recent years when the availability of social insurance benefits both for surviving widows and orphans and for insured workers suffering permanent disability, has served to accentuate the social problem character of welfare dependency. The growing proportion of children in need of assistance because of desertion, illegitimacy and divorce (without adequate provision for their support) has been further aggravated by the fact that until 1961 this federally aided assistance could be given only to children deprived of parental support by reasons of death, disability, or absence from the home. Thus children in a two-parent family in need because of unemployment were less privileged than those in need because of illegitimacy or desertion. While States are gradually moving to take advantage of the new authority to extend federally aided assistance to families in need because of unemployment, community resentment toward families in need because of socially disapproved behavior persists. This resentment is aggravated by the fact that this group typically includes a disproportionate number of persons of minority status. Poverty, discriminatory employment practices, inadequate education, traditional cultural patterns, social isolation, and lack of access to such legal processes as divorce make disproportionate numbers of Negroes on assistance rolls an inevitable consequence of discrimination as "An American Dilemma" predicted in 1944.

Many efforts have been made by State legislatures to circumvent Federal requirements for equal access to these benefits. Federal interpretations have developed somewhat greater precision as a consequence. The following situations illustrate this development:

Georgia and Louisiana laws: A law passed by the Georgia legislature in 1951 provided for the denial of assistance to more than one illegitimate child of a mother. The Social Security Administration advised that a formal hearing under the Social Security Act with respect to the legal and constitutional issues involved would be required if this law was implemented. No such hearing occurred because the law was subsequently repealed. The Social Security Administration subsequently issued similar advice with respect to a virtually identical law enacted by the Louisiana legislature. These determinations by the Social Security Administration were based on the proposition that denial of assistance to a child who met all of the State's other eligibility requirements, solely because of the legal circumstances surrounding his birth, was discriminatory and constituted an unreasonable classification in the light of the purposes of the Federal program.

Substitute approaches: Subsequent to the above Federal interpretations with respect to the Georgia and Louisiana laws, a number of devices have since been used or proposed for the purpose of excluding illegitimate children or others in families with unacceptable behavior patterns. These devices are equally arbitrary but less direct. Many of these are clearly discriminatory in their effect and, therefore, may well raise the same questions of equitable treatment under both Federal and State law and administrative practice. Under its authority to determine whether States receiving Federal grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act are conforming with the plan requirements conditioning such aid (and the principles inherent in our Federal constitutional guarantees) the Social Security Administration has moved gradually to clarify its own position on some but not all of these indirect approaches.

Louisiana "suitable home" controversy: One of these precipitated the regulation resulting from the so-called Flemming ruling of 1961, subsequently incorporated in the Social Security Act in a somewhat modified form. The Flemming ruling resulted from the passage of a second Louisiana law which provided that assistance could be given only to a child living in a "suitable home."[3] This law provides that any home must be deemed "unsuitable" if an illegitimate child was born to the mother subsequent to her receipt of assistance. As a result of the retroactive application of this law, 26,000 needy children were dropped from the public assistance rolls in Louisiana.

At the hearing called by the Social Security Commissioner to determine whether this action was in conformity with Federal law and protections of the Constitution, two questions of law were argued by counsel for the Federal and State governments and by five lawyers presenting amicus curiae briefs on behalf of interested voluntary agencies: (1) Did the action of Louisiana contravene Federal law as currently interpreted by the Social Security Administration and (2) did the Social Security Commissioner under the Social Security Act have the authority to rule such State policy and action "out of conformity" with Federal requirements. The ruling of HEW Secretary Arthur Flemming held that, while the answer to the first question was negative, the answer to the second was affirmative and the Social Security Act did contain such authority. The ensuing ruling required that as of a future effective date federally aided assistance could not be denied to an otherwise eligible child on the grounds that his home was "unsuitable" so long as the child remained in the home. This was subsequently modified in the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments to provide that a child who was otherwise eligible could not be denied federally aided assistance because of an unsuitable home unless other provisions were made for his care. Such provisions might include voluntary placement with other relatives eligible to receive public assistance payments in his behalf, removal of the child from the home on neglect charges by court order, or transfer to nonfederally aided general assistance. These decisions reflect the interaction of State responsibility to protect children against neglect and to extend assistance in time of need.

Richmond, Va.: The emphasis on this relationship has encouraged States to explore, and in some cases, to use the threat of actual institution of neglect proceedings as a means of eliminating certain kinds of cases from the assistance rolls. For example, the Richmond, Va., Times Dispatch of January 30, 1963, carries a story under the caption "City Welfare Office Acts Against Unwed Mothers" which begins as follows:

"Twenty-three women on city relief have given birth to second or subsequent illegitimate children since July 1, Welfare Director Raleigh C. Hobson said yesterday.

"And, under a new welfare department policy, court action has been taken or begun against all 23, he told members of district V, Virginia Council on Social Welfare.

"The women are taken to juvenile and domestic relations court on warrants for a court decision on whether they are suitable mothers."

The story indicates that in no case did the judge actually remove the children in question from their mothers' custody. (Such action would be extremely unlikely in most jurisdictions because of the almost total absence of substitute care arrangements for Negro children). This, however, in no way changes the basic fact that these women were subject to legal action solely because of their receipt of public assistance. It is reasonably safe to assume that family situations involving the same facts but no applications for or receipt of assistance were not so referred.

Intimidating effect: The basically significant effect of such policies is, however, one of intimidation. For many women in this situation, especially among Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican-Americans, the unforgivable sin is to give up their children to public authorities. If this becomes the actual or threatened price of public assistance, they will withdraw from or fail to apply for assistance no matter what their need or what the ultimate deprivation to their children. This is most clearly evidenced in the experience under a plan used in Florida and recently adopted by Louisiana to replace its outlawed suitable home policy.

Florida plan: In Florida, a mother of illegitimate children applying for assistance is granted aid if otherwise eligible but told that her situation must be studied by a special review team in order to determine whether court referral on neglect charges is not necessary. While relatively few referrals are actually made and virtually no children have been removed by court order, the effect on a group of mothers whose loyalty to their children is a dominant characteristic has been dramatic: that is, 45 percent voluntarily withdrew from the assistance rolls.

Maryland and Pennsylvania proposals: In a pair of bills currently pending before the Maryland Legislature the inequitable use of the neglect concept is even more pointed: (1) "Neglect" is redefined to include the occurrence of an illegitimate pregnancy in any family with one or more children and (2) the welfare agency is required to refer all such cases appearing among families in receipt of assistance to the courts after a 1-month grace period. A similar bill pending in the Pennsylvania Legislature provides comparable mandatory court referral of AFDC families under similar circumstances such as illegitimate pregnancy. The Florida experience indicates that such laws will produce a wholesale voluntary withdrawal from the exposure of public assistance to the relative safety of anonymous, if unaided, destitution.

---

[3] For a more detailed discussion of the suitable home concept in relationship to public assistance, see a forthcoming report by Winifred Bell entitled "Rejected Families: A Study of the 'Suitable Home' Concept in Aid to Dependent Children."

These proposals not only raise questions regarding inequitable treatment of persons under similar circumstances but also completely contravene the traditional concept of neglect in which each case is judged in terms of its individual circumstances and not on the basis of some sweeping categorical definitions which may or may not be damaging the particular child in question. Moreover, both these proposed bills and the Florida practice distort the concept of child neglect in a way that would appear to damage rather than safeguard the child's interests. If the mother withdraws from assistance in order to be sure of keeping her child, the child has neither the source of income to which it was legally entitled nor a court review of the adequacy of its home situation. On both counts, is not such a child denied the equality of protection under the law which our Constitution requires?

CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR FUND MISMANAGEMENT

The Federal Social Security Act was recently amended to modify the unrestricted money payment requirement by permitting States to impose criminal or civil penalties on mothers of dependent children for mismanagement of assistance funds following an official warning. Though still too recent to afford any useful experience, this provision would seem likewise to penalize a child for the alleged misdeeds of his parents without assuring to him the protective concern of a neglect proceeding. Moreover, it could well impose a different standard of civil liability on assistance recipients than is applicable to others in the population. Its potentialities as a punitive measure for socially unacceptable behavior on the part of those dependent on public aid are obvious.

USE OF LEGAL PROCEEDINGS TO TEST ASSISTANCE POLICIES

Welfare policies have rarely been challenged in the courts by individuals or groups who feel that their rights have been abridged. The very poverty of those who depend upon assistance makes this impractical and organizations have not interested themselves in this area to the same extent as in questions of racial or religious discrimination. Organizations interested in welfare policy have typically sought to exert their influence at the point of legislative or administrative decision rather than seeking court review of questionable laws or administrative practices.

Nevertheless, the possibilities for legal remedies do exist in the appeals procedure and in the courts, both State and Federal. This memorandum has been written to encourage lawyers and others interested in assuring the protections of the Constitution to all groups in the population to consider these possibilities.

REVERSE FREEDOM RIDER

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, about 1 year ago the first reverse freedom rider was sent to Jersey City from New Orleans amidst international publicity.

Recently, the Jersey Journal carried a report about Mr. Louis Ernest Boyd and his family of eight children and the results of his residency thus far in Jersey City.

Mr. Boyd and his family now live in an apartment in the A. Harry Moore development at Lincoln Park, a public housing project. I am informed by the director of tenant relations, Mr. Conrad J. Vuocolo, that the family is getting along well from the standpoint of employment, schooling and community relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Jersey Journal be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Jersey City Journal, May 22, 1963]

ERNEST BOYD: SOLID J.C. RESIDENT—FIRST REVERSE FREEDOM RIDER OVERCOMES WHITE CITIZENS' BIGOTRY

(By Judson Hand)

Louis Ernest Boyd scored against bigotry by becoming a solid Jersey City citizen.

A year ago, Boyd was internationally known as the first reverse freedom rider.

The White Citizens Council of New Orleans had sent him north with a one-way bus ticket and $50 pocket money.

A council representative, on hand at the New Orleans bus depot, explained why:

"We hope to show the Negroes who their real friends are," he said. "We'll see what those persons up north who have been maligning the South do for them."

The 42-year-old Boyd had worked for 20 years as a New Orleans longshoreman. In 1959 he contracted pneumonia and, when he left the hospital, he found that automation had wiped out his old job.

With no work open to him and few skills to offer, Boyd went on relief. He was hard pressed to feed his wife and eight children.

A little over a year ago, Louisiana cut off his relief payments, saying he was fit to work. Boyd said his doctor had told him he could perform only light duties.

Suddenly, by way of television, an opportunity came. The White Citizens Council offered to provide free bus trips north to any Negro who was unhappy in the South. Boyd jumped at the chance—and into a national spotlight.

Roy Wilkins, president of the NAACP, described the freedom trip as "a pretty cheap stunt." Senator JACOB JAVITS, Republican, of New York, called it "shameful." Bigots everywhere believed Boyd could not make a new life.

First Louis Ernest Boyd found a $100 a week job as a truckdriver and handyman in Jersey City. This job fell through and he was crushed for a time.

Boyd's courage did not falter. Jersey City ministers, businessmen, the NAACP, the Urban League and others rallied behind him. Louis Ernest Boyd found another job, this one with a rolling steel mill in Jersey City.

Some months ago he moved to a modern five-bedroom apartment in the A. Harry Moore housing project, just across the street from Lincoln Park. His neighbors represent many ethnic groups.

"Believe me, they are a fine family. It's a privilege to serve them," says Conrad Vuocolo, head of tenant relations for Jersey City housing.

Boyd's eight children are doing well at School 39. The family are parishioners at St. John's Episcopal Church on Summit Avenue, where it is reported the children are among the best behaved at the Sunday School.

Not that Louis Ernest Boyd has an easy life supporting a family of 10, but he once told a Jersey Journal reporter, "All I want is to settle down and work like any other man."

And that's exactly what he has done in Jersey City. He is doing very well on his own in the North now.

The Citizens Council apparently did him a favor.

KAMEHAMEHA AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the State of Hawaii is justly proud of her reputation as a showplace of racial harmony, where peoples of many races and cultures live and work closely together.

Her outstanding record in race relations had its beginnings in the ancient monarchy of Hawaii and, indeed, coincides with Hawaii's emergence as a unified kingdom in 1795 during the reign of Kamehameha I.

It was this great king who established the first civil rights in Hawaii, when in 1797 he promulgated the "law of the splintered paddle."

The story behind this first Hawaii civil rights law is recounted in a Honolulu Star-Bulletin editorial appearing on June 11, 1963, a day the State annually sets aside to honor Kamehameha's memory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this 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:

KAMEHAMEHA AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Kamehameha, the founder of the dynasty which bears his name, was born into a society in which there were no civil rights.

Each chief was the absolute ruler of his people and maintained his ascendancy with a cruel tabu system, and the death penalty.

The first recognition that government had a responsibility to protect its people, a rudimentary recognition of civil rights, probably was Kamehameha's famous "law of the splintered paddle."

The story is told that during the years when he was consolidating his rule on the Island of Hawaii, Kamehameha engaged in raiding expeditions along the Puna coast.

During one of these, the warrior was set upon by Puna fishermen who resisted his efforts to plunder their village.

One fisherman, bolder and stronger than the rest, brought his canoe paddle down heavily on Kamehameha, splintering the weapon. Kamehameha barely escaped with his life.

Later, when Kamehameha was undisputed ruler of the island, the fisherman was brought before him for sentence. Kamehameha, acknowledging that he, not the fisherman, was in the wrong, forgave the man and propounded the historic law of the splintered paddle.

He, Kamehameha, would guarantee to all his people their physical security from robbers and brigands. Indeed, they might lie beside the highway and not be molested, on pain of death to any who might violate the edict.

In thus recognizing both the right of his people to be secure in their homes and their belongings, and government's responsibility to protect this right, Kamehameha established the first civil rights in Hawaii.

And it is on this, as much as upon his prowess as a warrior and his ability as an administrator, that the merited fame of the first king of all Hawaii rests.

His memory is honored today because he was as great in the ways of peace as he was great in the ways of war.

CALIFORNIA ELECTS ANOTHER NEW REPUBLICAN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, to the gratification of many and to the surprise of more the resurging and reinvigorated Republican Party in California has come up with another Republican victory in a congressional district long

represented by a Democrat. This second such success within a few short months in which a sitting Democratic Congressman representing a long-time Democratic district has been succeeded by a Republican Congressman elected in a special election has important national significance.

These two election upsets in our country's largest State indicate Americans are getting tired of an administration which persistently substitutes attractive adjectives for appropriate action.

Yes, Mr. President, Americans are getting tired of continuing deficits; of programs which would institute a new WPA program in the midst of plenty; of the steady proliferation of one new agency or bureau upon another with the inevitable substantial increase in the overstaffing of Government payrolls; of an administration of foreign policies which are vague, defensive, and apologetic; of indecision in high places and of intemerate exercise of great authority by lesser officials. Americans are looking forward to an opportunity to change these and other similar ineptitudes and inadequacies in 1964. North, south, east, and west, Republicanism is on the march. It is a pleasure to see Californians in the vanguard of the parade for progress.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a George Todt column commenting on the factors leading to the election of Republican Congressman DEL CLAUSON, former mayor of Compton, Calif., in the recent byelection in that great State.

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

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: WHAT MAKES POLITICS?

What makes a political candidate become a man to be reckoned with? How does he cause us to like him? Who does he really impress by his actions?

Recently I heard a southlander running for Congress say something so different from anything I can remember before that it shook me.

In response to a direct question by a lady in the audience, in which I was seated, the aspirant said publicly: "No, I shall not attempt to gain favor with any minority group by promising special considerations. I shall be absolutely fair and impartial."

The man was Del Clauson, mayor of Compton for the past 10 years, and presently running tomorrow for the congressional seat in the 23d District vacated by the death of the late Hon. Clyde Doyle.

THE BUNK

He had preceded me on the lecture platform before the alert Downey Republican Women's Club last May 27—and the ladies cheered him to the rafters for his bold statement of fact. He really meant it.

This is the kind of politician for you and me. Favoritism and partiality are the bunk. What we want is the kind of man who is willing to give us a fair deal—and let the chips fall thereafter.

One of the banes of American political life in these modern times we live in today is the unholy pressure put on men running for office by numerous self-serving minorities. Each wants a special edge on everybody else.

TOO MANY PROMISES

Actually, we all are members of various minorities of some kind or other. When everybody demands his unfair cut, if the politican has made too many easy promises, some are bound to be left out and disappointed.

It would be much better if all politicians followed the example of Clauson and refused to make improper deals with anyone.

I would have the greatest respect for the honest man who merely said he would be guided by his best judgment under any given circumstance while in office—and would do his best to be fair at all times.

That would be good enough for me. How about you?

No way to know in advance if Clauson is going to win his seat Tuesday but I will always admire his exemplary stand on minorities. No deals!

WHICH COURSE?

We had good officers and bad officers in the Army during World War II—as I recall—just as there were good and bad GIs, too.

But I remember reading on one occasion in the officer's guide about two distinct ways to be a successful member of the corps. You had a choice between letting a selfish clique run the show and keep you out of trouble in return for backing them up to the limit—or rely on absolute fairness and impartiality.

Actually, you could make it either way. Which would you take?

I know in advance the choice Del Clauson would have made.

"SHE HAS CONSERVED A GREAT CONSERVATIONIST"

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF] in appreciation of the testimonial dinner in which the great national organizations concerned with conservation paid tribute to "Mr. Conservation," the beloved Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

It was an exciting event with a surprise ending. Mr. Howard Zahniser, director of the Wilderness Society, called Mrs. Anderson to the dais and presented her with a special award.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Zahniser's remarks entitled "She Has Conserved a Great Conservationist" be placed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege to express at this time our special appreciation to Mrs. Anderson, and, if I may so add, an appreciation thus to all the ladies who are with us and to all those others, too, who do so much for conservation but are so seldom recognized.

Those of us who have worked in conservation fields have realized especially well that it is difficult indeed to continue long or maintain an effectiveness without the support and cooperation, the tolerance and charity, of a good and sweet wife (who also must be strict and stern on occasion).

When we began, with this occasion in mind, to consider the innumerable accomplishments of Senator ANDERSON, remembering the many times we have seen his gallant effectiveness, we soon surmised that he must be accustomed to setting forth from home with the blessing of someone with patience and charm, a contagious assurance, and perhaps some authority too.

What we had surmised, investigation readily confirmed. Mrs. Anderson's services, like those of the Senator himself, have been far greater than ordinary, although like those of most wives, they have been little known.

Henrietta McCartney knew when she became the bride of CLINTON ANDERSON that she was undertaking more than ordinary wifely responsibilities.

Her husband's repeated health problems, his impatience with inactivity, his refusal to excuse himself from responsibilities, his consequent almost continuous lavish expenditure of energies, which in his case are unusually precious, have through the years tested her resources and have in truth proved her conservation of this great man to be truly phenomenal.

Of his years of accomplishment that we now honor, one score and ten, by his own estimate, we can well appreciate as an extension of his years that we owe to Mrs. Anderson. They are a measure of the gratitude and appreciation we have for her. She has conserved a great conservationist.

So we have learned what our hearts had led us to expect, and we have been pleased to prepare a plaque for Mrs. Anderson, also, for her devoted assistance to her distinguished husband.

"Her husband is known in the gates, when he sitteth among the elders of the land." (Proverbs 31:23) In his eminence, as the writer of Proverbs long ago led us to expect, we see also her virtues, and with him we honor her too.

Mrs. Anderson, it is my pleasure, a privilege indeed, to present to you, with our compliments and appreciation, this plaque, which includes a reproduction of that presented to the great man with whom you live, and in addition, it reads as follows: "Presented to Henrietta McCartney Anderson for her devoted assistance to her distinguished husband."

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT ST. PETERSBURG JUNIOR COLLEGE, ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if we are to surmount the crisis in race relations which now faces us, men of conscience must speak out forcefully on the moral issues and obligations which are involved. It is particularly encouraging to see a distinguished leader of the South—the area in which the direct confrontation is taking place between the Constitution and right on the one hand and unjust social and legal practices on the other—taking such a strong public stand.

Former Gov. Leroy Collins, of Florida, now president of the National Association of Broadcasters, in a recent commencement address at the St. Petersburg, Fla., Junior College, issued an impressive challenge to Southern leadership to declare for justice in the present crisis despite the unpopularity with some of such a stand. I think Mr. Collins' speech is thoroughly in keeping with his fine public position on this and other issues, and that it deserves wide attention. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY LEROY COLLINS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, ST. PETERSBURG JUNIOR COLLEGE, ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., JUNE 7, 1963

I consider it a great honor to take part in this ceremony, to be present at this very important event in your lives, graduates, and to be visiting again one of the finest junior colleges in America.

It is also a great thrill to be home again. Florida will always be home to all of our family, and I will never cease to be grateful for the privilege of serving as your Governor.

I know this day brings to the members of this graduating class mixed emotions. Doubtless you like the idea of getting out, and yet leaving has its pains, too.

Perhaps you feel like the little boy whose grandmother gave him a pin cushion for Christmas. His "thank you" note went like this: "Dear Granny, I thank you for the pincushion. This is something I have always wanted—but not very much."

If your education thus far has served you well, from this day forward you have the responsibility to continue your learning, to draw your own conclusions, to explore life in your own way. Education has given you new knowledge and has helped free your mind from the darkness, the narrowness, the groundless fears and self-defeating passions of ignorance.

In a troubled, anxious world I think we tend to look for some person, some philosophy, that will furnish us with the right answers to our problems. We assume, to begin with, that every problem has a pat answer. But getting answers this way is like using the old arithmetic book that had the answers in the back.

The temptation is to start with the answer and try to make it fit the problem. It didn't work very well then, and time hasn't improved the process.

The world, of course, is full of answers and people who are willing to furnish them at a moment's notice. Ready-made answers, however, are sometimes contradictory, often biased, and because of the great growth of knowledge, frequently irrelevant. Thus, a culture that is "answer" dominated—in which the question becomes secondary, the answer primary, is misdirected.

We should start with questions and the paramount one for each of us is: What is the chief end of man? Or, what am I here for?

Wise men have suggested that we are here to find fulfillment as individual human beings, to grow in our ability to live and work harmoniously with others. That is the challenge more than the answer. The task of the individual is to help set conditions for growth—growth of the individual and of the culture of which he is a member. It is the individual's task to find out how his growth is being hindered, and to discover new ways to release his best energies.

Answers come in countless ways and take many forms. The germ of each is in the spirit. Their development is greatly influenced by chance as well as by choice. They are likely to find maturity—to have their testing and proving-out—in conflict. The responsibility for all this is yours.

We know that the world was not made the way it is today—complete with transistors. Man's good fortune is to be born in one world, grow up in another, and grow old in a third.

The physical truth of this was impressed upon me the other day by a friend who had just taken a trip from the east coast to the west coast by nonstop jet flight. He said his seat neighbor turned out to be a lady in her late eighties who told him, as they were cruising at 35,000 feet, that this was her second trip West and that on the first, when she was only 7 years of age, she rode in a covered wagon, and in an attack by Indians her sister was scalped.

Now I was a little skeptical about this tale, but I later checked some history, and whether it happened to this old lady or not, some people were riding West that way, and Indians were scalping some little girls at about the time to which she referred. What a change in a single lifetime.

Each generation has had its men and women of questing spirit whose creative and inquiring minds have been determined to reach out beyond the known.

You men and women of this St. Petersburg Junior College graduating class have the opportunity to be among this number. The wealth of knowledge, discovery and accomplishment is spread before you.

Behind you are the wellsprings of history which offer you understanding, stability, and inspiration. Their eternal truth was so well expressed by Santayana when he advised: "Those who will not learn from history are condemned to repeat it."

William Faulkner once made this observation: "What's wrong with the world," he said, "is it's not finished yet. It is not completed to the point where man can put his final signature to the job and say, 'It is finished. We made it and it works.'"

This is one of the joys of being young and living in our country today. You know that you will never see Faulkner's finished world in your generation or in the generation of your children. It is this awareness that makes it possible for you to participate in a society that is dynamic, changing; one that stands in need of what you can offer with your mind, your heart, and your body.

If I could leave with you today a single thought which might linger on in your contemplation, I would like it to be simply this: It is important that people believe—that they have beliefs that they hold to strongly and strive to live by. For in this fragile existence we share, in this tenuous world in which we live, it is beliefs that can provide the human ship with a strong and true keel adequate for life's voyage.

Now it is not for me, or any other, to write the prescription for the forms your beliefs should take. This is everyone's life quest. It is the individual's inviolate responsibility to fashion beliefs for himself.

But of this I am sure: A man needs to believe deeply and strive for something beyond purely selfish purposes. His primary aims must be beyond physical survival—beyond the satisfactions of material comforts.

Nor is it enough to limit one's perspective to his own personal horizons. What happens in the great "out there" must be one of every man's grave inner concerns. For war and disorder anywhere, and the human conflict which nourishes such, now shake the foundations of all houses everywhere.

We often hear that the world is becoming smaller and smaller, and indeed from a physical point of view this is true. Instantaneous communication and fast transportation are seeing to that.

But thus far our skill and aptitudes for human relationships have failed miserably to keep pace with our technological progress. We are experiencing physical closeness without the compatibility that comes from understanding and mutual interest, and that doesn't work for nations any better than it does for individuals. Such a circumstance, if not improved, is far more likely to produce disunity than accord, to foment war more surely than peace.

We have allowed the potential brilliance of our age to be overcast by the threat of nuclear disaster; and with the presence of starvation haunting the lives of half the world's population, we face neither day nor night, but a new twilight of our own making.

To write off all the political, economic, and social restlessness throughout the world as Communist-inspired is to deny our intelligence. Much of it is inspired by the very basic desire for simple human dignity, to have room to live and breathe, to eat and vote, even to read and write.

To misunderstand the real issues involved almost surely means to misjudge the policies which should be applied for coping with them.

The answers to seemingly insoluble world problems, regardless of the form they may take, or the forum in which they are debated, must be bottomed upon a very broad belief in the universal brotherhood of man.

And a belief like this is grounded not just in the mind, but deeply in the heart and the will. It must be more than an intellectual conviction. It must be a feeling that takes hold and will not let one go.

Our Founding Fathers held this kind of belief in the brotherhood of man when they spelled out in the Declaration of Independence the philosophy of our Government. They reached out to all humanity with the words: "All men are created equal." This was the ark and covenant by which they felt Americans should be guided.

Continually we must call upon ourselves to rekindle the splendor of this bold dream. Custom and human frailty have dimmed it for us. For too many, it is little more than Fourth of July rhetoric. We indulge and take for granted tragic examples of man's inhumanity to man, which should shock us.

The spirit of 1776 that fostered our democratic government was one of broad vision despite limited material means. Too often today, with our booming production lines, we sit back blinded, fat and inert, feeling that so long as things go smoothly for us, all must be right with the world. In an affluent age, are we not thus in danger of producing a poverty-stricken spirit?

Today, the United States is witnessing an era of racial turmoil as the Negro, freed from slavery a century ago, is making his greatest effort to enter the mainstream of American life—to win a full measure of freedom.

It is said by many that our whole Nation may be on the brink of violent racial conflict. We hear appeals for moderation and order based upon each citizen's duty to support the Constitution and Supreme Court decisions, whether he personally approves them or not. Certainly there is logic in this position else there could be no order or stability in our society.

But by no means will this matter be settled on the basis of abstract legal obligations. Efforts for adjustments here must be anchored to something firmer, to feelings that reach out from the heart and soul.

If nondiscrimination in any form is to triumph, such must be supported by the simple belief of men that it is wrong—fundamentally, inherently, morally wrong—to deny to one person a right or privilege solely because he differs in race or color from another person to whom the same right or privilege is allowed.

Graduates, you cannot afford to close your eyes to any of the deep problems below the surface of society. If you do, the concept of a liberal arts education in the American college simply is not working as it should.

Across the country there is a growing feeling, now more loudly articulated, that something is wrong if we are increasingly unable to relate our Nation's problems to the educational experience.

If the college graduate is blind, prejudiced, provincial, he finds himself at cross-purposes to the historically proclaimed aims of education.

It is you who now possess a liberal arts education who must believe with Terence: "Nothing human is alien to me; no human knowledge, no human anguish, no human value, no human hunger. Anything less than this leads to a truncated or sterile life, a life without fullest meaning and direction and depth."

It is meaningless, therefore, to labor for better technical communications without being concerned about what is being communicated, to lay away an abundance of food for storage in one corner of the world while countless millions go hungry elsewhere, to speed up transportation without asking yourselves, "Why am I here, and where am I going?" Any person who does not seek wise answers to these broader human questions is unfit for significant lead-

ership. And all of these questions and answers relate to the beliefs a person holds.

Whatever your beliefs are, they must be firmly held and firmly expressed.

It is one thing to stand up and speak out clearly on some cause when there is no longer any uncertainty about its triumph.

It is something else to stick your neck out when the cause is unpopular, and to keep it there while even your friends may be disapproving and others jeering.

There is a price which has to be paid for leadership, for standing up for what you believe at a time when it may be unpopular. That price—the price of integrity—can come pretty high at times.

Beliefs require a willingness to make sacrifices. When the sacrifice comes, one may wonder if it is the prelude to even more suffering or the presage of new hope. It may be both. The important thing is a willingness to accept either.

For the Governor's inner office in the State Capitol, I sought and bought for the State a good painting of Andrew Jackson. He richly deserves to be there; he was our first Governor. But there were other reasons why I wanted "Old Hickory" peering down at everything which went on there. Jackson was a leader of great will who over and over again, with little or no regard for popular praise, stood firmly for what he regarded to be best for the country. It was Jackson who, against much popular will, insisted upon pushing the Nation's boundaries to the Pacific, making possible the broader physical base upon which to build our national greatness.

One of Jackson's "boys" was a soldier-politician named Sam Houston, of Tennessee. With extraordinary valor he fought Indians and, later, Mexicans. He served as Congressman from Tennessee, Governor of Tennessee, President of Texas, Senator from Texas, and Governor of Texas. He was a man of strong principle and very great courage in political as well as military battles.

As he approached the sundown of life, Houston was the elected Governor of Texas. The Civil War came, and he stoutly, but unsuccessfully, resisted secession by his State—unremittingly loyal to the Union, as all Jackson followers were. Secession was voted by his State, however, and the day came when all elected officials were called upon in public ceremony to take the oath of allegiance to the Confederacy. Houston was there, all right. Four times they called his name—"Sam Houston, Governor"—but he would not step forward. Then the name of the elected lieutenant governor was called. A young man, he eagerly stepped forward and was sworn in as Governor in Houston's place.

And that night a bent old man went home ready to die—faithful to his trust, but deeply wearied by the fight his principles had demanded of him. From the crowd in town there no longer came the acclaim which he had heard so loud and so often during his lifetime of service—only the thick, sticky silence of disappointment and regret.

But every schoolboy in America knows Sam Houston. A great city bears his name. There are monuments and memorials of all kinds fashioned for him by grateful people. And higher than any of these, of course, stands his record of loyalty to his beliefs.

Do any of you know the name of the young Lieutenant Governor who took his place? I doubt it and, what's more, who cares?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 777, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 777) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the time limitation now in effect, the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar, with the exception of No. 643–4P–32, Richard R. Conley, of Rome City, Ind., on page 2 of the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably sundry nominations in the Public Health Service. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

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

The nominations are as follows:

Michael Canelis, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service;

Alfred S. Nelson, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service; and

Alice M. Waterhouse, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration, en bloc, of the nominations on the Executive Calendar with the exception of the nomination of Mr. Richard R. Conley, of Rome City, Ind., identified as Calendar No. 643, Message No. 4P–32.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, with the exception noted, the nominations on the Executive Calendar are confirmed en bloc.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

AMENDMENT OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 777), to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, again exclusive of the time limitation, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the time be not charged to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time to be allocated by the majority leader be, instead, allocated by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

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

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments—which, without objection, with the exception of the amendment inserting section 3, will be agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, is the bill open to amendment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. One portion, the committee amendment, inserting section 3, on page 2, line 25, is open to amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the organic act, not to the committee amendment. When is my amendment eligible for consideration?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment has precedence, but, without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider the

amendment of the Senator from Iowa; and his amendment will be stated.

There was no objection.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. In section 31(2), before the word "private", insert the words "United States".

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). How much time does the Senator from Iowa yield to himself.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Five minutes, or as much thereof as I shall need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, last Thursday, the day when this bill was passed originally, I found that the Disarmament Agency had made at least one contract with a foreign institute—in England—in the amount of $21,064, to support a 6-month study of "The Effect of Disarmament on European Security."

I feel that this Agency is not yet ready to go into the business of making contracts with foreign principals, firms or agencies in other parts of the world.

The net effect of my amendment to the organic act is that the Disarmament Agency, although allowed to make contracts and agreements, for studies in the field of arms control and disarmament, with private or public institutions or persons, would be restricted, if this amendment is adopted, by the following language in section 31(2): "and other studies in the field of arms control and disarmament, by United States private or public institutions" thus at this time limiting the contracts to U.S. private or public institutions.

In connection with my remarks, Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of a June 7, 1963 release by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, setting forth some of these contracts which have been made. I ask unanimous consent that the release be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GRANTS AWARDED FOR STUDIES RELATED TO ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency today announced that three grants have been awarded since the first of the year to nongovernmental research organizations and individuals in support of various unclassified studies pertinent to the field of arms control and disarmament.

The first of these was awarded to the Institute of Strategic Studies of London, England, in the amount of $21,064 for support of a 6-months study on "The Effect of Disarmament on European Security." Under terms of the grant awarded on February 20 the institute is examining the effect upon European security and the balance of military power within Europe of the execution of stage I of both the U.S. disarmament proposals and those of the Soviet Union, as introduced in current disarmament negotiations.

"Arms and Democracy: The Reciprocal Influences of Weapons and Political Systems," is the subject of a 2-year study by the Eagleton Institute of Politics of Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J., which was awarded a grant of $40,000 on May 3. The focus of this study will be on the relation of changes in weapon technology to political institutions.

The most recent award was made on May 14 to Dr. Richard H. Pfaff, assistant professor of political science of the University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., for a study entitled "The Nonmilitary Aspects of CENTO." In examining the Central Treaty Organization in its economic and social influences, Dr. Pfaff will consider such subjects as the effect of increasing economic functions in CENTO in relation to regional arms control problems and the economic development of regional members in the context of regional disarmament possibilities. The study which will cost $1,500, is scheduled for completion in 3 months.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not care to argue this matter at any length. I merely suggest—although I have not had an opportunity to discuss this matter with the chairman of the committee—that the effect of the amendment is to limit the contracts providing for studies to either public or private agencies in the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I see nothing wrong with the amendment, and I am perfectly willing to accept it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 3, it is proposed to strike out the period, and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and a new paragraph (b), as follows:

In the proviso, strike out the balance of the sentence after the word "except," and insert in lieu thereof the following "in accordance with the constitutional processes of the United States."

And renumber the subsequent sections.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized. How much time does he yield himself?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Five minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, there appears a provision authorizing the Director of the Agency to prepare recommendations, for the present, concerning U.S. arms control and disarmament policy. As now amended by the Foreign Relations Committee, the pending bill contains a proviso which I should like to read in full to the Senate, as follows:

No action shall be taken under this act that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President, under the Constitution, or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States.

My amendment is directed to the phrase "or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

In particular, I call attention to the part of this proviso which states, in effect, that action can be taken looking toward disarmament or reduction of the Armed Forces, pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President or if authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress. With regard to that aspect of this proviso—which states that the disarmament shall be achieved by treaty pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President—I have no quarrel; that is in strict conformity with the Constitution.

However, it is my intention that the complete language has the effect of putting the Congress on record as authorizing the President to make treaties relating to disarmament subjects, through approval by means of further affirmative legislation by Congress. In my opinion, that would be a first step in circumventing the treaty-making process of the United States, and it should not be done.

My amendment does not attempt to make any new law; it merely states that no action shall be taken to obligate the U.S. Government to reduce its Armed Forces, except in accordance with the constitutional processes of the United States. In other words, Mr. President, I believe that in this bill we should make absolutely clear that we are not by means of this measure attempting, in the field of arms control and disarmament, to upset or cast any doubt whatsoever upon the constitutional processes of this Nation.

My fear is that the language now in the bill creates a fuzzy situation which might be interpreted as meaning that the President, instead of proceeding by way of treaty, may proceed by way of agreement, and thus require only a majority vote of both Houses of Congress, instead of a two-thirds vote of the Senate, as the Constitution requires in connection with the making of treaties.

There are instances in which certain types of international commitments have gone into effect after approval of proposed legislation by both Houses of Congress. That practice ought not to be encouraged. We ought to give full faith and credit to the thinking of the men who wrote the Constitution when they said that a treaty must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

I suppose I should be willing to trust the executive branch of the Government and have confidence that no disarmament treaty would be concluded without the approval of such an agreement in accordance with the treaty-making processes prescribed by the Constitution. I

understand that the present administration definitely contemplates that if an agreement is reached by it, the agreement will be in the form of a treaty. That is how it should be done. But the language of the act is "Or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

Through the existence of such language I suggest that we might enter into a most dangerous field.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield to myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to call to the attention of Senators the questions which I addressed to Mr. Fisher, who is the legal expert in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. One question was as follows:

Let me put this question. Let's assume that the Agreement deals with disarmament. Would the executive branch, in its discretion under this language, have the right to ask that it be disposed of by congressional action rather than the manner directed by the Constitution, that is, under treaty?

In his answer Mr. Fisher said:

If it was considered to be under the general constitutional practices that have developed they would have the right.

Senator LAUSCHE. Let's assume it provides for disarmament, and the matter, that is definitely the substance of what has been asked, that we disarm in a limited degree. Would it be under the existing language within the power of the administration to ask that it be disposed of by an agreement, by the Congress?"

Mr. Fisher gave the following answer:

I would say that it would, sir——

In other words, in the opinion of Mr. Fisher, an agreement could be made to disarm, and the language of the agreement might require only a majority vote of each House of Congress. My amendment contemplates merely that whatever agreement is made, it shall be subject to the approval provided in the Constitution. If the agreement were one that may be approved by a majority vote of both Houses, it would not conform with the treaty-making provisions of the Constitution.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I shall support the Senator's amendment. The proposed legislation is bad enough, regardless of how much it is improved. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio as to whose arms are about to be controlled. What country is it proposed to disarm?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No specific agreement has yet been reached. The bill would only provide the machinery by which an agreement subsequently made could be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield to myself an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. What country is it that the American people are told would disarm? Is it the United States?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would have to be both countries.

Mr. CURTIS. In the face of history, are we to go on record as saying that an agreement with a Communist country to disarm will be carried out by that country?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is what the agreement would envision. If we made an agreement with Red Russia to disarm, and we believed that it was made in good faith and Russia would keep it, that agreement would, of course, come before the Senate for ratification. If it should come before the Senate in the form of an agreement, the language of the bill would seem to imply that it would be subject to the approval of a majority. I contend that an agreement to disarm should be in the form of a treaty and would have to be approved by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the Senator, but I do not agree that the Commission should continue to talk, make commitments, and negotiate in the manner in which they do when they admit they cannot rely upon the parties with whom they are negotiating.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With respect to that aspect, I look with considerable doubt upon the good faith of Red Russia to keep its agreements when I know that 50 out of the last 53 important ones made by that country have been broken when to break the agreement was thought to be expedient for Russia's own interest.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator will yield further, I point out that if small nations would do what we are doing, we would censor their action. If they were setting up machinery to negotiate with the Communists, in the face of recent history showing that 50 commitments have been broken, I do not believe it would help the cause of peace or liberty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield myself one-half minute.

So far as I know, no agreement is now in existence. So the bill would merely deal with machinery relating to agreements in the event they come into existence.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

First, I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that I have no objection to the amendment. I believe it covers the situation quite well. I can imagine very minor agreements which would have nothing to do with disarmament—such things as a "hot line" or something of that kind of a relatively minor nature which might come up, and which the Senate would not wish to have covered as a treaty or legislation, because it would not be important enough to warrant such action.

But in respect to any measure of importance, as the Senator has mentioned, which would entail disarmament in a meaningful way, a treaty would be the proper way to handle the agreement. We must recognize the fact that the distinction in our constitutional history between an executive agreement and a treaty has not always been clear.

There are many distinctions. I believe that any agreement involving disarmament or dealing with defense clearly comes within the concept of the treatymaking power of the Constitution. The way in which the Senator from Ohio has stated his amendment, in accordance with the constitutional processes, is quite adequate. I am satisfied with the amendment and, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, while I have the floor, and in order to complete the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a short statement in regard to the bill. There has been some misunderstanding on the part of the public with regard to what has been done. At least I have had a few letters indicating that. I only emphasize that the bill does provide a 100-percent increase in the authorization for this Agency for the next 2 years, together with one or two other minor matters which I have treated in the statement.

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

AMENDMENT TO THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

(Statement by Mr. FULBRIGHT)

Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I present to the Senate S. 777, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. The bill is quite simple. (1) It authorizes the appropriation of $20 million for a 2-year period covering fiscal years 1964 and 1965; (2) It makes two procedural changes in the provisions dealing with security clearances; (3) it spells out clearly the fact that nothing in the act authorizes the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to deal with the question of the right of individuals to possess firearms for their own use; (4) it prohibits the Agency from spending its funds for promoting its legislation before Congress; (5) it limits the applicability of the proviso in section 33 to actions taken under the authority of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act; and (6) it prohibits the Agency from obligating more than 20 percent of its funds in the last month of a fiscal year.

Most of these amendments are of a minor nature and are fully explained in the committee's report. I intend, therefore, to limit my remarks to the amendments that consumed the greater part of the committee's time.

The first of these, quite naturally, was the authorization of funds. The Agency requested an open end authorization, as it did 2 years ago. Then, as now, the committee believed that this was a premature proposal. The Agency is not yet 2 years old. Its organizational phase is barely over and its research program is just getting underway. Under these circumstances, the committee sees a real advantage in a 2-year authorization of funds which will require the Agency to review its program and achievements with us in another 2 years. I think there is really nothing so terrible in having to go through the authorizing process from time

to time. Lots of agencies do this, and there is no overriding reason why the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency should not. In fact, the Foreign Relations Committee is extremely interested in the development of this Agency and intends to follow its various activities closely, particularly the negotiations at Geneva.

With respect to the amount authorized, the committee recommends the figure of $20 million for the 2-year period. This is a 100 percent increase over the $10 million authorized 2 years ago, and now virtually exhausted. Incidentally, under the committee's language, the unappropriated balance of $1,669,000 remains available to the Agency. The Agency proposed to request an appropriation of $15 million for fiscal year 1964, of which $11 million was earmarked for research contracts. This is a substantial increase in research activities for which the Agency has obligated $3,814,960 as of May 31, 1963.

I wish to mention one other amendment relating to funds which prohibits the Agency from obligating more than 20 percent of its funds in the last month of a fiscal year. This language is not very restrictive and is intended primarily to serve as a warning to the Agency to watch its monthly rate of obligations. As might be expected of a new agency, the monthly rate has risen steeply. The committee does not wish to see this become an established pattern in Agency operations.

Now, a brief word about the security provisions on which the committee spent some time in order to assure itself that they will not result in any dilution of the standards established 2 years ago. The committee sees no disadvantages to the two proposed changes. On the other hand, there are real advantages in terms of time and money saved. The committee also was informed that highly sensitive agencies such as Defense, the Atomic Energy Agency and the Central Intelligence Agency have the authority that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is now seeking.

The last amendment that I wish to call to the attention of the Senate is the limitation on the use of funds for propaganda relating to pending legislation affecting the Agency. Members of the committee were subjected to what appeared to be a highly organized campaign to approve S. 777 without any amendments. I realize that this is not unusual in the annals of Congress, but it is unusual in the affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations. No other legislation or treaty handled by the committee has provoked quite such activity. The right of American citizens to petition Congress is not being questioned by the amendment which is directed solely at the Agency and designed to ensure that the Agency not use any of its appropriated funds to promote its own legislation.

I believe that the committee amendments serve to encourage the Agency's orderly growth. This committee has always regarded the Agency as a highly sensitive one, one that should proceed with its tasks carefully and cautiously. This is made possible by S. 777 as amended by the committee and I urge the Senate to give its favorable consideration.

JUNE 17, 1963.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I offer a 1-word amendment. On page 3, line 19, in the committee amendment, I propose to strike out the word "general" and insert in lieu thereof the word "any".

The paragraph presently reads:

None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of general propaganda in support of any pending legislation concerning the work of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The word "general" seems to be a little too general. I have not been able to get a good definition of the word "general" as applied to this particular bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is speaking under controlled time. Does the Senator yield any time?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. I think this situation came about because of the fact that members of the Committee on Foreign Relations were solicited to support the bill before there was any bill, apparently the result of a leak somewhere, probably from the executive branch of the Government. It seems to me that if we are to prevent the use of funds for propaganda purposes it should be for "any propaganda" and not for "general propaganda," when nobody appears to know exactly what that means. Therefore, I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I see no objection to the amendment. Either "any propaganda" would be all right, or we could leave out the adjective altogether. Both would serve the purpose. Either would suit me.

The point of particular interest to us is that this propaganda should not be directed to any pending legislation. A general statement about the virtues of disarmament is not objectionable, but in this case the campaign was directed to this particular bill.

I agree with the Senator. I think "general" is an equivocal word which should be either removed or changed to "any."

I am willing to do either.

Has the Senator from Vermont offered an amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. I offered an amendment to strike out "general" and to insert "any."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no objection to that, if the Senator prefers that to deleting the word "general."

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the word "any" more than I understand the word "general."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do also. Would the Senator prefer to delete the word "general" altogether? I think that would have the same effect.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be perfectly satisfactory with me to delete the word.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Perhaps that would be better.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I change my amendment to one of deleting the word "general."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. I shall not object, but before the amendment is put to a vote I should like to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I am a little concerned about what is meant by the word "propaganda." I have no objection to prohibiting the use of taxpayers' money for propaganda in support of legislation, but I hope it will be clearly understood that the Agency is entitled to make available to the people of the United States full and free information with respect to all the activities of the Agency in connection with negotiations, proposed agreements, and treaties which it may bring to the President or to the Senate for consideration. I agree that the taxpayers' funds should not be used for "propaganda," but I do not wish to see the flow of information cut off by reason of any legislative construction of the provision in the act or in the amendment now before the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that problem was dealt with satisfactorily in the committee report, on page 10. The key sentence is:

The committee does not intend by this language to restrict Agency officials from addressing public affairs groups and others on the general subject of arms control and disarmament or to undertake similar activities.

What we were trying to reach was the nuisance of the very extensive campaign for this specific bill. Some of it came in before we even considered the bill. That is why we have said "pending legislation." We did not intend to restrict discussion of the general subject of disarmament.

That sentence is in the report.

Mr. CLARK. I see that sentence. I think it is a useful and helpful sentence.

I assume the chairman of the committee would not intend that the language should be construed to prevent the dissemination of pamphlets such as those which have already been disseminated by the Agency, explaining the proposals both with respect to a test ban and with respect to general and complete disarmament, which have been tabled by the President and his advisers at Geneva, so that the country can be fully advised as to what we are advocating and why.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think it would cover that situation. Propaganda in support of pending legislation, by the Agency would seem to me to be all that would be covered. The general explanation of the work of the Agency and the various considerations involved in arms control would be perfectly proper subjects on which to inform the public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the question of passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska withhold his point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to inquire if it is the purpose to deny the yeas and nays.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; that is not the purpose.

Mr. CURTIS. I withhold my point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona asked for the yeas and nays. I believe a sufficient number of Senators are now present. I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I withdraw my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains one-half hour of debate on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, has the bill been read the third time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield me 10 minutes from the time on the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending bill. In my opinion, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been doing a magnificent job in the cause of peace since its existence was authorized in the late summer of 1961.

It will be recalled that this bill was brought to the Senate, and later to the House, in August of 1961, shortly before the President made his historic address at the United Nations advocating general and complete disarmament under enforceable world law.

That speech was followed, a day or two later, by the Zorin-McCloy agreement, under which the United States and the U.S.S.R. agreed to 18 principles for a treaty of general and complete disarmament.

This Agency, which we are about to approve, whose finances we are about to refurbish, has been engaged ever since then in an earnest effort to reconcile the differences between the Soviet Union and ourselves with respect not only to a treaty of general and complete disarmament under enforcible world law, but also with respect to a test ban treaty.

It is true that we do not as yet have what the President wanted, and what I believe every intelligent and sensible citizen of the United States wants, namely, an end to the arms race and a cessation of nuclear testing. But cynics to the contrary, I contend that substantial and discernible progress has been made toward both of those objectives in the past year and a half. I believe there is good reason to hope that, in the years ahead, those objectives will finally be reached, so that we can take off the backs of the taxpayers of the world the frightening cost of the arms race; so that we can eliminate the delicate balance of terror under which we all live; and so that we can bring to an end nuclear testing, which is the outward and visible sign of the physical poison of radioactivity, and the poison in the hearts and minds of men which the arms race engenders.

I was dissuaded earlier today from proposing an amendment to the bill which would have restored the full $30 million of authorization, for a 2-year period, which the Agency requested. I think they were entitled to that money. I think the committee should have given it to them. I think the Senate should have given it to them. I hope the House will give the full $30 million; that the bill will go to conference and come back here, and that the Senate will be more generous than it is going to be today, and vote the whole amount.

Mr. President, how many Senators know the dramatic fact that between now and tomorrow we will spend for war, or for the preparation for war, over $100 million. This in a space of less than 24 hours; and yet we hesitate to give this Agency, for 1 whole year, $15 million, not for war, but for peace, for research into peace, for maintenance of a payroll which will work for peace, for the negotiations and issuance of contracts which will show us the way to make disarmament a reality, not merely a hope.

I commend the able Director of the Agency, Mr. William Foster, an outstanding American citizen, for the excellent work which he has done in his unceasing search for peace, utilizing the fine commonsense which has made him such a successful businessman.

I commend his able assistant, Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the Agency, a skilled lawyer, and an imaginative and resourceful negotiator.

I commend the General Counsel of the Agency, George Bunn, for the fine work which he has done.

Finally, I congratulate Mr. Foster on having brought out of private life Archibald Alexander, a distinguished and able lawyer, a former candidate for public office in New Jersey, who has taken over the economic aspects of the search for peace which the Disarmament Agency is conducting.

As one Senator I resent the criticisms which have been made against this Agency. It seems to me it has been improperly held up to criticism, and sometimes to scorn. Its activities should not be denigrated. We should be proud of this Agency. It is doing a magnificent job.

I noticed, for example, an article in the New York Times for the 17th of June, entitled "Experts Quit Jobs on Arms Control," under the byline of that ordinarily accurate reporter, Mr. E. W. Kenworthy.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article may 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:

EXPERTS QUIT JOBS ON ARMS CONTROL—U.S. AGENCY IS LOSING TOP AIDS OVER ITS POLICIES

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, June 10.—At the time when President Kennedy has called for a new initiative for a nuclear test ban, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is losing virtually all its most experienced experts and negotiators.

According to informed sources, these men are transferring because they have become increasingly unhappy and frustrated over the operations of the Agency.

Ronald I. Spears, former Chief of the Political Affairs Office, who for years has done most of the policy planning on the nuclear test ban issue, has already left for a high position in the State Department's Bureau of European Affairs.

Charles C. Stelle, who has been in charge of the day-to-day test ban negotiations in Geneva, plans to leave in a few months.

RELIED UPON BY DULLES

Other experienced disarmament officials who will soon transfer to other areas of the State Department are Vincent Baker, James E. Goodby, David E. Mark, and Robert E. Sturgill.

These men comprise a tight little group who, even before the Agency was set up, were relied upon by Secretaries of State John Foster Dulles and Christian A. Herter for planning and the execution of policy.

William C. Foster, Director of the Agency, has been reluctant to lose them and has delayed their departure as long as he could.

It is also understood that two key officers, Jacob D. Beam, former Ambassador to Poland, and Henry A. Byroade, former Ambassador to Egypt, South Africa, and Afghanistan, are hoping that they will be assigned to new ambassadorships.

The Agency was created as a quasi-independent organization within the State Department in September 1961, in fulfillment of a campaign pledge by President Kennedy.

Repeatedly in the election campaign of 1960 he accused the Eisenhower administration of giving "this problem no attention." At nearly every whistlestop he said, in support of this charge, that "fewer than 100 people" scattered through four or five agencies were working on disarmament.

WANTS MORE PERSONNEL

Now the Agency has about 187 persons, of whom roughly 75 are officers. This is 10 times the number that dealt with disarmament in the State Department in 1960. Mr. Foster would like to increase the number of personnel to 277 in the next fiscal year.

Testifying on May 1 before a House appropriations subcommittee, Mr. Foster said

that he needed the increase to take care of the larger research program and the continuing active negotiating responsibilities.

However, according to informed sources, the principal grievance of those who have left or are leaving is what they consider overstaffing in the Agency.

One official said both the President and Mr. Foster had assumed that a tenfold increase in personnel would automatically achieve a tenfold increase in quality and breadth of planning.

This is not necessarily so, he said.

Another official said that the principal effect of the expansion had been "more meetings, more committees, more memorandums."

Another criticism concerns the size and volume of the research program. So far the Agency has made contracts and grants for studies totaling $4,500,000. Next year Mr. Foster wants to spend $11 million more.

The critics concede that formerly the political officers and negotiators were at a disadvantage because the disarmament section did not have its own scientific staff to come up quickly with needed studies. A few such scientists and technicians were needed, they say.

They also concede that some of the medium-range and long-range studies contracted to research organizations can be useful.

However, they contend that many of the studies are "completely irrelevant to any of the real problems" the Agency is likely to face in the foreseeable future.

Examples cited are studies on world law and reorganizing the United Nations.

One official said that officers were so busy "dreaming up" new studies that they often did not read the ones that were delivered.

COMPLAIN ABOUT RUSK

A third complaint involves relations with the Secretary of State. Formerly, officials point out, the small group worked daily with Mr. Dulles and Mr. Herter. Now Secretary Dean Rusk, it was said, largely divorces himself from day-to-day consideration of disarmament matters, possibly because he regards this area as the responsibility of Mr. Foster.

The trouble with this arrangement, it is argued, is that disarmament and a nuclear test ban are political problems in which the State Department is deeply involved.

Considerable doubt about the growth and direction of the agency exists on Capitol Hill. This is evident from the recent cut in the agency's spending authorization made by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Two years ago the agency received $10 million, to be available until spent. With this almost gone, Mr. Foster sought an authorization to spend as much money "as may be necessary and appropriate," and an actual authorization of $15 million for the next fiscal year.

RECONSIDERS FUND CUT

The committee at first authorized $15 million for 2 years. On the reported urging of the agency, the committee reconsidered and the amount was raised $20 million.

To prevent hasty contracting of studies toward the end of the year, in an effort to use up unexpended funds, the committee declared that no more than 20 percent of an appropriation could be obligated in the last month of the fiscal year.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this article, quite inaccurately, states that many of the important experts in the Agency are quitting, that it has been under increasing criticism.

The fact of the matter is that certain eminent, honest, honorable, permanent Foreign Service officers who have been assigned to this agency are now about to leave. I do not want to say anything in derogation of the public career of those fine gentlemen, but I will say that they will not be missed. The hearts of very few of them have been in the real work of the agency. They went over there to finish their careers after honorable service in the Foreign Service, waiting for retirement. Not too much reliance has been placed on their vision and imagination in the agency.

The men whom I earlier commended are the ones who are carrying the load and the men to whom the country should look for accomplishments. I completely disagree with Mr. Kenworthy in his criticism of the agency. It is rendering an outstanding service. It needs more money than the Senate is willing to give it. I hope that money will be forthcoming before the bill goes to the President for his signature. I hope, since the yeas and nays have been ordered, that the bill will be passed by an overwhelming majority of Senators who are willing to cast one vote for peace negotiations and commonsense.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 3 or 4 minutes to me?

Mr. AIKEN. If I have control of the time, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, when this legislation was first proposed, I voted against it—not that I am opposed to disarmament. Like all reasoning men, I believe that disarmament is a very desirable thing; but I like to see the other fellow disarming at the same time.

I voted against the creation of the extra committee of the State Department because I was not convinced that our enemies were in a mood to talk disarmament. Neither am I convinced that they are in the mood today.

The very first act of this Agency was to propose a disarmament treaty at Geneva that was never discussed, so far as I have been able to determine, with any Members of the House or the Senate. It came as a complete surprise to me, months after it had been offered, through the Associated Press and the UPI. It came on the morning debate began on the moneys that were advanced to the United Nations last year.

After exhaustive questioning on this floor of Senators who should know, and who one would reasonably expect to know, due to their connection with the various committees of the Senate dealing with this subject, I found that none of them was aware of this proposal.

Anyone reading the proposal can see in it efforts made toward unilateral disarmament. I do not charge the Agency with being engaged in that, but I do suggest any proposal such as the one which was offered at Geneva is a dangerous one to be sponsored by the United States. It is one that, had I been Mr. Khrushchev, I would have accepted the day it was offered.

I did not like the idea a newly created agency of our Government not wanting to discuss with interested Members of the Congress a proposal that could well change the entire course of our freedom.

Another point that disturbs me is that at first we asked for 120 on-site inspections in Russia, to help bring to an end nuclear testing. We have continually yielded and compromised until we are now down to seven, and I understand the figure might get down to five, or even to three. I have expressed my interest in disarmament. I also express my interest in people who talk about disarmament having stiff backs and not giving in to the enemy every time they are asked to give in.

We are told, for example that underground nuclear testing by the Soviets can be detected by seismic means. I deny that. For an agency of Government even to suggest to the American people that such detection can be made would be cause enough, in my opinion, to vote against passage of the authorization and appropriation.

I do not wish to detain my colleagues in the Senate any longer. We are using a very unrealistic approach to the whole subject of disarmament. I do not want at some future day to be connected with an agency in which my confidence does not rest. Therefore I shall vote against the pending bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I will take a very short time, to correct the record. I should like to state that the agreement which was submitted at Geneva, to which my friend the Senator from Arizona has referred, was first called to the attention of the country by the President of the United States at the time he made his historic speech before the United Nations, on September 21, 1961. The agreement was drafted, not by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which was not in existence at that time, but under the supervision of Mr. John McCloy, a prominent Republican, and then the President's principal adviser on disarmament affairs.

If there is any criticism of the treaty—and I personally do not think there is—the criticism should not be directed against Mr. Foster and his agency, which played very little, if any, part in connection with it, but against the President of the United States and his adviser, Mr. McCloy.

I thought then, and I think now, that it is an excellent treaty, of which all Americans can be proud.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania has misunderstood my point. I should probably have mentioned the fact that the President outlined the agreement in his speech before the United Nations. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the original draft was dated the day after the legislation was passed by Congress. I was merely referring to this fact—and it is an interesting fact, and the Senator can verify it by reading my questions propounded to various Senators when the debate opened last year

on the United Nations funds—that not one responsible member of the Foreign Relations Committee or of the Armed Services Committee, who should have known about this proposal, knew anything about it. I should think that a treaty like this would have been discussed by them, or at least they should have shown evidence of having some familiarity with it. The chairman of the House committee knew nothing about it. That is the point I was trying to make.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield to me on my time so that I may propound a question to him?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I was on the floor of the Senate on the day when the Senator from Arizona made that comment. I well remember that he queried two prominent members of the Foreign Relations Committee. Both of them said they did not know anything about the proposal. If they had read the President's speech, which he made before the United Nations the preceding September, they would have known about it. They could have learned about it from the pamphlet, which was issued to all the American people, and which I saw in Moscow on September 25. In that way they would have found out about the proposal, which the Senator from Arizona, I am sure in all sincerity, has said he had never heard of.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator saw it in Moscow on September 25, he saw it before it was published in the United States.

Mr. CLARK. I took it to Moscow.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I shall vote in favor of the bill. I believe that the same motivation which caused me to vote for the original bill compels me to vote for the pending bill.

We have a national conscience to satisfy that we are doing all we can on our side to achieve some kind of arms treaty and disarmament program. However, I wish to sound a note of warning. I share the concern of many of my colleagues in the Senate, that we have been giving the impression, at least, that we are making too many concessions in Geneva. I believe we have had the proclivity of trying to tell the Soviets what is good for them, without realizing that they probably know in their minds what is to their best interest, whether or not we do.

I believe that we have also given the impression that we are a little too eager. If a person is on one side of the bargaining table, over-anxiety or over-concession on his part does not help his bargaining position.

Therefore I suggest that our negotiators, particularly those who issue press releases, not be in such a big hurry to give the impression that the United States has any less time in this matter than the Soviets; that the people of the United States are any more susceptible to nuclear fallout than are the people of the Soviet Union: The United States negotiators must make clear that we recognize that the people we are dealing with have an ideology which does not inspire trust and confidence, and which holds that the end justifies the means, that lying, cheating, stealing, and anything else is permissible.

In such a situation it behooves us to keep our powder dry. I do not want to suggest that we must have a completely foolproof treaty. However, I suggest that if there are to be any errors, they had better be on the side of the security of the United States and of the free world.

I hope that our negotiators will continue to negotiate, recognizing that they cannot get a treaty through the Senate, ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, if such treaty jeopardizes the security of the United States.

With that in mind, I hope the Senate will pass the bill, and that our negotiators will continue to negotiate and will be successful.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I shall vote for the pending bill, because in my judgment it not only goes in the direction of exploring ways in which disarmament could be effectively brought about on a mutual basis, with the Soviet bloc disarming parallel to disarmament in this country, but also because the proposed legislation and the basic legislation which it amends provide that any disarmament agreement must be implemented either by treaty—in which event two-thirds of the Members of the Senate would have to concur in the ratification of the treaty—or by statute passed by both Houses of Congress by a majority vote.

That being the case, I do not share the fear of those who believe that some very imprudent and unwise agreement will be brought before us.

If that were the case, under the proposed legislation Congress would have to approve it. In the absence of such an approach, it is possible that a disarmament agreement could be put into effect by Executive agreement. That is something I very much fear, because I believe Congress should be very careful in determining precisely what was to be agreed to, in the event any agreement were arrived at in the field of disarmament.

As one who served on a committee studying the problems of disarmament over a period of years, I know it is oftentimes a difficult and frustrating task. But this Nation should, so far as it can, seek to bring about a limitation of arms and a certain amount of arms control. While nothing has happened along this line with regard to our effort for the past 16 years or more, I am hopeful that someday something will happen along that line. Therefore, I shall vote for the proposed legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] has asked me to make a statement in his behalf. The Senator is fulfilling a prior engagement in Connecticut, not having known that the measure under consideration would be brought up today.

The senior Senator from Connecticut has asked me to state to the Senate his deep interest in the bill; that he voted for the creation of the Disarmament Agency when the issue was initially before the Senate; and that he subscribes to the policy of our country in attempting to negotiate a ban on nuclear tests and disarmament consistent with the security and the maintenance of the honor of our country. If he were present, the senior Senator from Connecticut would vote for the measure.

I shall vote for the bill. In my judgment, the danger of nuclear war is of such a specialized nature that a special agency of government is necessary to deal with the problem. I have expressed my views in the past, and I shall do so again, namely, that those who are in charge of negotiation should not abandon the thought of protecting the security of our country merely for the purpose of reaching an agreement. An agreement may be reached; but the agreement reached may be most dangerous to our country unless it contains adequate provisions to insure the Nation's security.

I think the record ought to show that our country has constantly yielded. From the beginning Red Russia has said that there should be not more than 3 on-site inspections. We initially asked, I believe, for 20; we then reduced the number to 7. Russia's proposal still remains at not more than three.

I hope that those in charge of negotiations will try to reach an understanding that will be honorable and in accordance with the security of our country.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I think we are engaged in the purest sort of folly to be considering disarmament at a time when the militant arm of communism is seeking to encircle the world. Can we in all honesty expect a dictatorship that holds suzerainty over captive people to disarm? I think not. I believe we are engaging in the sheerest sort of folly to pass a bill which entails a program of disarmament.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I intend to support the bill; but I shall do so with a clear reservation in my mind and with the expression of the hope that the bill will not be used to extend the executive authority beyond the powers vested in the Congress of the United States. I should not like to see our Nation confronted with a fait accompli in the framing of a treaty when it will be too late to bring the attention of such a proposal to the attention of Congress for its opinion. Therefore, I believe the rights of Congress should be carefully observed in this and in all other instances.

With that personal reservation, I shall support the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by

the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAVITS AND SENATOR KEATING ON ARMS CONTROL AGENCY BILL

As strong supporters of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—of which Senator JAVITS was a cosponsor—we deeply believe there is continuing need for intensive study and development of the whole range of disarmament matters. Peace is the objective of our time and an end to nuclear testing, which is injurious to the welfare of all mankind, must be pursued by negotiations. We strongly support this authorization for $20 million to carry on the work of this important agency in helping to formulate policies and programs for arms control.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much time remains on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time in opposition to the bill has expired. The Senator from Minnesota has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The bill before the Senate is the product of much discussion, debate, and deliberation by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It has been amended. In the main, I believe the amendments are constructive. The bill provides the agency with the authority to continue in the work in which it is now engaged. The purpose of the agency is to act as a coordinating arm of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, in matters relating to the policy of arms control and disarmament.

No one believes that we will be immediately successful in these endeavors; but every thoughtful person knows that the arms race, constantly spiraling upward, leads to continuing problems, economic as well as political, and perhaps even problems of survival.

I submit that every proposal involves a risk. There is a risk in the arms race. History tells us that an arms race has never resulted in peace. History also tells us that there has been little or no success in disarmament. Therefore, the risk is present; and anyone who would pretend to the contrary would be deceiving himself and others.

But I believe the agency fulfills a useful purpose. It gives to the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, who speaks for the Nation, counsel, advice, and a coordination of policy, which is highly essential. We shall be negotiating, and we shall be compelled to negotiate, because of the demand of humanity to seek a way out of this impasse. The negotiating must be done carefully and prudently and with the constant objective of protecting the security of the United States.

I cannot believe that President Kennedy or his predecessor, President Eisenhower, both of whom have engaged in the subject of disarmament, would ever do anything that would prejudice the security of the United States.

Remember that any proposal for negotiation will be presented on behalf of the President of the United States after most careful counsel and advice from his advisers, including those who are informed about such matters. Therefore, I am hopeful that we will give the President the authority and the machinery that he needs to conduct our disarmament policy safely and prudently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired. All time has expired. The bill having been read the third time, the question is Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. 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. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. If the Senator from South Carolina were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If the Senator from Connecticut were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. If present and voting the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 14, as follows:

[No. 105 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morton
Anderson	Hill	Moss
Bayh	Holland	Mundt
Beall	Humphrey	Muskie
Boggs	Inouye	Nelson
Brewster	Jackson	Neuberger
Burdick	Johnston	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Kefauver	Pearson
Cannon	Kuchel	Pell
Carlson	Lausche	Prouty
Case	Long, La.	Proxmire
Church	McCarthy	Scott
Clark	McClellan	Smathers
Cotton	McGovern	Smith
Dirkson	McIntyre	Sparkman
Douglas	McNamara	Symington
Fong	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Miller	Yarborough
Gruening	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Morse	

NAYS—14

Allott	Ellender	Russell
Bennett	Goldwater	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Talmadge
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Dominick	Mechem	

NOT VOTING—27

Bartlett	Hart	McGee
Bible	Hayden	Randolph
Cooper	Javits	Ribicoff
Dodd	Jordan, N.C.	Robertson
Eastland	Keating	Saltonstall
Edmondson	Kennedy	Simpson
Engle	Long, Mo.	Thurmond
Ervin	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.

So the bill (S. 777) was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to announce that, on the rollcall just taken, my colleague, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, could not be present. He is at this moment delivering an address at the National Coal Association's annual luncheon which is being held at the Mayflower Hotel. I have just left the luncheon to answer to my name on this rollcall, but, obviously, Senator RANDOLPH could not do this, as everyone here will readily understand.

TELEVISION AND RADIO BROADCAST BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on the evening of June 11, President Kennedy commented on the events occurring as a result of the enrollment of two young Alabama residents at the University of Alabama. The only thing that made this a special occasion was the fact that these two students were Negro.

President Kennedy's eloquent and moving message to the American people poses a problem that is broader than Alabama or any region of the United States. He spoke to all Americans. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the text of the television and radio broadcast be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the television and radio broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY ON NATIONWIDE RADIO AND TELEVISION

Good evening my fellow citizens. This afternoon, following a series of threats and defiant statements, the presence of Alabama National Guardsmen was required on the University of Alabama to carry out the final and unequivocal order of the U.S. District Court of the Northern District of Alabama. That order called for the admission of two clearly qualified young Alabama residents who happened to have been born Negro.

That they were admitted peacefully on the campus is due in good measure to the conduct of the students of the University of Alabama, who met their responsibilities in a constructive way.

I hope that every American, regardless of where he lives, will stop and examine his conscience about this and other related incidents. This Nation was founded by men of many nations and backgrounds. It was founded on the principle that all men are created equal, and that the rights of every man are diminished when the rights of one man are threatened.

Today we are committed to a worldwide struggle to promote and protect the rights of all who wish to be free, and when Americans are sent to Vietnam or West Berlin, we do not ask for whites only. It ought to be possible, therefore, for American students of any color to attend any public institution they select without having to be backed up by troops.

It ought to be possible for American consumers of any color to receive equal service in places of public accommodation, such as hotels and restaurants and theaters and retail stores, without being forced to resort to demonstrations in the street, and it ought to be possible for American citizens of any color to register and to vote in a free election without interference or fear of reprisal.

It ought to be possible, in short, for every American to enjoy the privileges of being American without regard to his race or his color. In short, every American ought to have the right to be treated as he would wish to be treated, as one would wish his children to be treated. But this is not the case.

The Negro baby born in America today, regardless of the section of the Nation in which he is born, has about one-half as much chance of completing a high school as a white baby born in the same place on the same day, one-third as much chance of completing college, one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man, twice as much chance of becoming unemployed, about one-seventh as much chance of earning $10,000 a year, a life expectancy which is 7 years shorter, and the prospects of earning only half as much.

This is not a sectional issue. Difficulties over segregation and discrimination exist in every city, in every State of the Union, producing in many cities a rising tide of discontent that threatens the public safety. Nor is this a partisan issue in a time of domestic crisis. Men of good will and generosity should be able to unite regardless of party or politics. This is not even a legal or legislative issue alone. It is better to settle these matters in the courts than on the streets, and new laws are needed at every level, but law alone cannot make men see right.

We are confronted primarily with a moral issue. It is as old as the scriptures and is as clear as the American Constitution.

The heart of the question is whether all Americans are to be afforded equal rights and equal opportunities, whether we are going to treat our fellow Americans as we want to be treated. If an American, because his skin is dark, cannot eat lunch in a restaurant open to the public, if he cannot send his children to the best public school available, if he cannot vote for the public officials who represent him, if, in short, he cannot enjoy the full and free life which all of us want, then who among us would be content to have the color of his skin changed and stand in his place? Who among us would then be content with the counsels of patience and delay?

One hundred years of delay have passed since President Lincoln freed the slaves, yet their heirs, their grandsons, are not fully free. They are not yet freed from the bonds of injustice. They are not yet freed from social and economic oppression, and this Nation, for all its hopes and all its boasts, will not be fully free until all its citizens are free.

We preach freedom around the world, and we mean it, and we cherish our freedom here at home, but are we to say to the world, and much more importantly, to each other that this is a land of the free except for the Negroes; that we have no second-class citizens except Negroes; that we have no class or caste system, no ghettoes, no master race except with respect to Negroes?

Now the time has come for this Nation to fulfill its promise. The events in Birmingham and elsewhere have so increased the cries for equality that no city or State or legislative body can prudently choose to ignore them.

The fires of frustration and discord are burning in every city, North and South, where legal remedies are not at hand. Redress is sought in the streets, in demonstrations, parades and protests which create tensions and threaten violence and threaten lives.

We face, therefore, a moral crisis as a country and as a people. It cannot be met by repressive police action. It cannot be left to increased demonstrations in the streets. It cannot be quieted by token moves or talk. It is a time to act in the Congress, in your State and local legislative body and, above all, in all of our daily lives.

It is not enough to pin the blame on others, to say this is a problem of one section of the country or another, or deplore the fact that we face. A great change is at hand, and our task, our obligation, is to make that revolution, that change, peaceful and constructive for all.

Those who do nothing are inviting shame as well as violence. Those who act boldly are recognizing right as well as reality.

Next week I shall ask the Congress of the United States to act, to make a commitment it has not fully made in this century to the proposition that race has no place in American life or law. The Federal judiciary has upheld that proposition in a series of forthright cases. The executive branch has adopted that proposition in the conduct of its affairs, including the employment of Federal personnel, the use of Federal facilities, and the sale of federally financed housing.

But there are other necessary measures which only the Congress can provide, and they must be provided at this session. The old code of equity law under which we live commands for every wrong a remedy, but in too many communities, in too many parts of the country, wrongs are inflicted on Negro citizens as there are no remedies at law. Unless the Congress acts, their only remedy is in the street.

I am therefore asking the Congress to enact legislation giving all Americans the right to be served in facilities which are open to the public—hotels, restaurants, theaters, retail stores, and similar establishments.

This seems to me to be an elementary right. Its denial is an arbitrary indignity that no American in 1963 should have to endure, but many do.

I have recently met with scores of business leaders urging them to take voluntary action to end this discrimination and I have been encouraged by their response, and in the last 2 weeks over 75 cities have seen progress made in desegregating these kinds of facilities. But many are unwilling to act alone, and for this reason, nationwide legislation is needed if we are to move this problem from the streets to the courts.

I am also asking Congress to authorize the Federal Government to participate more fully in lawsuits designed to end segregation in public education. We have succeeded in persuading many districts to desegregate voluntarily. Dozens have admitted Negroes without violence. Today a Negro is attending a State-supported institution in every one of our 50 States, but the pace is very slow.

Too many Negro children entering segregated grade schools at the time of the Supreme Court's decision 9 years ago will enter segregated high schools this fall, having suffered a loss which can never be restored. The lack of an adequate education denies the Negro a chance to get a decent job.

The orderly implementation of the Supreme Court decision, therefore, cannot be left solely to those who may not have the economic resources to carry the legal action or who may be subject to harassment.

Other features will be also requested, including greater protection for the right to vote. But legislation, I repeat, cannot solve this problem alone. It must be solved in the homes of every American in every community across our country.

In this respect, I want to pay tribute to those citizens North and South who have been working in their communities to make life better for all. They are acting not out of a sense of legal duty, but out of a sense of human decency.

Like our soldiers and sailors in all parts of the world, they are meeting freedom's challenge on the firing line, and I salute them for their honor and their courage.

My fellow Americans, this is a problem which faces us all—in every city of the North as well as the South. Today there are

Negroes unemployed two or three times as many compared to whites, inadequate in education, moving into the large cities, unable to find work, young people particularly out of work without hope, denied equal rights, denied the opportunity to eat at a restaurant or lunch counter or go to a movie theater, denied the right to a decent education, denied almost today the right to attend a State university even though qualified. It seems to me that these are matters which concern us all, not merely Presidents or Congressmen or Governors, but every citizen of the United States.

This is one country. It has become one country because all of us and all the people who came here had an equal chance to develop their talents.

We cannot say to 10 percent of the population that you can't have that right; that your children can't have the chance to develop whatever talents they have; that the only way that they are going to get their rights is to go into the streets and demonstrate. I think we owe them and we owe ourselves a better country than that.

Therefore, I am asking for your help in making it easier for us to move ahead and to provide the kind of equality of treatment which we would want ourselves; to give a chance for every child to be educated to the limit of his talents.

As I have said before, not every child has an equal talent or an equal ability or an equal motivation, but they should have the equal right to develop their talent and their ability and their motivation to make something of themselves.

We have a right to expect that the Negro community will be responsible, will uphold the law, but they have a right to expect that the law will be fair; that the Constitution will be color blind, as Justice Harlan said at the turn of the century.

This is what we are talking about and this is a matter which concerns this country and what it stands for, and in meeting it I ask the support of all of our citizens.

Thank you very much.

WAIVER IN CERTAIN CASES OF INDEBTEDNESS GUARANTEED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 412) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. ALLOTT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly, without losing his right to the floor, so that I may ask the Senate to consider items on the calendar to which there is no objection?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING MODIFICATION OF THE REPAYMENT CONTRACT WITH THE GRAND VALLEY WATER USERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 218, House bill 2821.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2821) to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 237), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 2821, introduced as the result of an executive communication, is to authorize certain modifications of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association, Colorado. The repayment obligation of the association would be modified by (1) deducting from such obligation the unaccrued construction charges in the amount of $109,158.19 against 1,366.2 acres of public land originally classified as productive and now classified as permanently unproductive, and (2) crediting to the next annual installment from the association the sum of $4,531.93, which represents construction charges paid by the association on 123.6 acres of land in canceled farm units included in the above acreage.

COSTS

The enactment of this legislation would not involve any additional cost to the Federal Government.

DISCUSSION

The Grand Valley project in west-central Colorado is one of the older Federal reclamation projects. Construction was authorized in 1912 and the first water was delivered in 1915. The initial project works, including the main canal, were constructed with capacity considered adequate to serve 53,000 acres. However, over 50 percent of this acreage was never entered. On the basis of classification of the project's 53,000 acres under the Omnibus Adjustment Act of May 25, 1926, and reclassifications, pursuant to that act, in 1953, 1954, and 1955, 24,783 acres were determined to be productive and 28,217 acres were classified as permanently unproductive.

On December 18, 1954, the Grand Valley Water Users' Association advised that it considered certain lands included in the 24,783 acres to be unproductive and requested an additional reclassification. This request was based upon its belief that the area classified as irrigable on many of the vacant tracts so greatly exceeded the usable area that the construction charge payments discouraged entry, purchase, or other disposition of the lands. The association agreed to pay one-half of the expense of the reclassification.

The field and report work pertaining to the reclassification was completed in 1955. The total area reclassified was 1,533.3 acres. Of that total, 1,366.2 acres were found to be permanently unproductive and 167.1 acres were found to be productive. The 1,366.2 acres found to be permanently unproductive included 123.6 acres which had been entered and on which the association has paid certain construction charges.

As a result of the reclassification, the 1,366.2 acres were recommended for exclusion from the irrigable project area with the 167.1 acres to remain subject to repayment charges. H.R. 2821 would implement these recommendations. The unaccrued construction charge obligation for the 1,366.2 acres found to be permanently unproductive was determined to be $109,158.19 and the legislation provides that this amount be written off as a loss to the reclamation fund. In addition, the legislation provides that the association be given credit in the amount of $4,531.93 which represents construction charges paid on the 123.6 acres of entered land which have been found to be permanently unproductive.

The enactment of this legislation would not only permit a realistic adjustment of the irrigable acreages and construction charges heretofore applicable to these lands but would assist the Bureau of Reclamation in making this public land available and useful to resident farmowners and resident entrymen through sale or by amending existing farm units.

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends that H.R. 2821 be enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

E.L.K. OIL CO.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 221, Senate bill 1066.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1066) for the relief of the E.L.K. Oil Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 240), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

The purpose of S. 1066 is to authorize the Secretary to do equity, if he finds the facts and circumstances warrant such action, by reinstating a Federal lease on oil lands in Wyoming which has been terminated automatically under the provisions of section 31 of the Mineral Leasing Act (found in 30 U.S.C. 188). The subject lease was that of the E.L.K. Oil Co., a small independent corporation of Cheyenne, Wyo., which has been conducting wildcatting operations in the Mountain States. By dint of investment of time and money, and with good luck, the company found oil on a part of the acreage covered by the lease. Thus, if this acreage were now to be offered for lease, it would have to be disposed of by competitive bidding with the chances being that the E.L.K. Co. would lose out to a major corporation which probably would outbid it.

FACTUAL SITUATION

The E.L.K. lease covers a tract of 240 acres. Payment of advance annual rental for 1963 was due on February 1, 1963. This was a Friday. The rental check for $120, dated January 31, was not received in the office of the Bureau of Land Management in Cheyenne until the following Monday, February 4. Since, under the law, the lease

had terminated as of the close of business the preceding Friday, February 1, the check was returned to the E.L.K. Oil Co. on February 6.

At the subcommittee hearing, the president of the E.L.K. Oil Co., Mr. Robert Klicker, testified that he had come in from a field trip on Thursday, the 31st, discovered that the rental had not been paid, and that he himself wrote the check for $120, placed it in an envelope addressed to the Bureau of Land Management office and mailed it at the Cheyenne post office in person.

This testimony was not contradicted, and no evidence casting any doubt upon it offered from any quarter.

At the subcommittee's specific request, the Bureau of Land Management made a search of its files for the postmarked envelope in which the check had been mailed. Results of this search were negative; the envelope was not found. Bureau of Land Management officials explained that except in rare instances, such as in an appeals case, letters received in BLM field offices are opened, the contents time stamped, and the envelope discarded. The volume of mail is quite large.

The committee wishes to emphasize the fact that S. 1066 does not reinstate the E.L.K. oil lease. Rather it authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to "receive, consider, and act upon" any petition by the company that may be filed within 180 days after enactment. That is, the Secretary will conduct a full and complete investigation of the facts and circumstances, and then determine whether the lease should be reinstated upon payment of the year's rental.

APPLICABLE LAW

Although S. 1066 makes no changes in existing law, the applicable section of the Mineral Leasing Act, section 31, as amended by Public Law 87-822, which added subsections (c) and (d), is as follows:

"Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 450) as Amended

"SEC. 31. (a) Except as otherwise herein provided, any lease issued under the provisions of this Act may be forfeited and canceled by an appropriate proceeding in the United States district court for the district in which the property, or some part thereof, is located whenever the lessee fails to comply with any of the provisions of this Act, of the lease, or of the general regulations promulgated under this Act and in force at the date of the lease; and the lease may provide for resort to appropriate methods for the settlement of disputes or for remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

"(b) Any lease issued after August 21, 1935, under the provisions of section 17 of this Act shall be subject to cancellation by the Secretary of the Interior after thirty days' notice upon the failure of the lessee to comply with any of the provisions of the lease, unless, or until, the land covered by any such lease is known to contain valuable deposits of oil or gas. Such notice in advance of cancellation shall be sent the lease owner by registered letter directed to the lease owner's record post office address, and in case such letter shall be returned as undelivered, such notice shall also be posted for a period of thirty days in the United States land office for the district in which the land covered by such lease is situated, or in the event that there is no district land office for such district, then in the post office nearest such land. Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, however, upon failure of a lessee to pay rental on or before the anniversary date of the lease, for any lease on which there is no well capable of producing oil or gas in paying quantities, the lease shall automatically terminate by operation of law: *Provided, however,* That when the time for payment falls upon any day in which the proper office for payment is not open, payment may be received the next official working day and shall be considered as timely made.

"(c) Where any lease has been terminated automatically by operation of law under this section for failure to pay rental timely and it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that the failure to pay timely the lease rental was justifiable or not due to a lack of reasonable diligence, he in his judgment may reinstate the lease subject to the following conditions:

"(1) A petition for reinstatement, together with the required rental, for any lease (a) terminated prior to the effective date of this act must be filed with the Secretary of the Interior within one hundred and eighty days after the effective date of this Act;

"(2) No valid lease has been issued affecting any of the lands in the terminated lease prior to the filing of the petition for reinstatement.

"(d) Where, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, drilling operations were being diligently conducted on the last day of the primary term of the lease, and, except for nonpayment of rental, the lessee would have been entitled to extension of his lease, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Act of September 2, 1960 (74 Stat. 790), the Secretary of the Interior may reinstate such lease notwithstanding the failure of the lessee to have made payment of the next year's rental, provided the conditions of subparagraphs (1) and (2) of section (c) are satisfied."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of section 31 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (30 U.S.C. 188), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to receive, consider, and act upon any petition of the E. L. K. Oil Company, of Cheyenne, Wyoming, filed within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, for reinstatement of United States oil and gas lease "Wyoming 046887(C)", as if such petition had been filed within the time provided in such section and such section had been applicable thereto.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE TAXATION BY STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 223, H.R. 6441.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6441) to amend Public Law 86-272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 242), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

This bill would extend from July 1, 1963, to March 31, 1964, the time within which the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and/or the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall file the reports required by Public Law 86-272.

STATEMENT

Public Law 86-272, as amended, requires the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the U.S. Senate, acting separately or jointly, or both, or any duly authorized subcommittees thereof, to "make full and complete studies of all matters pertaining to the taxation of interstate commerce by the States" and report to their respective Houses the results of such studies, together with their proposals for legislation on or before July 1, 1963.

The Committee on Judiciary, acting through a special subcommittee, has undertaken such a study, which is both broad and thorough. In the course of its work, the subcommittee has gathered a large amount of useful information. It is now engaged in analyzing this data and preparing recommendations based upon it.

Although the subcommittee has proceeded with diligence, the issues involved are numerous and complex. The time remaining for completing the report will be insufficient for the continued careful consideration which these issues demand. The House Committee on the Judiciary believes that an extension to March 31, 1964, should provide enough time for it to complete its work.

The Senate Committee on Finance is of the view that this extension is necessary and desirable and commends this bill to the Senate for its favorable consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 6441) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 225 through 229, in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first measure.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF EXCERPTS ON THE 1963-64 NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE SUBJECT OF MEDICARE

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of selected excerpts on the 1963-64 national high school debate subject of medicare, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document selected excerpts on the 1963-1964 national high school debate proposition: "What Should Be the Role of the Federal Government in Providing Medical Care to the Citizens of the United States", compiled by the Education and Public Welfare Division,

Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and that there be printed twenty-five thousand six hundred and sixty-five additional copies of such document, of which ten thousand three hundred shall be for the use of the Senate and fifteen thousand three hundred and sixty-five shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF 65TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The resolution (S. Res. 159) authorizing the printing of the 65th Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the sixty-fifth annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1962, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF STUDY ENTITLED "PROBLEMS AND TRENDS IN ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP—II"

The resolution (S. Res. 152) to print as a Senate document the study entitled "Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership—II," was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a staff study entitled "Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership—II", prepared at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that six thousand additional copies of such document be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF "SELECTED REPORTS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES"

The resolution (S. Res. 156) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of "Selected Reports of the Administrative Conference of the United States," was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document "Selected Reports of the Administrative Conference of the United States", submitted by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that there be printed two thousand additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

PRINTING FOR USE OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF ITS HEARINGS ON "PACIFICA FOUNDATION"

The resolution (S. Res. 157) authorizing the printing for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of its hearings on "Pacifica Foundation," was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary four thousand five hundred additional copies each of parts 2 and 3 of the hearings on "Pacifica Foundation", issued by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the Eighty-eighth Congress, first session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of measures on the calendar. There will be no further pieces of proposed legislation taken up at this time. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his forebearance and courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

CUBAN LIBERATION: A PROPOSAL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, there is a time in the policy councils of a free nation for measured deliberation and even for conscious delay. Until all of the facts are in hand, until they are confirmed beyond a reasonable doubt, and until the public mind and the national will have coalesced into an overwhelming consensus—that is the time for deliberate indecision.

But there is also a time for decision—and for decisive action. And then, soaring rhetoric must give way to purposeful deeds.

We have arrived at such a time—in sober fact, at the moment of truth—in this Nation's confrontation with world Communist imperialism.

Still more, we are face to face with the moral imperatives of our national honor. The weight of our words, and the value of our most solemn pledges, are now hanging in the balance. And it will be a dark day indeed for the cause of freedom, everywhere in the world, if they are found wanting.

My subject is Cuba. My concern is Cuba. My concern is the liberation of that terribly oppressed people; and the removal of a leprous sore gnawing away at the very life of this hemisphere.

I speak today to my peers in this coequal branch of the National Government—and thus also to and for the American people—in the name of our blemished national honor and with the mandate of a collective judgment that can no longer go unrepresented. We must take up the burden of responsible leadership that has so long been defaulted by our executive officials. It is time, at long last, to make good their own pledge of Cuban liberation. It is time, to put the matter most bluntly, to fulfill the same mission begun at the Bay of Pigs—to establish a beachhead of freedom on Cuban soil. Only this time we must get the job done, as I shall propose.

It is right and proper that the Congress should be the forum for such critical public debate—leading first to unequivocal decision and then to bold action. What better place, indeed, than the representative assembly of the whole American community to bring to a focus the mounting tide of public anger and public frustration over a Cuba policy of planned procrastination? If the executive will not lead—will not represent what I am convinced is the hardened will of the American people—then where but here can responsible action originate?

This action began a few days ago, in my judgment, when the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] subjected to careful scrutiny the Cuban policy of this administration. His analysis was dispassionate; but not the implications that so indisputably emerge from this sorry record of delay and deceit, of empty rhetoric, and of bold promises timidly deferred.

The political and security considerations are grave enough—and to these I will direct attention in the remainder of my remarks. But equally grave, and more shocking still, are the moral implications of our Cuban policy. Or, to call them by their true name, the moral failures.

We failed at the Bay of Pigs—through flaccid reasoning at the critical moment. And we compounded our failure by attempting, months later, to hide behind some legalistic distinction between "air cover" and "air support," in a manner wholly unworthy of a great and powerful nation. What was at stake there was not formal niceties but rather the lives of brave men. And these we callously sacrificed.

We failed again last October when, with every winning card in our hand, with overwhelming popular support in this Nation and throughout the free world, we stopped short of our avowed goal. And the Soviet presence remains in Cuba—if, indeed, it does not grow.

We have failed, repeatedly, to mobilize the vast anti-Castro ferment inside Cuba and to unify with it the self-exiled refugees from Communist tyranny in this country and throughout the hemisphere. In crude terms of strategy, this has meant a shameful waste of valuable resources; and in the more significant terms of moral commitment, we have played cruel games with the hopes and aspirations of all these people—endlessly proclaiming our desire to see them once more free but failing to follow through with effective action.

We thus cheapen the concept of freedom—and irreparably undercut both the material strength and the moral stamina of the forces of freedom, worldwide.

And we contribute to the disarray among the forces of free Cuba, that, time and again, administration spokesmen point to as an excuse for our failure to mobilize the full resources of the hemispheric community in support of a provisional free Cuban Government.

This Nation, in honor and good conscience, can no longer have it both ways. If we are not prepared to do more than talk the Castro regime out of existence, then let us at least muster up the candor to confess our timidity and our helplessness. But I do not for one moment believe that this would properly represent the hardened will of the American people; and in their name, I utterly reject any such counsel of despair. Instead, I urge upon this body a clear and purposeful reaffirmation of our commitment to Cuban liberation. It is a matter, equally, of our national interest and our national honor. Now, let us get on with the task.

Can there be any remaining doubt about the urgency of the problem? A Communist Cuba is no mere annoyance. It is not some minor blemish in a community of nations otherwise healthy. It

is, rather, an ugly and a potentially fatal cancer within the vitals of the free world.

In the measured words of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee's "Interim Report on the Cuban Military Buildup:"

> Cuba is an advanced Soviet base for subversive, revolutionary, and agitational activities in the Western Hemisphere and affords the opportunity to export agents, funds, arms, ammunition and propaganda throughout Latin America. It serves as an advance intelligence base for the U.S.S.R. It provides a base for the training of agents from other Latin American countries in subversive, revolutionary, agitational, and sabotage techniques.

The report goes on:

> Our friends abroad will understandably doubt our ability to meet and defeat the forces of communism thousands of miles across the ocean if we prove unable to cope with the Communist threat at our very doorstep.

This evil threat—

The report concludes—

must be "eliminated at an early date."

Let me simply underscore those final words. The Communist presence must be removed—not endlessly discussed, not reduced, not redeployed, but removed. And Cuba must once more be free.

When the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], in effect, challenged this administration to supplant its eloquent words with positive deeds, I rose to observe that I, too, had been engaged in a critical analysis of our Cuban policy. I then applauded, and now underscore, his argument that the time is long overdue for this body to come to the aid of the executive: if they will not spell out the details of a policy aimed at Cuban liberation, if they will not make good their own pledges, then let us provide the impetus. I promised to come forward with a proposal, more to promote and provoke debate than a full-blown operational plan, which would be devoted to one overriding purpose: the restoration of a free Cuba.

And so today, in no spirit of competition or partisanship, but simply as one profoundly disturbed American whose official responsibility it is to help hammer out the guidelines of national policy—in this spirit I rise to offer such a proposal. I ask only that it be considered in the same spirit—seriously, soberly, impartially. I ask that it be thoroughly debated, on its merits. If it helps move us forward, from dissonant oratory to a national harmony of decisive purpose, then I will be content. I ask that you hear me out, and then put my proposal to the hard test of full and free debate and to the ultimate standard of this Nation's best interest.

It is in this affirmative spirit that I offer a proposal for Cuban liberation.

The goal has already been stated: the liberation of Cuba, by and for the Cuban people themselves.

What unique resources, what readily available strengths does it call upon?

Chiefly two: First of all, the Cuban people throughout the hemisphere, and within Cuba itself. This is the manpower ultimately required for Cuban liberation—dedicated, ready, and willing to spearhead the operation. They must have U.S. encouragement and support. And they must have a home for their government.

That home, too, exists—right on Cuban soil. The U.S.-leased naval station at Guantanamo Bay is perfectly located to become a free Cuban outpost upon the very island of Cuba. It is there. It is fully equipped. It can serve as a moral rallying point for all Cuban patriots, on their own land. It is, in fact, exactly what the Bay of Pigs operation was meant to secure: a territorial beachhead on Cuban soil, a place for a seat-of-government for provisional officials upon the very sands of their homeland, and a focus for eventual liberation operations.

These are the unique resources that would form the basis of an operation committed inflexibly to Cuban liberation—the manpower and the territorial beachhead itself. But something more is needed—indeed, it must be the first order of business—and that is a free Cuban Government, as widely representative as possible of all Cuban democratic groups and parties. Up to now, we have treated a free Cuban Government as a stumbling block to liberation; and we have greatly contributed, by our own indecision and our own failure of nerve, to the confusion of competing and sometimes conflicting forces, each claiming to speak with the voice of free Cuba.

No one, and certainly not this Nation, can say for sure just who does represent a free Cuba. Only the Cuban people themselves, in free elections, can ultimately give the answer—and even then, only after the full restoration of freedom and the gradual rebuilding of the basic institutions of Cuban society. But what we can do—and do now, with a candor to match our bold purpose—is to call on the Cuban patriots to compose their own differences and to unite behind the one supreme goal of liberation. Let us issue our call—our challenge, in fact—in these terms:

We pledge our full support to a unified interim government and then prepare the way for free elections, within the framework of the 1940 constitution.

We will help this government establish itself on Cuban soil, at our Guantanamo base and, at the earliest appropriate moment, accord it full recognition as the legal instrument of Cuban sovereignty—at the same time branding, once and for all, the Castro regime as foreign-dominated usurpers. We will thus make use of our Guantanamo base to complete the mission we so shamefully muddled at the Bay of Pigs—the establishment of a free Cuban Government on Cuban soil. And we will do so without firing a shot, without risking lives or spilling blood.

We will insist on the provisional nature of this interim government—and request its executive officials to deposit with the Secretary-General of the OAS their undated resignations, to become effective when the Cuban people, by free elections, reassert their own ultimate sovereignty. We offer the use of Guantanamo, while retaining our full treaty rights and our perpetual leasehold. And thus we utterly reject the notion of offering this key base as a pawn in some future negotiations—with any Cuban government. That form of appeasement has no part in our liberation policy.

We will, at the same time, continue the policy of training free Cubans in our own Armed Forces. These men, in increasing numbers, will provide a reservoir of military skills upon which the provisional government may wish to draw as it charts its own course toward ultimate liberation. Without such an objective, without such a government to rally these forces and to lead them, our present training program has no real meaning. It is an illusion of action with no clear objective.

We will, at every step in this process, seek the fullest possible collaboration and support of the OAS community—in recognizing an interim government, in branding the Castro Communists a regime of usurpers, and in training the nucleus of a free Cuban army. But with or without such collaboration, this Nation will honor its pledge with every necessary resource.

I am suggesting that we thus challenge all Cuban patriots to units in the name of liberation. And toward the accomplishment of this goal, we must pledge our unequivocal purpose and the resolute use of our power.

Having proclaimed Cuban liberation as the core of our policy, we must do one thing more: we must warn away any and all outside powers that we will tolerate no interference, in Cuba or elsewhere in this hemisphere—no arms, no strategic supplies, no technicians, no training missions. And if the interval between the proclamation of our liberation policy and its effective implementation is used for the withdrawal of all foreign presence from the OAS community, so much the better. But let every foreign power be on notice, clear and unmistakable, that the United States means business about Cuban liberation. Let no one doubt that this Nation is prepared to meet its commitments—wherever in the world the challenge may come. We will not be diverted. Neither will we be deterred.

There we have the bare outline of a proposal for Cuban liberation. Let me stress once more that I offer this proposal as one possible course of action—consistent with our own avowed goals and with a high potential for accomplishing these goals. I offer it mainly as a spur to purposeful debate. I hope and expect to have it subjected to close and careful questions. Indeed, nothing less than this will fulfill my own purpose of moving our present Cuban policy out of the doldrums of defeatism and into the range of effective action. And in spelling out all the details, there will be problems. There will be legalistic forms to be either observed or overcome. There will be accusations, internally and externally, of warmongering. And there will surely be dire threats about escalating the crisis and blustering warnings about rocking the boat.

I submit that this is precisely the time when the boat needs rocking—right on out of the shoals of procrastination and of indecision. And I submit, too, that the form of escalation we can least afford

is to permit this advance base of Communist imperialism to harden into a permanent enemy outpost barely beyond our own mainland. These are the realities of an intolerable situation. Our purposes are entirely honorable. And with a resolute will, we can achieve these purposes—to assist an oppressed people to liberate themselves from a foreign tyranny, and thus to advance the cause of freedom everywhere in the world.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I rise to pay my compliment to the distinguished Senator from Colorado for the statement which he has just made. In it he is suggesting positive action, which in this day and age, in this city, is rather unusual, in view of the constant negative approaches of our administration.

The Senator has said that we need effective measures today. I suggest that we need an effective measure somewhere in this world, because whether we like it or not, we must admit that we are not being too successful around the world. We are faced with disaster in South Vietnam and in Laos. The Lord only knows what Berlin will bring up. Cuba is the one place close to our hearts and close to our heartland where we can do something.

I believe that what the Senator has suggested is worthy of discussion and consideration.

Frankly, as an American, I am a little ashamed of letting other people down. We have let the Hungarians down. We are beginning to let the people of southeast Asia down. We are not certain about what we will do in Berlin. We have certainly let the Cubans down.

It has been historic in this country that we keep our promises. So far the administration's hallmark, in addition to being indecision, has been failure to keep its word to our friends and allies.

Before I close I should like to ask the Senator a question, to make it perfectly clear in my mind and in the minds of my colleagues in the Senate, what he means with respect to one point in his speech.

When the Senator suggests that Guantanamo, on which we have perpetual lease, be used for the establishment of a free Cuban government, he is not suggesting that we give up our naval base. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. I am merely suggesting that in Guantanamo we offer the Cubans a place, on their own homeland, where they can form a home for their provisional government.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my friend from Colorado. There will be those who will immediately charge that the Senator from Colorado is suggesting that we give up Guantanamo. I know that his suggestion does not contemplate that. I believe that at the outset we should make this point clear, so that those who tremble and quake at every word from the Kremlin will not throw at him and the people who back him the charge that he is following the example of constant appeasement.

Whether we like it or not, and whether the newspapers have covered this subject up with other headlines, the fact remains that Cuba is still the most important issue to our people and the most important issue for peace anywhere in the world. We had better get on with the problem that confronts not only the freedom of America but also the freedom of the entire Western Hemisphere, and the freedom of the entire world.

Again I congratulate the Senator from Colorado. I thank him for having made this historic and courageous speech.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona very much, particularly for pointing out one thing which I think should be made perfectly clear; namely, that we have no intention—and I have no such purpose in mind—of giving up Guantanamo either to the Castro regime or to a new regime which we would recognize after it was formed in Guantanamo, or to any other regime, until that time, not now in the foreseeable future, when Guantanamo would not be of any service to us whatever. I cannot foresee such a time at the moment. The Senator's question has given me an opportunity, which I appreciate, to make this point perfectly clear.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator, from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I am greatly impressed and very much intrigued with the idea the Senator from Colorado has presented. We have been going along for several years, being told that there is no practical step that we can take, and that there is nothing whatever that we must do. Now, for the benefit of the American people, the Senator from Colorado has presented a very practical proposal. It seems to me that this is a challenge to the executive department, either to adopt the proposal or to come forth with one that is better. It cannot be wiped off the record merely by saying, "We must still wait to see what happens."

I have this question to ask: If a provisional government were set up in Guantanamo, would all activities of that government be confined to Guantanamo?

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not think so. If we permitted the establishment of a provisional government in Guantanamo, we would recognize that government. One of the paradoxical and anomalous situations in this country today is that we have never severed our connections with Cuba. We have only withdrawn our diplomatic representation from Cuba. Therefore, at the time that we would recognize the provisional government, we would sever diplomatic connections with Cuba.

Mr. BENNETT. If we recognized the new provisional government, would it not be perfectly proper for the people of the new Cuban government to establish embassies and other representations, particularly on our own soil?

Mr. ALLOTT. I assume that they would set up representation in many places where they thought the need existed. They undoubtedly would do so somewhere on our own soil.

Mr. BENNETT. Therefore, there would be an opportunity for that government to have free contact with the Cuban refugees who are located within the borders of the United States, and with anyone else or with any other government that might be interested in the success of the new provisional government thus established. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. The situation as it exists now—and even the administration's spokesmen have said so over and over—is that our dealings with Cuba have so fragmented the exiled patriots that they are now broken into many groups.

It is my hope that such a proposal as this, offering exiled Cubans a home on their own soil, with all the national honor and dignity that would come with it, would create an impetus, a drive, a motivation among them to establish a provisional government, a government which, of course, we would recognize when we were satisfied that it was a truly representative government.

Mr. BENNETT. If such a provisional government were recognized by the United States, would it not be possible also to have it recognized by the other states which are members of the Organization of American States, so that Cuba could again be represented in that important body?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is a possibility. Of course, no one knows what the first reaction would be; but I am sure that the South American countries themselves are as critical of our policy toward Cuba as are the Cuban exiles themselves. I know they wonder why we, with all our power, with all our might, with all our prestige, are unable to assist the little country of Cuba, while at the same time we are talking about keeping the peace of the world. The South Americans simply cannot understand a powerful, strong nation, which acts in such an utterly flaccid, vacillating, unpurposeful manner.

There has been a whole series of such actions by this administration. If we would not continue to act in this way, if we acted with all our force behind us, we might convince those people, and we might find, as we did last fall, when the President made his ringing declaration, that we would pull all the support of the Organization of American States behind us at once.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah is much impressed with the idea proposed by the Senator from Colorado. Until another one that seems even better and more practical comes along, I shall do everything I can to support and hasten the fruition of this interesting and intriguing plan. I congratulate the Senator from Colorado on the idea which he has brought before the Senate today.

Mr. ALLOTT. I express my deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Utah. He himself made an outstanding speech on the Cuban situation a few weeks ago. I hope that he also will continue the discussion of this subject in the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Colorado. He, like the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, has made an outstanding contribution to our national welfare. The suggestion that a provisional government be recognized and be given a home on Cuban soil, on the Guantanamo base, without in any way relinquishing any of our rights there, is one of great promise. Frankly, I do not believe it should be rejected unless a better proposal is offered. It is one of the most important steps that could be taken. Some of us may have something else to offer; but I believe the Senator from Colorado is talking in the long-range interest of the peace and security of the United States as well as the liberty of the Cuban people.

Recent history proves that whenever the West has acted with determination and strength in the defense of great principles, the Communists have backed down. Likewise, recently history shows that whenever the West has acted with vacillation and compromise, communism has advanced. Instead of being called warmongers, those who advocate specific, purposeful action in connection with the Communist threat to the Western Hemisphere are actually serving the long-range cause of peace with justice and honor. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska. I wish to make two points. First, I go back to my prefatory remarks; namely, that I offer this proposal as one positive plan.

Second, I do not know whether the administration has a policy or not. The distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] brought this point out very well the other day. If the administration has a policy, the best description that can be given of it is that it is a policy of containment. At best, it is a negative policy. I believe it is time for Americans to get our whole international policy off its heels and forward on its toes, where it can punch, and punch hard. I do not believe we can steer a true course of world leadership, to which we are definitely committed and which we cannot avoid, until and unless we are willing to take strong moral positions and support them.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I, too, salute the Senator from Colorado for making a most compelling, courageous suggestion of a constructive nature, one which would put an end to the retreat from freedom, which the United States has been leading in the Western Hemisphere. What the Senator from Colorado proposes is on all fours with the hallowed concepts, principles, and programs embraced in the Monroe Doctrine.

We have reached a stage in our relationships with the Western World where to do nothing, as we have been doing for so long, is much more dangerous than to do something and to take some constructive action. His call for action should produce results either along the line of his proposals or in conformity with some other plan of action.

I liked what the Senator said about the dangers of escalation. It seems to me that the dangers of escalation in this area are much greater from the standpoint of a continuation of a do-nothing program than they would be if some constructive leadership were exerted.

Over the weekend I was visiting with a friend from a Latin American republic. We were discussing the excellent speech made by the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], in the Senate on Thursday, in which the Senator from Kentucky reviewed the catastrophic consequences of our Cuban policy to date. I was discussing with this important Latin American citizen the feeling I have that the Latin American republics should be as much concerned about Cuba as we are; and that they should join with us in some kind of concerted effort to eliminate the Communist cancer from the Western Hemisphere. The rejoinder of my friend was that the Latin American people are far ahead of the North Americans—or at least ahead of the U.S. Government. He said:

> We are looking for some leadership. We are waiting for someone to give us marching orders. We are willing and eager to cooperate; but we are unable to cooperate in a do-nothing atmosphere. While you sit on your hands, we sit on our hands.

I like the double-edged suggestion that a provisional Cuban Government be established. The Senator from Colorado has in mind, as I have, the creation of incentives by which the Cubans themselves would become eager to select their provisional government and to settle their personal or political differences.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I wish to make certain that my own purpose in this respect is understood. It is not that the United States would create a provisional Cuban Government, but that the Cubans themselves would create it.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. I think we should create some incentives. One reason why the Cubans have had so much difficulty in getting together is that they have had not much incentive to get together. They have not had a chance to do things which would bring them together. I think a provisional government which would have nothing to do would be unpopular in Cuba and among the refguees. To establish a provisional government and then to tell it that it could not recruit freedom fighters, could not train its forces, could not have contact with the people in Cuba who are anti-Castro and anti-Communist, would be to give the kiss of death to a provisional government before it was created. So we ought to provide a provisional Cuban Government work to do and an opportunity to house itself on Cuban soil.

If there are those who may oppose such a program—I hope there will be no opposition—I suggest that there are perhaps islands adjacent to Cuba, aside from Guantanamo, on which a provisional government could be established. It seems to me that the important thing is to give a provision government an opportunity to locate itself on Cuban soil, where it can begin to undertake plans for what will happen after Castro. The suggestion of the Senator from Colorado point to that direction.

I should like to ask the Senator whether he believes the program which he has discussed would be in conflict with the suggestion I have made from time to time, in various speeches and in reports to the State Department and the White House; namely, that the first essential step that we could take to indicate that we mean business about getting rid of communism in Cuba would be to intensify our economic boycott, which at least would tend to keep the Castro government in Cuba from fattening itself on the fruits of the free world. Would there be anything contradictory between such a policy and the suggestions made by the Senator from Colorado in the course of his speech?

Mr. ALLOTT. I see no conflict between those two courses of action. In one respect they are quite similar; namely, the proposal that we cease doing nothing; that, instead, we start upon definite planned courses of action which will exert upon Castro every kind of pressure for the fall of Castro which we can exert, and which will exert every kind of pressure upon Cuba and Khrushchev—instead of permitting Khrushchev to exert pressure upon us—to get his own people out of Cuba before, because of certain developments, it might be too late to get them out.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to hear the Senator from Colorado make that statement, because in my opinion one of the most dismal aspects of our present policy toward Cuba is the fainthearted effort we have made to establish the first essential step in setting up and supporting an economic boycott in the Western Hemisphere against Cuba. The U.S. policy has been completely satisfactory from the standpoint of our own nationals, for they are not allowed to trade with Cuba or to send to Cuba anything except essential medical supplies. But in the implementation of that policy we have not taken even a half-sized step in the direction of persuading others to adopt a similar policy. For example, we say that ships which engage in Communist trade with Cuba will not be welcome in U.S. ports, for commercial purposes. But if we meant business, if that policy were designed to do something other than to deceive the public, and if we really meant to establish an economic boycott, the least we could do would be to insist that shipping companies which permit their ships to trade with Cuba will not be permitted to have any of their ships engage in commerce in American ports. Such a policy would have some meaning, some validity, and some effect.

However, when we say to a shipping company, "All we require of you is that your ships A, B, and C, which trade with Cuban ports, shall not enter our ports; but you may bring into our ports any other ships you operate," in my opinion

that is an exercise in futility, for it is designed to do nothing.

So we should take the first step in making our economic-boycott policy effective. We should have taken it long before now. However, after October 22, after the Bay of Pigs fiasco, and after retreating down hill ever since then, we still have not taken that first step in endeavoring to apply economic sanctions against Cuba.

So I am happy that as the Senator from Colorado has discussed our studies, he has pointed out that there is nothing to prevent us from taking action tomorrow to apply economic sanctions against Cuba.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator from South Dakota is entirely correct, and I thank him for contributing this point to the debate.

The main point is that we must begin placing pressure upon them, for there is no reason why our country should be the constant recipient of pressure from Khrushchev and the Communists in Europe. Instead, we should be exerting some sort of pressure ourselves, not only in this one spot, but also in spots throughout the world. If we did what the Senator from South Dakota has suggested, that would be at least one positive step toward exerting some pressure on them, instead of backing away from it, as we have constantly done.

Mr. MUNDT. If we took the simple, logical, and completely understandable step I have just discussed, and then moved in the direction the Senator from Colorado has proposed, I am sure—as my Latin American friends said over the weekend—that the countries of Latin America which are looking to us for leadership would finally realize that we are serious; and they would take steps of their own, and steps in cooperation with us, to implement this policy. Furthermore, I believe that some of the NATO countries and some of our supposed friends across the seas who are constantly fattening their economic coffers by trading with the enemy, while insisting that we continue to give them large handouts in order to make them safe against communism, should stop that counter-productive practice. Thus we would not find NATO countries and other countries we are supporting knifing us in the back by making profits for themselves by trading with the enemy.

I salute the Senator from Colorado for his persuasive and challenging suggestions.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I have been testifying before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, so I did not have the advantage of hearing the first part of the speech of the Senator from Colorado. As I understand from the latter part of his speech and the subsequent colloquy, he proposes that the Cubans who are now in our country establish a government-in-exile, and that we offer them a place of domicile at Guantanamo Bay.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. And that thus we would help the Cubans who are now in exile return to their own country.

Mr. ALLOTT. No; their return would have to be planned. First, we would have to determine how many of the Cubans now in exile would be offered a domicile at Guantanamo Bay.

This suggestion is based upon the historical fact that in the past 2 years the body of Cubans in exile has been fragmentized. My purpose is to offer them motives for setting aside their differences and forming a provisional government as representative as possible—and, of course, we would not recognize it until it was as representative as possible—and then to offer that government a place of domicile and a home on their own soil. That government would then have the recognition of many countries which otherwise would not recognize it.

This development would provide a great upsurge in the effort for liberation of the Cuban people. Today, most Americans have forgotten that we have had many years of wonderful relationships with the Cuban people and that in many instances we really owe them a great deal.

All in all, I feel that this proposal would give a strong push to the movement of obtaining liberation for Cuba. We would be starting that movement, instead of merely talking about it.

Mr. GRUENING. I can understand how this proposal, if accepted and carried through, would have a definite psychological value. However, I do not clearly understand—and perhaps the Senator can assist me in this connection—what would happen then? How would that help overthrow Castro?

Let us assume that a government-in-exile were organized, established, and recognized on Guantanamo Bay. What then?

Mr. ALLOTT. Then I think we must provide assistance for every organized effort which the government would make in relation to exiled Cubans and Cubans within Cuba in order to help them gain recognition for themselves. We are now training Cubans in our military forces. Such training is an empty gesture unless we really mean to use those people, or permit them to implement their efforts to gain a beachhead in their oun country and overthrow Castro.

Mr. GRUENING. Any constructive suggestions are desirable at this time. I should be interested to see what the reaction outside of this small group who endorse the idea would be. I should like to see what reaction we get from the administration or from the public. I confess that I feel we must do something more definite and tangible than we have been doing in the past. I suppose other Senators were as shocked as I was to read that a Castro group had invaded the residence of a U.S. Embassy official in Caracas, seizing his wife, tying her up, and painting their slogans on the walls. It was a plain defiance of the dignity and authority of the United States. It is shocking to think that that sort of thing can happen, with no apparent redress sought.

Mr. ALLOTT. It is shocking to think that our country has changed so much in 50 years. That invasion could not possibly have happened 50 years ago. No one would have dared to insult the integrity of the United States in such a manner.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. First, I commend the Senator from Colorado for his positive approach to the problem. A few days ago when he discussed his suggestion with me informally, I tried to take a negative view. I was a little skeptical. But the more I have thought about his proposal, the more impressed I have been that he has suggested a practical approach to a very difficult problem.

I should like to comment on three items of his proposal. First, I commend the Senator for bringing out the point that it was U.S. action or lack of action which contributed toward the fragmentation of the various groups that are interested.

They have one common interest—the liberation of Cuba from communism. But they are divided among themselves as to how best to approach a solution to the problem. The U.S. Government has used that fact as an excuse for its position of doing nothing. I believe that action such as the Senator has proposed—or if not that approach, something parallel—would get us out of the dilemma in which we find ourselves today as a country and as the leader of our hemisphere.

As I understand the proposal of the Senator from Colorado, he is trying to accomplish the original concept of the so-called Bay of Pigs undertaking. Is that not correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. MORTON. I was not in any way privy to what went on in the planning of that unfortunate undertaking after January 20, 1961, but I was somewhat privy to what went on before then. In the first place, the locale was not to be the Bay of Pigs, but another point. However, that is immaterial one way or the other. The idea was not that we should land a force of Cubans on Cuban soil and suddenly see Castro overthrown and the Communists out. The idea was much more sophisticated than that. It was based upon the premise that if we could establish a provisional government on Cuban soil—a government such as the Senator has described in his careful and well-chosen words—it would become a rallying point. Contact could be made with the anti-Castro forces which were in the very mountains in which Castro himself got his start, and ultimately communism could be thrown out.

It was anticipated that either there would be protection against air attack, or that Castro's airpower would have been liquidated completely. That was the basic concept behind the training program which started in March of 1960 for those who took part in the invasion

13 months before it actually was put into effect.

I believe that no one questions the fact that the plan was not implemented during the previous administration because we had not been able to obtain the proper leadership among the various groups that were tainted by the brush of Batista or even the brush of communism.

So the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado would accomplish the particular purpose of setting up a provisional government on Cuban soil.

The Senator from Alaska has asked the question as to whether we would train a force at Guantanamo which would go farther into Cuba. That question brings up many problems. Of course, I doubt that such action would be practical. But the proposed government on Cuban soil could, as the Senator has pointed out in previous colloquy, have an embassy in Washington and a consulate in Miami, in the keys, or somewhere else. Through that consulate or through some of the South American countries, the government would be in communication with the Cuban underground and keep active. It could encourage and give guidance to the Cuban revolutionaries who are in the mountains.

The suggestion of the Senator from Colorado has great merit and should be carefully considered by the Congress, and by the administration.

A final point is that the Senator will be criticized for some possible treaty violation which might come about as a result of his proposal. We have a base in Guantanamo under what might be called an executive arrangement between President Theodore Roosevelt and the early Cuban Government formed after Cuba achieved its independence. That arrangement was formalized into a treaty in 1934, which was ratified by the Senate. The treaty is very simple. I do not profess to be an expert in the field of international law. I recently examined the treaty. Frankly, I can see nothing in the treaty that would prevent such an arrangement. But should it be argued that the treaty would prevent such action, if we should recognize a provisional government in Cuba for Cuba, would we not then be at liberty, with that government, to make any amendment of any treaty obligation? As the Senator has pointed out, if we should completely sever diplomatic recognition of any Castro regime or the de facto regime in Cuba today, it seems to me we would be free to negotiate treaty amendments or any treaties we might wish with the Government of Cuba which we in fact recognize, and which I hope others will recognize.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is entirely correct. I should like to point out that at the present time Castro himself does not recognize the treaty of 1934, which was based chiefly upon two executive agreements dated in 1903. Castro refuses to recognize that treaty. So far he has refused to cash any of the checks, in the amount of $2,000 annually, paid for the leasehold under the treaty. Perhaps in the amount in which Castro is now stowing away funds, $2,000 does not mean too much to him. I have no doubt of that. So we are in the anomalous position that Castro does not recognize the treaty anyway. We are dealing with a man who does not recognize a right which we say is valid and which exists. So if we should recognize a provisional government in Cuba we would, of course, expect that provisional government to recognize our treaty and our leasehold.

Mr. MORTON. The fact that Castro will not cash a check for $2,000 for the leasehold of Guantanamo might show his attitude toward a very modest amount, but he does not hesitate to shake us down for approximately $55 million in tribute.

Mr. ALLOTT. No. I have previously pointed out on the Senate floor that when the Senate attempted to revise the sugar bill, those of us who were very interested in that bill waited until the very last day—the night of June 30—before action was taken. We should have acted upon the measure many months before that. By failing to act previously, we financed the Cuban revolution and Castro that year to the extent of about $155 million. Therefore, it is not too soon for us to shake our heads and start coming to grips with reality.

Mr. MORTON. Again I commend the Senator. I hope this question will be fully debated not only in the Senate, but also throughout the country.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who has been a great help to me on the floor and also in our private conversations, in developing these facts.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to join my voice with the voices of those who have commended my senior colleague for a positive, forward-looking, and progressive program. I have stated on numerous occasions, both publicly and on the Senate floor, that it has seemed to me the present administration has taken two basic positions as its fundamental foreign policy.

The first is that communism will evolve if we do not enter into a head-on confrontation with it, and that sooner or later it will be agreeable enough to live with peaceably. I do not believe this, but it seems to me that it is a part of our so-called isolation program.

Second, there seems to be a belief that Mr. Khrushchev is the most moderate of the Russian Communist leaders, and therefore should not be embarrassed by the creation of a crisis for him, whereby he might be overthrown. This has even been publicly stated by our representative at the United Nations, Mr. Stevenson, who said that we might possibly be able to get Soviet troops out of Cuba provided we did not embarrass Khrushchev too much. How he comes to that conclusion I do not have the faintest idea; but it seems to me that by taking such an attitude we would do nothing except strengthen the armed base in Cuba, now so well established for the infiltration of Central and South American countries.

I stated, as a part of my comments in a conversation with the Senator from Kentucky a few days ago, that I had recently had a meeting with a distinguished Cuban who had been originally a Castro supporter, who is now living in South America. I asked him what he thought we should do, to get his viewpoint. He replied that the first thing we ought to do would be to provide incentives for the creation of a provisional government-in-exile. He stated that we should recognize that government, that we should give it all the assistance we can, and that we should stimulate aid to the guerrillas and freedom fighters in Cuba.

It seems to me that my colleague has pinpointed in his remarks the ideas and comments which were expressed to me, as well as adding to them by proposing an actual base on Cuban soil, which is quite important if we are to recognize a provisional government under our present Neutrality Act, as I understand it.

I should like to ask my colleague one question. In addition to the problems discussed by my colleague and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, are there any other legal complications which might occur by virtue of establishing a provisional government on Guantanamo Bay?

Mr. ALLOTT. I answer the Senator's question by saying, first, that later I propose to discuss this subject more fully.

We know we would not be recognizing an exile government on U.S. soil. It is therefore my belief that we would not be violating the neutrality laws of the United States.

In my study of this question the question of the legality of such action was raised again and again. I have consulted many people about it, and the question has been studied thoroughly. Though I do not wish to go into a full discussion of it at this time, I merely say that the soil involved is, in an international sense, still the soil of Cuba, which would make the proposed action very desirable. Such a proposal would stir the hearts and move the blood of the Cubans themselves.

We hope that this would stimulate a desire to do away with the fragmentation.

I have examined the two original executive agreements, and the treaty. I find nothing in those agreements—and others I have asked to examine them have found nothing in them—to violate the neutrality laws. I have found no express prohibition. Only by reading something into the treaty consciously could this be declared unlawful or against the terms of the treaty.

I am not concerned about that problem, although the question which the Senator asked is one of the first questions which crossed my own mind.

Mr. DOMINICK. Again I commend the Senator for his positive program. Mr. Castro himself started with about 62

people in the Sierra Maestri Mountains. When he started with 62 against the forces of Batista, he looked pretty silly, but he continued to grow in strength, with support from a great many people who were tired of the Batista government, who, without realizing the problems they were creating, nurtured this creature in their own breasts.

It seems to me that if we could create a government chosen by the Cubans themselves—not one of the "Kennedy favorites," as expressed by the Cuban to whom I talked a few days ago—with someone chosen by the Cubans themselves to be placed in temporary power, pending free elections, as the Senator has so carefully spelled out, we would be creating a fountainhead which would be the source of inspiration for continued guerrilla activity designed to free Cuba from this Communist menace.

I think it is a wonderful idea.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank my colleague very much. I should like to go back to one of the first points he made, because I do not think it should be dropped completely. I refer to the indecisiveness, and the flaccidity of our Government in its attitude toward this situation. It is one which creates a feeling of hope along with a miasma of despair. It is bound to cause that, in addition to fragmentation.

This is the sort of thing which creates a climate Khrushchev himself wants, in order to promote his form of imperialism in this world. It is this coexistence policy which has come out so prominently in the past few days, particularly since Castro returned from his little tete-a-tete with Khrushchev, which creates the ideal situation and climate in which to confound the world, and permit Khrushchev to make further gains. I am reminded of something which was said to me by a Member of the Swiss Parliament. I believe it is worth repeating now. He said that anyone who believes in coexistence believes that the lion can lie down with the lamb and that the lion will become a vegetarian.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to pay my compliments to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Colorado, for his excellent statement of a program.

I also wish to observe that for a long time we have been on dead center so far as Cuba is concerned. Certain speeches and statements to the contrary notwithstanding, I think the American people are very much aware of the fact that we are on dead center. It seems that every time a spokesman from this side of the aisle makes a proposal one of two things happens. Either we are met by the retort that it is warmongering or advocating a measure leading to war; or, secondly, the proposals we make are completely ignored, and in press conferences and other forums the administration spokesmen say, "If those on the other side do not agree with what we propose, what do they propose?"

All they have to do, Mr. President, is to read the newspapers and take a look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There they will find that for a long time Members on this side of the aisle—such as my colleague, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], both Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], myself, and many other Senators—have made proposals. They are not proposals to invade Cuba or to attack Cuba, but are concrete proposals which are not warmongering and which would, if carried out, probably get the job done.

They relate more to the area of economic and political activities than the area of military activities, although I suggested that the quarantine or blockade the President of the United States established last October should be reimposed until such time as Mr. Khrushchev and his puppet, Mr. Castro, carried out the commitment that there would be onsite inspection in Cuba.

I suggest to the Senator that, beneficial and helpful and instructive as his comments are, we may expect to find in the future the old "abracadabra,"—"Are they suggesting war measures, or what do they propose?" They will say that merely because they do not care to read in the newspapers what we have been proposing.

I congratulate the Senator from Colorado. I hope, somewhere along the line, that those who have eyes will see, and that those who have ears not only will listen, but will act.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am very appreciative of my friend's help.

Mr. MILLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent article by David Lawrence may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my comments in my colloquy with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] a few minutes ago.

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

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

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet, and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the "clearer idea" has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in South Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort of the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to becloud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built MIG's, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called neutrality laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuban territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of neutrality. The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly neutral.

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet Government

to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke "neutrality" laws against the only individuals who wish to risk "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to overthrow a tyrranical dictatorship?

Mr. ALLOTT. I add, in conclusion, that I know one of the first questions that will be asked is, "Are you advocating that we invade Cuba?"

I am not advocating such action. That would be one of the greatest mistakes this country could make at this time. There was a time for us to act. I think it was Shakespeare who said:

There is a tide in the affairs of men, which taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.

We had our "time of fortune." We did not take it up. What I am advocating is that we increase the amount of pressure on Cuba, using every facility and advantage at the disposal of this great country, until we have succeeded in giving to those wonderful people the liberty they thought they had won when they welcomed Castro down from the mountains.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. I join with Senators who have spoken to congratulate the senior Senator from Colorado, because what he has recognized is that where we are is not as important as where we are going.

I was impressed by the observation made by the Senator from South Dakota that to offer some leadership now would certainly fill the minds and the hearts of people all over Latin America with hope. I recall, as the Senator from Colorado will recall, that not so very long ago there was a situation in Guatemala in which an anti-Communist government overthrew an anti-Communist government.

How does this happen? As I privately thought about it, I observed the fact that not too long before that, in a South American conference in which this Nation was represented by no less than our Chief Executive, at a time when the people were concerned about their freedoms, we began to talk about social reforms that would come about through our inter-nation efforts and cooperation. Of course, that was important, but the people who went back to Guatemala said, "We alone must stand firm."

I think the Senator from Colorado is urging that our Nation stand firm, and show it in this forum and otherwise, so that those who looked to the North for leadership and who for so long found it lacking may find it here again.

I salute the Senator. I think he has made a great contribution. I think from here on we may expand the dialog around this subject. The Senator from Kentucky suggested that we do so, and the Senator from Colorado has done so today.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, before I submit the amendment I propose to introduce to the foreign aid bill, I should like to say that I have listened to the remarks of the Senator from Colorado and the discussion which followed. I do not want to be included among those who have been charged with accusing the members of the Republican Party with warmongering. I know the Senator from Colorado is not a warmongerer. I respect his good intentions in making the suggestions he has made.

Doubtless we share a common purpose in wanting to see the Castro regime brought down, and doubtless this ought to be accomplished by the Cuban people themselves, for, after all, it is their Government, not ours, and it is their country, not ours.

I must say to the Senator from Colorado, however, that I cannot see how the proposal he makes would advance that objective. The problems we have had with the Cuban exile movement stem in part from the fact that many of the leaders now in this country come from the few families which owned or controlled nearly all of the land and wealth of Cuba. These men are not likely to be greeted on the shores of Cuba as liberators, but, rather, as those who would reinstate the plantation-and-peon economy that existed in Cuba under the Batista regime.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he goes on?

Mr. CHURCH. Not at the moment. I want to make my point first.

Mr. ALLOTT. Very well.

Mr. CHURCH. I say this because I think there is a need to find leadership that is not identified with the old order, which, as the Senator knows, was not freedom, but tyranny of a very vicious sort, in its way, as bad as the tyranny that now has been imposed on the Cuban people, which all of us find so objectionable.

Second, I point out that, from what I know of the feeling and the attitude of the Cuban people, there has long been considerable resentment in Cuba itself over Guantanamo, whether it is well or ill founded. It would seem to me not to augur well for any provisional government, that we hope one day would win general support of the Cuban people, to headquarter it in Guantanamo.

Psychologically, I think it would seriously set back whatever hopes we might have that the Cuban people would give this government the general support necessary to overthrow the Castro tyranny.

For these reasons, it seems to me I would have to part company with the distinguished Senator from Colorado in the proposal he has made, even though I honor his motivation and share the end objective of seeing the Castro regime overthrown and a genuine democratic government established in Cuba.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I invited comments when I started my speech, and I am very happy to have the comments of the distinguished Senator from Idaho. Even though we part company, it would not be the first time, and I am sure it will not be the last, although I respect him for his own motivations and his own sincerity.

A provisional government does not necessarily have to be made up of the people he has mentioned. I suggest that, before the Castro regime, bad as the Batista regime was, the people of Cuba then had by far the highest standard of living of any country in Latin America. No country in Latin America has yet approached it.

As for the second point, this plan has also been suggested to Cubans. We have not had the reaction that the Senator suggests.

I know that the Senator from Idaho has waited a long time to make his statement. I had not anticipated this long a discussion, so I will not prolong it now.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator. It is true, as the Senator has said, that the per capita income in Cuba under Batista was higher than that of most other countries of Latin America, but that is based upon dividing the gross national product by the population, and makes no allowance for the exceedingly inequitable distribution of wealth which was placed lavishly in the hands of a few, while the many were exposed to fearful poverty.

I am sure that had it not been for the dissatisfaction of the peons in Cuba, who worked on the great sugar plantations, it would never have been possible for Castro to have achieved the popular support—the grassroots support—that enabled him to overthrow Batista and his 35,000-man army, which we helped to arm and equip. The very success of this grassroots revolt indicates the deep dissatisfaction the average Cuban in the countryside felt toward the Batista regime. We must face this fact if we are to fashion a realistic policy that can win the support of the great majority of the Cuban people, because in their support alone rests the opportunity to see Castro overthrown and a genuine democratic government established.

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

Mr. CHURCH. It had not been my purpose to discuss Cuba at this time. I have an amendment to the foreign aid bill that I wish to discuss and present. However, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have been informed by native Cubans that in the early days Castro was supported by the intelligentsia and people with a high standard of living, and that those people supported Castro almost unanimously, because they wanted to get out from under Batista, whose regime we agree was tyrannical. It was not until after Batista had been ousted that they found that they had something worse than what they had been fighting against. In many cases those people are the ones who have now left and who are most active in the exile groups, trying to find some mechanism or government with which they can pull together the various fragmented sections. Not only are the peons active; a great number of highly intelligent and highly

educated people, and some formerly wealthy people are active in this movement. They want to go back and create a democratic form of government.

Mr. CHURCH. I do not disagree in the least with the Senator in that regard. There are some very fine potential leaders, I am sure, who could head up an exile government which would have the potential for success in Cuba. However, those leaders must be people who are convincingly for the establishment of a government based upon liberal democratic principles, and who are not so identified with the old regime as to lack popular appeal. That is the challenge that faces us. It faced the last administration also. It is a difficult problem. I am sure that both the Senator from Colorado and I share a common interest in finding that kind of leadership for the people of Cuba.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN AID ACT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to this year's foreign aid bill (S. 1276), and ask that it be appropriately referred. As I believe it to be genuinely bipartisan in character, I am hopeful it will win widespread bipartisan support. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may lie on the desk for 1 week, in order that other Members who may wish to join in its sponsorship may have an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and, without objection, will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the need for this amendment can be expressed in a few words. In fiscal 1962, the latest year for which the figures are available, the United States gave foreign aid to 107 countries. Apart from the Sino-Soviet bloc, there were only eight countries left in the world which did not receive some form of foreign aid from the United States.

Unless one is to believe that there are only eight countries in the whole of the free world that can make do without some kind of American subsidy, something must be seriously wrong with the administration of our foreign aid program.

What is wrong should be obvious to Congress. Foreign aid has become thoroughly institutionalized. The bureaucracy charged with its administration has a vested interest in extending and perpetuating the program. Each year the list of recipients has grown longer. In nearly every case, under both Democratic and Republican Presidents, the administrators have shown an inability to end foreign aid in any country, once the spigot has been turned on, regardless of how much has flowed out, or how rich the recipient country has since become. The nature of the subsidy may change, the flow may even be reduced, but the spigot never stops dripping.

The purpose of this amendment is to turn off a few of the spigots by simply prohibiting further grants of aid to rich countries.

The amendment is so drawn as to give adequate direction and discretion to the President. Under it, all existing unfulfilled commitments would be fully honored; only new pledges of additional gifts would be barred. The amendment would not affect loans or credit sales.

The operative language of the amendment is as follows:

> No assistance shall be furnished on a grant basis under any provision of this act to any country, except to fulfill firm commitments made prior to July 1, 1963, unless the President shall have determined that it would be an undue economic burden upon such country to purchase or provide the supplies, equipment, or services proposed to be furnished.

The principle embraced by this amendment can be plainly put: Countries that can readily pay their own way ought to be taken off our dole.

Since it cannot be argued that the purpose of foreign aid is to subsidize rich countries, the administrators are disposed to say that it is their policy to reduce, and eventually to terminate, further aid to such affluent countries as the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, Italy, and Japan, all of which were still receiving American grants in 1962, in the total sum of nearly $400 million.

The very size of our subsidy to these rich countries in fiscal 1962 is argument enough for the amendment. They should have been dropped from the list long ago, but they are still on it. All of these countries will continue to receive further subsidies under this year's foreign aid bill.

If it is the purpose of the administrators to stop giving aid to rich countries, then they ought not to object to this amendment. For it will put some legislative bite into their declared policy, and give them a statutory basis for sooner achieving their acknowledged goal. Indeed, they should welcome the amendment, as it would make their future dealings with these affluent nations much easier, enabling them to explain the need for finally shutting off further gifts by citing the requirement of our law. Congress, I am sure, would be willing to shoulder the blame.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, my efforts, over the past 3 years, to get an amendment of this kind adopted, have been given no support by the administrators of the program. I have been unable to overcome the combined opposition of the State Department and the Pentagon, despite the fact that the arguments raised against the admendment are demonstrably without factual basis. Most of the aid we continue to give these rich nations takes the form of military assistance; that is, American grants of military equipment and supplies. When aid can be wrapped in a uniform, Congress is reluctant to open the package and look inside. This accounts, I think, for the willingness of Congress, in the past, to accept the excuses for these continued subsidies, without giving critical appraisal.

We should stop behaving this way. It should be incumbent upon us—especially those of us who have supported the foreign aid program—to insist that all parts of it make sense. The excuses often given for continued subsidies to the rich are lacking in reasonable basis, as the following answers should demonstrate:

First. The amendment will not "handcuff" the President. The argument that Congress should delegate to the President full discretion over the spending of foreign aid money has become an artful way of dodging the question of why, on the merits, a given program is being perpetuated. Certainly an emergency might arise, or special circumstances might cause the President to conclude that further grants of aid should be made to a particular country, even though it can afford to pay, but, in such cases, the bill provides an ample contingency fund for the President's unfettered use. The amendment I propose would restrict only the normal programing of our foreign aid, which is really the function of the bureaucracy, not the President.

Second. The amendment will not affect our obligation to the NATO alliance, nor will it weaken or disrupt the alliance in any way. The amendment does not touch our contribution to the NATO infrastructure, or any other treaty commitment of the United States to any multinational organization. It merely cuts off further grants to individual countries, in NATO or elsewhere, which are able to get along very well on their own.

Since all existing commitments would be honored, the amendment would cause no disruption or disorder within NATO. Moreover, the language permits the President the latitude to continue giving aid to our poorer NATO partners, such as Turkey, wherever he finds that economic conditions warrant it.

In the long run, the amendment could actually strengthen the alliance by making it clear to each member that, as we intend to do our part, so we expect them to do theirs. The continuation of our needless subsidy to rich countries, fully capable of paying their own way, can lead only, as history has often shown, to a corruption of the alliance which will weaken it internally through the erosion of the mutual respect that comes from each member doing its share.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows that I have offered much more strongly worded amendments than he has offered, in an endeavor to achieve the same purpose. I cannot for the life of me understand why the United States should still be continuing to supply economic aid to the United Kingdom, West Germany, France, the Benelux countries, or other countries, which are today enjoying a degree of prosperity greater than those countries ever enjoyed before. In fact, if one could conceive of the United States not being a part of this planet, those countries would be the most progressive, prosperous nations on the earth; they would be the leaders and the hope of the free world.

I am happy to see the Senator again offering an amendment to achieve the same objectives. I only hope that if his amendment is successful, the administrators will not abuse the purpose of it, as I have seen them do in years gone by, by seizing upon any escape language available to them to reach a conclusion that is not justified by the facts.

The Senator from Idaho well knows that economic or military aid to those countries can no longer be justified. Those countries should have their own foreign aid programs to help less fortunate nations. I believe some of them actually do. There is no reason whatever why the United States should continue to aid those countries this long after the war.

We undertook a very heavy burden after the war, beginning in 1946; but 17 years after the war, those nations should be able to pick up and carry some of the burden, rather than asking us to do it.

I believe that one thing that has been driven home and made demonstrably clear is that so long as any nation can be certain that Uncle Sam will carry the burden if that nation defaults on it, the burden will be passed off on to Uncle Sam.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator from Louisiana is eminently correct. I can see no reason why the prosperous countries of Western Europe should continue to be on the American subsidy. As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, we are calling upon these countries, recognizing their unprecedented level of prosperity, to help us shoulder the burden of foreign aid for the underdeveloped nations of the world. At the same time that we ask them to give us their help, we are doling out hundreds of millions of dollars to these very countries in subsidies to help them maintain their own armed forces. This does not make sense. I think it is the administrative momentum within the program, and the vested interest that the bureaucracy has in extending it, that accounts for the fact that this many years after the full recovery of Western Europe, the American subsidy still continues. That is why I think that if we are finally to turn off the spigots, Congress will have to take action by writing into the law some requirements the administrators will have to respect.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not also true—perhaps the Senator has already covered this in the earlier part of his speech, before I entered the Chamber—that the nations of Western Europe, and for that matter, almost all the nations with whom we are allied, are contributing less than 5 percent of their gross national product, or about that figure, as their part of the defense of Western Europe, while the United States is contributing almost 10 percent of its gross national product to the defense of the entire area, plus the United States?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. We are making approximately twice the effort in proportion to our own wealth to maintaining our Armed Forces, as our prosperous NATO allies are making in proportion to theirs.

I intend to place in the RECORD some previous statements that give these facts in detail, in support of the amendment. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will have the opportunity to read the RECORD tomorrow, where the whole case will be brought together and these facts will be set out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not also true that the contribution that this Nation would propose to make, in the event the NATO nations were attacked, would be almost as great as we would expect the sum total of those nations together to be?

Mr. CHURCH. Everyone who has studied the question at all knows that the defense of Western Europe today rests upon American nuclear power. The NATO alliance has succeeded because we have tied our nuclear striking force to the trip wire of American troops in West Germany. Were it not for our presence in Europe, and the availability of our nuclear striking power, Europe would have no effective defense today. So we are not only providing Europe with the elements that constitute its effective defense; we are also subsidizing the individual countries to maintain their own conventional forces. And we are doing so, despite the fact that they are making only half the effort, in proportion to their own wealth, to provide for their own defense, as we are making in proportion to ours. This does not make sense. We ought to put a stop to it. The least we should do is to stop furnishing subsidies to countries which have become rich. We should say: "We rejoice in your wealth. We are happy that the objectives of the Marshall plan have proved out, and that prosperity, profits, and productivity have been established at unparalleled levels. We commend you on these accomplishments. And now the time has come to take you off our dole."

This is the purpose of my amendment. I believe it would help the NATO alliance and strengthen it. I believe the countries of Western Europe would fully understand why it became necessary to write this provision into the law.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If there is any error in the Senator's amendment, it might be in the degree of flexibility with which the program would be administered. I am sure that he permits flexibility to such a degree in hopes that the administrators would go along with it.

It has been my impression, almost since the day I came to the Senate, that one of the great difficulties in the program is that the administrators, having a responsibility for the defense of this country and its conduct of foreign affairs, have become so spoiled, so soft in the job they do, in the years they have played Santa Claus, that it would be difficult for them to turn around and start a drive in this Nation's interest in dealing with equals around the world. But that will take time to accomplish.

However, certainly what the Senator from Idaho is proposing is the most reasonable thing we could ask.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much.

Four years ago, when I first became a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I asked the spokesmen for the foreign aid program whether they could point to some countries which were soon to be taken off the list, as examples of success, countries to which we had given large amounts of our aid over a long period of time to build up their economies and make them self-sustaining Of course, this is the basic rationale of the foreign aid program. So I asked, "After all these years, where has success been achieved? What countries are about to be taken off this evergrowing list?"

The Senator from Louisiana will be interested to know that the reply listed the same four or five countries, which it was then said would "soon" be dropped, as were listed this year by the Secretary of State, in making his response to the same question. Those countries are still on the list, although we are still being told that in due course, perhaps in another 4 or 5 years, these countries will yet be taken off. I think this situation is indicative of the reluctance of the administrators finally to close the spigots, even in the case of countries which, after having received enormous amounts of aid from the United States, over a long period of time, have become rich and fully self-supporting.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from Idaho that I am more optimistic than he is, for my suspicion is that his speech will result, after we adopt the amendment, in removing from the list these four or five countries.

Mr. CHURCH. I hope the Senator from Oregon is right.

Mr. President, I have supported the foreign aid program because I believe it vital to the security interests of our country. But unless all parts of the program make sense, unless we cut off our aid from all countries which no longer have any reason to be on the list, and unless we can show the American people reasonable progress, we face the day when popular support of the program will crumble and it will collapse like a house of cards. It is for this reason that I offer the amendment. I wish the administration would get behind the amendment, because I believe it would serve the longterm interests of the foreign aid program itself. I think it is particularly necessary that the amendment be adopted at this time, when we are still failing to correct our own adverse balance of payments, despite the fact that our gold supply has fallen dangerously low. As the Senate knows, this problem is far from being solved; and one of the reasons why our balance of payments continues to be adverse is our continued spending of large amounts of money in the foreign aid field.

So, Mr. President, Congress should at least begin to close the door on further

American subsidies to those self-supporting countries that have no need whatever for any more American aid.

The continuing American subsidy has not been successful as an inducement to the rich countries to make a greater defense effort on their own. To persist in this notion is to keep throwing good money after bad.

After 15 years of "inducements" on our part, approximating 15 billions of dollars, our prosperous allies in Western Europe were spending 5.4 percent of their gross national products on defense in 1962, while we were spending 9.8 percent of ours. Moreover, the average yearly military expenditure of our NATO allies had fallen off from 7.1 percent, in 1953, to 5.4 percent, in 1962. The trend in the United States is up; in Europe, it is down.

To demonstrate beyond argument the level of wealth that has now been achieved by most of our NATO partners in Western Europe, their resultant capacity to maintain their own armed forces without American subsidy, and the lesser effort they are actually making, compared with our own, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an appropriate chart containing these figures for last year, 1962.

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

Selected economic and defense expenditure data on European NATO countries, calendar year 1962

	Population, mid-1962	GNP in current market prices		Private per capita consumption	Defense expenditures	
		Total	Per capita		Total	Percent of GNP
	Thousands	*Millions*			*Millions*	
Belgium-Luxembourg	9,579	$13,876	$1,449	973	$417	3.0
Denmark	4,707	7,130	1,515	1,058	215	3.0
France	46,710	68,580	1,468	967	4,435	6.5
Germany	54,766	84,275	1,539	884	4,308	5.1
Greece	8,480	3,775	445	317	170	4.5
Iceland	183	160	874	601		
Italy	49,821	38,400	771	464	1,360	3.5
Netherlands	11,797	13,100	1,110	630	590	4.5
Norway	3,645	5,186	1,423	842	192	3.7
Portugal	9,268	2,800	302	227	200	7.1
Turkey	29,200	6,090	209	154	330	5.4
United Kingdom	53,242	79,115	1,486	977	5,081	6.4
Total, European NATO	281,398	322,487	1,146	721	17,298	5.4
United States	186,591	553,600	2,967	1,912	54,400	9.8

Source: Statistics and Reports Division, Agency for International Development, June 14, 1963.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, that which is true in Western Europe is also true in Japan. Japanese defense expenditures, as a percentage of her gross national product, have gone down from 2.2 percent, in 1953, to 1.1 percent, in 1962. In short, 10 years after our military subsidies to Japan began, the Japanese were making only half as much effort to maintain their own armed forces as they had made to start with. The inducement argument is obviously unsupported by the record.

Mr. President, on several earlier occasions during this session, I have taken the floor to argue in greater detail the case for this amendment. I have also made insertions in the RECORD in support of the objective this amendment seeks to serve. In order that the whole statement of the case may appear at one place, I now ask unanimous consent that these materials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 21, 1963]

MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IN WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent article appearing in the U.S. News & World Report. The article compares the present defense burden of the United States with that of the countries of Western Europe. The analysis very cogently demonstrates the disproportionately heavy burden the United States carries in providing an adequate defense for ourselves and for our Allies in Western Europe. The article shows that the American taxpayers are bearing far more than their fair share of this cost, while at the same time the NATO countries are assuming military expenses in an amount much less than their national wealth would allow.

For example, as the article points out, the United States is spending 11.3 percent of its total national income for defense purposes, while Western Europe spends 4.9 percent. The average American taxpayer pays $277 a year for defense purposes, while the average European is paying only $53 yearly for defense purposes. In addition, the United States has some 2.7 million men under arms, which is only slightly less than the total men under arms in all of the NATO countries put together. While we operate under a rigorous 24-month compulsory draft, all of the NATO countries have shorter draft requirements—except Turkey and Greece—and Great Britain has no compulsory draft at all.

In short, Mr. President, the article shows that the prosperous countries in Western Europe are not making as much an effort, in proportion to their own resources, to maintain their armed forces, as we have been making in proportion to ours. Indeed, we are making over twice the effort for defense in relation to our own wealth as the average of our European Allies in NATO. I think the American people are of the opinion that the time has come for many of these prosperous nations in Western Europe to assume their obligations by contributing their share of these vast defense costs.

The inequitable situation becomes more apparent when the military assistance program of the United States, as it is applied to the countries of Western Europe, is considered. Only last year, over $314 million was allocated for military assistance grants to Western Europe. This is a perpetuation of the military subsidies we continue to give these countries, which have totaled more than $14½ billion since 1950, despite the fact that the majority of the countries involved have long since recovered economic capabilities sufficient to sustain their own military forces without external aid.

There is clearly no economic basis upon which to justify our continuing subsidies, in the form of military grants, to these countries in Western Europe. Congress stopped further substantial economic aid to these countries nearly 9 years ago, when it was recognized that they had fully recovered their capacity to be self-supporting. The time is long overdue for us to take a similar stand on military aid.

My colleagues may recall my efforts in 1961 to have the Congress amend the Foreign Aid Asistance Act to provide that further military assistance on a grant basis to the countries of Western Europe, except to fulfill prior firm commitments, should terminate, unless the President declared an emergency or determined that such termination would create an undue economic burden on the particular country for which the proposed grants were intended. At that time storm clouds were gathering over Berlin, and my amendment failed to carry in the Senate. Last year, in hopes of getting some kind of congressional action, I proposed a less stringent amendment to the Foreign Aid Assistance Act of 1961, and it was adopted. This amendment provided:

"The President shall regularly reduce, and, with such deliberate speed as orderly procedure and other relevant considerations, including prior commitments, will permit, shall terminate, all further grants of military equipment and supplies to any country having sufficient wealth to enable it, in the judgment of the President, to maintain and equip its own military forces at adequate strength, without undue burden to its economy."

History has shown, Mr. President, that once these military assistance programs are underway, those administering the program become increasingly reluctant to end the program. Their oft-stated policy that the United States must furnish follow-on support in order to assure full effectiveness of previously furnished materiel simply means that once this military aid has begun it can never stop. If we accept this principle, the United States will have to continue its grants-in-aid indefinitely, even when the recipient countries can afford to purchase the follow-on support, as is now the case for most countries in Western Europe.

At a time when we are struggling to correct our adverse balance of payments, and when too many of our citizens are unemployed, the American taxpayer has a right to expect our NATO Allies to assume a greater share of their own defense burden. Through the adoption of my amendment last year, the Congress has made a start to close the door on further American subsidies to those self-supporting countries that have no need whatever for more American aid. It is my intention to urge the Congress, at the appropriate time, to strengthen its expressed position by writing stronger limitations into this year's foreign aid bill.

I believe this article is most timely, Mr. President, and I am hopeful that those of my colleagues who have not had the opportunity to read it can find time to do so. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, the article appearing in the January 21, 1963, edition of the U.S. News & World Report.

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

"DEFENSE BURDEN: WILL EUROPE PAY ITS SHARE?

"The White House now is giving signs of being more and more impressed by a set of facts often glossed over in the past.

"The facts, in essence, are these:

"A Western Europe that was heavily damaged by war not many years ago is actually moving ahead faster today than the United States. Americans over the years contributed importantly, of money and direction, to produce these good times for Europe.

"Around the world, colonial empires that European nations are turning loose, or have turned loose, are being bolstered with American aid.

"American youths, American weapons, American leadership, and American taxpayers, at this time, are bearing the bulk of the burden of defending the rich nations of Europe, with combined populations greater than that of the United States.

"Time for a change?

"The idea is dawning that maybe the time has come when other nations can take over more of the task of defending themselves and of helping underdeveloped nations.

"President Kennedy has suggested that. Robert McNamara, U.S. Defense Secretary, repeated it rather bluntly to a meeting of U.S. allies in Europe.

"Charts and tables on the two following pages help to give you an understanding of what is on official minds. The figures indicate that Americans are carrying a disproportionate share of the load involved in defending the political freedom and economic well-being of big European nations.

"It is this burden, officials point out, that is weighing heavily on American taxpayers and leaving an unbalanced American budget.

"The suggestion that part of this load be shifted to shoulders of Europe's taxpayers and Europe's young manhood is not meeting with an enthusiastic reception in Europe.

"A look at Europe shows this:

"The British, as an example, insist that they cannot afford the burden they already are carrying. Britain has no draft. Its contribution to the defense of the European Continent is three badly understrength divisions, instead of the four full divisions to which the British are committed. Britain, in addition, was counting on the United States to develop, and to help supply, missiles with which to arm its bombers. There was a loud outcry when President Kennedy decided to cut off that program.

"The Germans and French, meanwhile that the latest American ideas about what is needed to defend Europe are wrong. Americans are placing stress upon the need for more ground forces, armed with modern weapons of conventional nature. They discount the chances of unlimited, nuclear war, pointing to a growing stalemate in nuclear arms between United States and Russia.

"The big need, in the U.S. view, is primarily for more French and German divisions, to supply the troops for a mobile defense. As the Germans and French see it, however, any future war in Europe will be nuclear war, with only the United States and Russia possessing those weapons in quantity. If Europe is to do more, nuclear arms must be shared in some way, they say. So a standoff in basic policy results here.

"Italy and the smaller nations in Western Europe are reacting to the American suggestion by insisting individually that they are not as rich as they may appear to be on the surface. They plead inability to supply more manpower, or to provide more weapons or funds for their defense.

"Despite this resistance to increasing Europe's share of the defense burden, a serious effort now is to be made by the Kennedy administration to work out a more equitable arrangement for paying for Western defenses.

"The arguments to be used by the United States boil down to these:

"America, with a third fewer people than Western Europe, is now supporting about the same number of men under arms—including 425,000 American standing guard in Europe in 5 U.S. divisions, a major U.S. fleet in the Mediterranean, and a big network of U.S. air bases over Europe and nearby areas.

"The United States, at this time, also is paying out far more than are its allies in Europe for defense, even after discounting the differences in national incomes. This contrast in defense costs is what bothers hard-pressed U.S. officials the most, now that Europe has achieved record prosperity. The important measure of defense costs, as they see it, is this: The United States is spending 11.3 percent of its whole national income for defense, while Western Europe spends only 4.9 percent.

"In terms of money actually spent by allies on each side of the Atlantic, the contrast is even more pronounced. The United States now is spending for defense at a rate of $52 billion a year. That compares with only $14.9 billion a year spent for defense by all 12 of its European Allies combined.

"When these outlays are averaged out to find the cost to each taxpayer, the burden appears more one sided than ever. It works out to this: The average American is now paying $277 a year toward the cost of defending the West. But the average European is paying only $53 a year for defense.

"Americans, it turns out, are paying on the average about five times as much toward the burden of defense as do Europeans in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

"A comment from London

"This disparity is recognized by many informed people in Europe as well as in the United States. The London Economist reported the growing restlessness over the one-sided defense costs in this way in its January 5 issue:

" 'The United States regards the defense of Western Europe as utterly necessary to its own defense and does not visualize a time when this will not be so. But Americans feel that the burden of this defense is very great and should be shared more equitably; the United States provides the nuclear deterrent power, at fabulous cost, and an unduly large proportion of the fully trained and equipped manpower for the frontlines as well.'

"The whole issue is coming to a head at the time of a change in the top military command of the NATO forces, with Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer replacing Gen. Lauris Norstad as supreme commander of the NATO forces in Paris.

"The new commander, like the retiring one, is known to feel strongly that more military forces are needed—and in a hurry—in Western Europe if any real defense is to be insured.

"The lineup

"Right now, under the NATO command in the crucial zone across central and northern Europe is a total of 24 divisions. Top military planners at NATO headquarters in Paris believe they need 30, at a minimum.

"Of the present 24 divisions, the United States contributes the 5 best equipped, most combat-ready units. Britain furnishes three divisions—all under strength. France contributes two, West Germany nine, Belgium two, the Netherlands two, and Canada one brigade.

"The additional required divisions have been promised for years by NATO nations, but not supplied. They include two more French divisions, three more German, and one more British.

"There are other NATO divisions on hand now, on Europe's southern flank. Turkey is supporting 14, Greece 8, and Italy 7. But all of these units are needed to defend that flank, could not readily be shifted to the central front if a Soviet attack should begin to sweep across Western Europe.

"As a result, NATO planners see a major need now for more conventional troop units in central Europe. In addition, they say, tactical nuclear weapons soon will be needed as part of the basic equipment for most NATO divisions if defense is to be effective.

"Together, these needed improvements could increase the cost of Europe's defense by billions.

"Tougher drafts?

"More military manpower is involved, too, as well as more money. At present, none of the allied nations in Europe comes anywhere close to the United States in the proportion of its young men serving in the Armed Forces. Where the United States has 5.4 percent of its available manpower now in military uniform, Britain has only 2.5 percent, West Germany 2.2 percent, Denmark 3.2 percent.

"Draft provisions, United States believes, need tightening all over Europe if this manpower burden is to be equalized.

"At present, for instance, Britain has no draft at all. Denmark drafts its youths for a minimum of only 16 months. France has just reduced its draft service from 27 to 18 months. Germany has 18 months as a basic draft period. Italy's minimum is 18. Norway has 16 to 18 months, Portugal 18 to 24 months. Only Turkey and Greece, in fact, equal the United States requirement of a basic 2 years of service for all draftees.

"Special cases, all

"Why is a prosperous Western Europe reluctant now to contribute more toward its own defense? Each nation, when queried by the United States, comes up with a different reason.

"Some, like West Germany, point to an acute manpower shortage in a period of full employment, plus a lack of training facilities for more military units.

"Others, like the British, say politics keeps the Government from going back to drafting men for the armed forces, or draining off funds needed elsewhere for use in stepping up defense outlays.

"Then there are special cases. Italy's inadequately equipped force is financed by the lowest percentage of national income devoted to defense of any big European country. Yet Italy insists no funds can be spared from the job of rebuilding depressed southern Italy. And the French, with nearly a million men under arms, are contributing only two divisions to NATO—the same number as Belgium—because of continued nervousness about North Africa.

"Americans, as a result, are finding that their share of the defense burden continues to run to many times that of Europe, when Europe's growth rate surpasses that of the United States.

"To some Members of Congress, it raises the question, 'Is America being played for a sucker, when it comes to paying the bill for defense?' ".

The arms load, country by country

IN MONEY

	Yearly defense budget	Defense spending's share of national income
	Millions of dollars	*Percent*
United States	52,000	11.3
Britain	4,180	6.7
France	3,786	7.2
West Germany	3,750	5.9
Italy	1,255	4.4
Netherlands	555	5.0
Belgium	364	3.8
Turkey	287	4.3
Norway	191	5.0
Denmark	180	3.2
Greece	170	5.8
Portugal	158	6.9
Luxembourg	7	1.7

IN MANPOWER

	Size of Armed Forces	Armed Forces' share of manpower
		Percent
United States	2,700,000	5.4
Britain	415,000	2.5
France	705,000	5.3
West Germany	353,000	2.2
Italy	470,000	2.8
Netherlands	141,000	4.2
Belgium	110,000	4.3
Turkey	455,000	5.1
Norway	34,000	2.9
Denmark	46,500	3.2
Greece	160,000	6.2
Portugal	80,000	2.9
Luxembourg	5,500	5.0

IN LENGTH OF MILITARY DRAFT

	Compulsory military-service term
	Months
United States	24
Britain	(1)
France	18
West Germany	18
Italy	18
Netherlands	20
Belgium	18
Turkey	24
Norway	16
Denmark	16
Greece	24
Portugal	18
Luxembourg	9

[1] No draft.

MILITARY AID TO WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial appearing recently in one of the largest and most influential newspapers in the West, the Salt Lake Tribune. This editorial alerts the paper's readers to the disproportionate burden the United States is carrying in providing an adequate system of European defense. The editorial shows that our NATO allies are not meeting their share of this burden, either in terms of money or manpower.

The editorial points out that the United States is now supporting about the same number of men under arms as all of the NATO countries put together, even though the population of the NATO countries is almost 100 million larger than that of the United States. In addition, defense spending in the United States is currently about $52 billion a year, or $277 per capita, while the current spending of all NATO countries is only $15 billion, or $53 per capita.

The editorial concludes with a plea that this relationship between the United States and our NATO allies be corrected. And correct it we must.

As I have pointed out on numerous occasions in the past, there is no justification for the United States to continue subsidizing the armed forces of our prosperous NATO allies. Congress stopped further substantial economic aid to these countries some 9 years ago, when it was recognized that they had fully recovered their capacity to be self-supporting.

Yes, since 1950, the United States has given to the nations of Western Europe, in the form of outright military assistance grants, a sum approaching $15 billion. This vast sum is in addition to our contribution to the NATO infrastructure. These countries have long since recovered their capacity to support their own armed forces without further help from us. The United States, however, continues to extend these military grants, to the tune of $314½ million in fiscal 1963 alone. Must the taxpayers of this country pay this bill indefinitely? Is there to be no end to the subsidy?

I am certainly aware, Mr. President, of the great wealth of the United States, and I am also aware that our per capita gross national product is much higher in the United States that in Western Europe. But is this difference in wealth proportionate to the burden being carried by the United States? The figures indicate otherwise. The per capita GNP in the United States is about 2.6 times as great as that of Western Europe. But, as I mentioned before, the average American taxpayer spends $277 yearly for defense purposes, while his West European counterpart pays only $53 yearly for defense purposes. The average American taxpayer is therefore spending over 5 times as much for defense purposes than the average taxpayer in Western Europe, which is almost twice the burden that would be warranted by comparing the individual income of each. This leaves no conclusion but that the American taxpayer has a legitimate complaint, and that it is high time for the financially successful NATO countries to assume a somewhat more equitable share of their own defense burden.

To demonstrate further the level of prosperity that has now been achieved by most of our NATO Allies in Western Europe, we need look only to the unemployment figures for the United States and for the NATO countries. A study has been made which compares the unemployment levels of the United States with the countries of Western Europe, during the period from 1953 through 1961. Figures were available for all of the NATO countries except Greece, Portugal, and Turkey. In 1953, the average number of unemployed persons in Western Europe—Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Italy, Norway, and the United Kingdom—was about 4.1 million of the total labor force. This number has steadily decreased over the years, until in 1961 the total unemployed in these same countries was only about 2.2 million persons. In the United States, on the other hand, our citizens have not been so fortunate in finding needed jobs. In 1953, the United States had about 1.9 million unemployed persons in our labor force, while in 1961 we had an average of over 4.8 million unemployed persons. The unemployment trend in the United States is up; in Europe, it is down.

For these reasons, I think the Tribune editorial, entitled, "Sharing Burden of Defending Freedom," is particularly appropriate. It is time for our NATO Allies to pay their own way, and for this result to be realistically accomplished, it is essential that this year's foreign aid bill be amended to express such a policy by congressional action. If we continue unwarranted subsidies to rich NATO members, we not only disserve ourselves, but the Alliance as well. In the long run, it will be greatly weakened, because it will lack the strong internal respect that comes from each member doing its share. This Congress should terminate further military grants to the individual NATO countries that have no further need for them.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the editorial in the February 4, 1963 issue of the Salt Lake Tribune.

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

"SHARING BURDEN OF DEFENDING FREEDOM

"Something of an 'agonizing reappraisal' of relationships within the Western Alliance is now in progress. It is related to the fair sharing of the burden of European defense, both in terms of money and manpower.

"The reappraisal was in process well before France's brutal action in vetoing expansion of the European Common Market. But this French withdrawal from closer British and United States association is bound to further exacerbate strained relations and divergent views among the allies on defense policies and proper burden shares.

"That dispute was dramatized by the furor in Britain over the United States decision to abandon the Skybolt missile. Hardly had that been ironed out at the Nassau Conference between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan, than new controversy erupted over British responsibility to pay part of the cost of the improved Polaris missiles offered as a substitute for Skybolt.

"Meanwhile France insists on going its own way as a nuclear power and downgrades its commitment to NATO by assigning a puny division and a half to NATO forces—contrasted with Britain's 55,000-man NATO Army and the 400,000 men the United States has committed to NATO.

"In Britain, meanwhile, the influential Manchester Guardian is challenging the whole plan to have six British Polaris submarines as not worth the estimated $1 billion cost.

"At the same time the United States is challenging all its European Allies to take over more of the task of defending themselves. Defense Secretary McNamara put the case quite bluntly at a recent meeting with the Allies in Europe.

"And there is reason for a blunt presentation.

"The United States with a population of about 188 million is now supporting about the same number of men under arms as all the European NATO countries with their population of some 280 million.

"The United States is the only large NATO power with a 2-year draft. Britain has none, most others 18 months or less.

"The monetary comparison is even more weighted against this country. U.S. defense spending currently is at the rate of $52 billion a year, or $277 per capita. All 12 of our European allies spend only $15 billion, or $53 per capita.

"With such a disproportionate share of the defense burden, it is no wonder America's groaning taxpayers can't provide enough tax revenues to balance the national budget; or that the international balance of payments continues to be against this country; or that the American economy and its rate of growth remains sluggish in comparison with most European nations.

"This relationship must be, and it is being reappraised.

"As President Kennedy said recently, it is really fantastic what the United States has done to defend freedom around the world and to rebuild the economies of war-shattered countries, including our former enemies. This magnificent effort has undeniably halted the advance of communism and built the foundations of Europe's present prosperity.

"But other nations of the Western World are now capable of resisting communism

themselves, and their economies need no more support. It is time for them to accept a more equitable share of the burden of defending freedom.

"Failure to resolve this problem on a basis of commonsense and reasonableness could so weaken the alliance as to make its members easy prey to Communist takeover."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Apr. 22, 1963]

AMERICAN FOREIGN AID—ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN JAPAN

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, no American who has visited Japan in recent years can fail to be impressed with the astonishing pace of her burgeoning economy. Today Japan enjoys the fastest rate of economic growth of any of the great industrial powers, while the United States continues to suffer from a lingering affliction of stunted growth.

Last December, as I walked the streets of Tokyo, I was amazed at the evidence of economic vitality to be seen at every corner. Hundreds of modern business buildings—factories, hotels, department stores—were under construction. The din of riveting filled the air, and the steel skeletons of high-rising new construction could be seen in all directions across the skyline of the city.

Broad boulevards were being pounded out to make way for the clogged traffic, a vast new subway system was being dug, and expanded terminals were being built to meet the need for rapid transit. Never have I seen an American city more alive with activity than today's Tokyo. Never have I seen a city anywhere experience so surging a boom.

And what is true of Tokyo is true also of Japan itself. Her current production of goods and services dwarfs her prewar yield. Not only has Japan become self-sustaining, she has achieved an unprecedented level of prosperity, far beyond anything her people have ever known before. Alone among the nations of the Orient, Japan is rapidly approaching living standards which are comparable to those that now exist in some countries of Western Europe. If present trends continue, Japan will outdistance most of her rivals, and many of us who now serve in this Senate will live to see the day when Japan is listed in the forefront rank, among the richest nations of the world.

I say this, not in criticism, but in praise of the Japanese. They exult in hard work; they are an efficient and competitive people; they have the good sense to understand the superiority of the incentive system of free enterprise, and they are making it work for them, with startling success, in the marketplaces of the world. They are practicing popular, free government, in an area of the world where one must search for it with the patience and persistence of a Diogenes, and, though recently our enemy, they have forsworn the course of neutralism to ally themselves formally with the United States. For all this, we can rejoice and raise our voices in praise of Japan.

We would also do well to remember—for if we forget, no one else is likely to remind us—the central and controlling role of the United States in the working of the miracle of modern Japan. From the day the war ended, we have treated the Japanese, not as the victor has historically administered to the vanquished, but as a doctor administers to a sick patient. We have nursed Japan back to health and vigor. The economic and political reforms decreed by MacArthur during the period of American occupation, which were unashamedly patterned after our own national experience, furnished Japan the framework of her remarkable recovery. Instead of extracting reparations from Japan for her attack upon us, as other attacked countries in southeast Asia and the western Pacific have done; instead of making Japan repay us for the heavy toll she took in American lives and property when she seized Guam, Midway, and the Philippines, possessions we had to forcibly recover at so dear a price to ourselves; instead of taking any act of retribution or demanding any part of the ransom customarily due a conqueror, we were soon offering our own money to Japan to help her bind up her wounds, repair her wreckage, and regather her strength. From July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1962, the United States has given Japan some $3.3 billion in grant aid.

Again, let me say, I recall these facts, not to deride the policy of the United States, but to praise it. For it matters not whether we were motivated by the fear of communism, as our critics charge, or inspired to act in conformity with the Scriptual injunction, "love thine enemy;" in either case the policy was a sound and statesmanlike response to the needs of the postwar era. With it we helped to rejuvenate Japan, and she, in turn, willingly allied herself with us, as the northernmost anchor in the chain of island defenses on which we rely in the far Pacific.

But policies once wisely begun often outlive their usefulness. The respect of a beaten people for a conqueror so strong that he generously extends his own help to put them back on their feet again, can quickly turn to contempt, if, when robust and healthy once more, they discover that the conqueror has somehow turned so weak that he cannot stop the subsidy. This has come to be the hard truth concerning our continuing grants of military equipment and supplies to the Japanese Government, whatever other arguments maye be offered to justify the perpetuation of this aid program.

The plans for a demilitarized Japan were punctured by the Korean war. The fear of potential aggression, revived by the Communist invasion of South Korea, led the Japanese Government to reestablish a home defense force, comprising army, navy, and air units. This was done, notwithstanding the prohibition in the Japanese constitution against the maintenance of armed forces, though the legality of the action still remains a troublesome issue in the politics of the country.

We approved the rearming of Japan. Indeed, we consented to help finance it. From July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1962, we have given Japan over $737 million in grants for military supplies and equipment. This represents approximately 18.5 percent of the total cost, during the 9-year period, to the Japanese Government for maintaining her defense forces.

Mr. President, in order to detail the amount of military aid we have furnished Japan over the years in question, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a chart which sets forth these figures, giving the totals for the full period, as well as the breakdown for each fiscal year since 1958.

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

CHART NO. 1.—*Japan-United States MAP deliveries, defense expenditures, and defense expenditures as percent of GNP, by fiscal year*

[Dollars in millions]

Country	Total, 1953-62			1962			1961			1960			1959			1958		
	MAP[1] deliveries	Defense[2] expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures		MAP deliveries	Defense expenditures	
		Amount[3]	Percent of GNP[4]		Amount	Percent of GNP		Amount	Percent of GNP		Amount	Percent of GNP		Amount	Percent of GNP		Amount	Percent of GNP
United States	-------	$453,500	10.1	------	$53,400	9.6	------	$49,000	9.4	------	$45,700	9.1	------	$46,200	9.6	------	$44,800	10.1
Japan	$737.8	4,424	1.4	$74	572	1.1	$66.9	503	1.1	$85.8	454	1.2	$131.5	436	1.3	$130.9	421	1.5

[1] Figures were furnished by the Department of Defense, and the amounts include only the price of the chargeable program in grant form. The amounts do not include acquisition price of excess material delivered to Japan, which totaled $169,900,000 during the same period of time. MAP to Japan did not commence until fiscal year 1954, so this total is 1954 to 1962, inclusive.

[2] As indicated on charts Nos. 2 and 3, the United States totals are in calendar years, totals for Japan are in fiscal years commencing April 1 of each year.

[3] The amounts shown for United States were rounded from figures given in chart No. 3. Amounts shown for Japan were taken from chart No. 2.

[4] The percentages shown for the 10-year period were computed from data contained in charts Nos. 2 and 3. The percentages shown for the individual years were taken from charts Nos. 2 and 3.

Mr. CHURCH. It will be noted that this chart also gives the comparative figures, from fiscal year 1958 forward, of the dollar equivalents spent each year by the United States and Japan, respectively, for defense purposes, together with the percentage these amounts bear to the gross national product of each country. These figures give us an accurate comparison of the proportionate effort each country is making to provide for its own defense. The chart also shows the total amounts for the entire period since American military subsidies to Japan began, fiscal years 1953 through 1962, inclusive. These totals are most revealing. They show we spent the grand sum of $453.5 billion on our own Armed Forces, which was 10.1 percent of our gross national product, while Japan spent $4.4 billion, which was 1.4 percent of her gross national product.

I cite these figures not because I think it realistic to expect Japan to make anywhere near as much an effort, in proportion to her resources, to provide for her own defense, as we make in proportion to ours. Why on earth should she? Under the terms of our mutual defense treaty with Japan, we guarantee to defend her, with our own forces, against attack, and the umbrella of our protection has enabled Japan to escape the stifling burden of armaments. Indeed, this has been one of the primary reasons why Japan has been freed to pour her energies into peaceful, consumer production, and thus to lift her standard of living to an all-time high.

No, Mr. President, I cite these figures merely to show how little Japan is doing in her own behalf. Yet, this very fact is often used as a basis for justifying continued grants on our part, by those ingenious men who think up arguments for perpetuating aid programs. They say we must continue to offer the aid as an encouragement to the Japanese to do more on their own. I have frequently heard such arguments made on behalf of further extensions of military assistance to wholly self-supporting nations, by sober-faced spokesmen appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

It is not easy to understand how such contentions go unchallenged, when, year after year, the facts are precisely the contrary. How long are we to permit ourselves to be fooled? We have now given the Japanese Government nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars in military aid. We have been at it for 10 years. Has it induced the Japanese Government to increase their own defense effort, as their capacity to do so has grown with their burgeoning wealth?

It has not. In fact, the very opposite is the case. Just to prove the point, and to demonstrate how the Japanese have slackened their own rate of expenditure for defense, I ask unanimous consent to publish in the RECORD at this point tables giving the exact data, both for Japan and for the United States.

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

CHART No. 2.—*Selected data on Japan*

[Calendar years, unless indicated otherwise]

Year	Population [1]	GNP current prices	Per capita GNP	Per capita personal consumption expenditures	Defense expenditures [2]	Percent of GNP spent for defense
	Thousands	*Millions*			*Millions*	
1953	87,000	$19,039	$219	$135	$431	2.2
1954	88,200	20,498	232	147	430	2.1
1955	89,276	22,696	254	156	378	1.7
1956	90,170	24,990	277	167	374	1.5
1957	90,920	28,119	309	180	425	1.5
1958	91,760	27,703	302	188	421	1.5
1959	92,630	33,441	361	201	436	1.3
1960	93,419	38,845	417	223	454	1.2
1961	94,280	47,584	505	253	503	1.1
1962	95,180	[3] 51,700	[4] 543	[4] 295	572	1.1

[1] As of Oct. 1.
[2] Budgeted totals for fiscal years beginning Apr. 1 of year indicated.
[3] Fiscal year ending Mar. 31, 1963.
[4] Estimate.

Source: "Economic Statistics of Japan," 1961, the Bank of Japan.
Prepared by Far Eastern Division, OIRE, Bureau of International Commerce, Department of Commerce.

CHART No. 3.—*Selected economic measures, United States, 1953–62*

[Calendar years]

Year	Population	Gross national product	Per capita GNP	Personal consumption expenditures	Personal consumption expenditures per capita	Defense expenditures	Defense expenditures as percent of GNP
	Thousands	*Billions*		*Billions*		*Billions*	
1953	159,559	$365.4	$2,290	$232.6	$1,458	$49.3	13.5
1954	162,388	363.1	2,236	238.0	1,466	41.2	11.3
1955	165,276	397.5	2,405	256.9	1,555	39.1	9.8
1956	168,225	419.2	2,492	269.9	1,604	40.4	9.6
1957	171,278	442.8	2,585	285.2	1,665	44.4	10.0
1958	174,154	444.5	2,553	293.2	1,684	44.8	10.1
1959	177,080	482.7	2,726	313.5	1,771	46.2	9.6
1960	180,676	503.4	2,786	328.5	1,818	45.7	9.1
1961	183,742	518.7	2,823	338.1	1,840	49.0	9.4
1962	186,591	553.9	2,969	356.7	1,912	53.4	9.6

NOTE.—Per capita figures computed from unrounded data.

Sources: Population figures from the Bureau of the Census; all other data from the Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce.
Prepared by U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a quick glance at these tables will suffice to give the picture. Between 1953 and 1962, the gross national product of Japan nearly tripled, difficult as this is to believe. It jumped from $19 billion to over $51 billion; the per capita income went up from $219 to $543. But Japanese defense expenditures, as a percent of the GNP, went down from 2.2 percent in 1953 to 1.1 percent in 1962. In short, 10 years after our military subsidies to Japan commenced, the Japanese were making only half as much effort to maintain their own armed forces as they had made to start with. The inducement argument obviously lacks any factual basis.

Is it the purpose of the foreign-aid program to subsidize wholly self-supporting countries? If it is, then Congress had better speedily execute the monster once and for all. We have our own solvency to protect, a stubbornly persistent adverse balance-of-payments problem to correct, a deficit to reduce, chronic unemployment to eliminate, and many other urgent problems at home that the money we are spending abroad could help to cure.

If, on the other hand, the purpose of foreign aid is to help poor, undeveloped nations resist communism by arming themselves against it, and by raising the living standards of their people, which I have always understood the purpose of the program to be, then why do we continue to dole out money to Japan?

Groping for an answer to this question, the Pentagon has come up with a new and different argument. By offering money to assist the Japanese in the procurement of certain types of weapons, it is argued, we can influence the kind of forces they maintain, fitting them into our overall strategic plan for the defense of the western Pacific.

Well, perhaps this argument is all that is needed to perpetuate our subsidy to Japan indefinitely. To accept it as valid is to concede that there cannot be an end to our handouts, ever. It is the perfect solution for those who administer the program; it can be applied to any country, rich or poor or in-between; and it has no limits whatever in time.

Mr. President, if Congress will use a little commonsense, it will become at once apparent that the size of Japan's defense force doesn't even begin to be sufficient to successfully defend her against a full-scale attack. For defense, she relies upon us. We are formally committed to protect her under the terms of the treaty of mutual defense between the two governments. Japan maintains hardly more than token forces, as a semblance of good faith. If they are to be of any use to her in an emergency, they necessarily must fit into the overall strategic plan for the general defense of the area. We do not have to pay Japan to make these forces fit the bigger scheme of things; it is in Japan's own national interest to see to it that they do.

Mr. President, twice before during this session I have taken the floor of the Senate to speak in support of an amendment I propose to offer to this year's foreign-aid bill. This amendment will bar further grants of aid, whether economic or military in form, to self-supporting countries, excepting only that which may be required to fulfill prior commitments.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted that the Senator from Idaho will offer his amendment. I understood him to say that he will offer it. If so, he would honor the senior Senator from Oregon if he permitted him to be one of the cosponsors of the amendment again this year, as he was privileged to be when the Senator from Idaho offered the amendment previously.

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to welcome the senior Senator from Oregon as a cosponsor of the amendment. I wish publicly to thank him on the floor for the very effective help he gives cosponsoring the amendment. I hope Congress will adopt it. If we are to make the kind of sense that we need to make in our foreign-aid program, we must start here. If we cannot stop the subsidies to prosperous, flourishing nations, how on earth can we expect to reform the program elsewhere where we face great difficulties in the underdeveloped areas of the world?

The amendment will, of course, apply to Japan. It will apply also to a number of flourishing countries in Western Europe. I believe it conforms with both the letter and spirit of the Clay report on our foreign-aid program, and so I hope the Congress will approve it. If we do, we will have taken one important step toward making more sense out of foreign aid—a course we must pursue if we expect the American people to continue to accept and sustain this program.

I want to make it clear that my sponsorship of this amendment is in no sense a reflection upon the leadership of the President, or the direction he has given our foreign-aid program. He himself has often urged our prosperous allies, in Europe and in the Pacific, to assume a larger part of the aid burden that we have carried so long. It must be very difficult for him to make them believe he means it, when we continue to pour subsidies into the very countries to which he appeals for help.

No, the fault lies with the legacy that Kennedy has inherited. Alone, he has not been able to force an end to programs which are

carried along by their own momentum. He needs the help of Congress, and so, too, do the taxpayers of this country.

But we will never accomplish even so sane and sensible an objective as that embraced by the amendment I have mentioned, without hearing the outcry of the easily intimidated: "We dare not change the law to exclude Japan," they will plead, "for this will offend the Japanese."

Mr. President, I shall conclude these remarks as I commenced them—with a personal reference. Twenty years ago, I sat in the great hall at Nanking and witnessed the formal surrender of Okamura Jasugi, commanding general of the Japanese occupational forces, to the Republic of China. That day we thought the Japanese had lost the war. Now we know it was Tojo who lost. As for the Japanese people, they have turned out to be the winners, perhaps more so than any other people involved in the Second War, including ourselves.

Only their total defeat on the war fronts, followed by the surrender and occupation of their country, could have destroyed so completely the military tyranny which had so long dominated their affairs. It was then that we reformed their institutions, and with our own money helped repair the damage they sustained in the war that they themselves had thrust upon us. If now, when Japan has emerged as the fourth greatest industrial power of the world, protected by American might, and free not only to occupy herself with the profitable pursuits of peaceful commerce, but to heap ceaseless criticism upon us in the process—if, in this situation, we cannot even muster the gumption to stop subsidizing the token defense forces Japan does maintain, for fear of offending the Japanese Government, then God pity the United States of America.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. If I were to interrupt the Senator every time I find myself in agreement wtih him, I would be constantly interrupting him. He is so right in the observations he has made with respect to the position of Japan vis-a-vis the United States.

As the Senator knows, I hold the same point of view in regard to the aid that we are giving to many NATO countries. These countries are simply not carrying their burden of the price of freedom. I see no reason why the American taxpayers should continue to pay through the nose, to pour into Great Britain and France and Portugal and other NATO countries the huge sums of money that we are pouring into them, including, I may say, West Germany, when, first, they are well able to pay their own way with regard to this subject and, second, I am greatly disturbed about the attitude that certain NATO countries have taken with regard to the United States concerning economic relations.

I see no reason why we should continue to pour money into West Germany, while West Germany prepares to take the discriminatory attitudes she is preparing to take against the United States in regard to agricultural products. That is true also of France and of the Low Countries. Once again I call the attention of the State Department to the fact that of the $3 billion-plus of U.S. exports, more than $1 billion worth in the past has been American agricultural products. Yet when we talk with the officials of the State Department, we continue to be given the old line that we still are selling more to Europe than we are buying from Europe. That does not change the fact that negotiators for the State Department have been for some time selling American agriculture short in our relationships with the NATO countries.

I repeat my notice: I do not intend to vote for this administration's foreign aid policies vis-a-vis the United States and Europe until the State Department proceeds to do a better job of protecting American agriculture.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. He and I have supported the foreign aid program in the past because we have recognized it to be an essential instrument of American foreign policy in dealing with a world in ferment, and in coping with the Communist menace. This very fact makes it clear that our efforts are not directed toward opposing foreign aid, as such. We have been friends of foreign aid; we have recognized its necessity. What we are striving to do is to reform the program, so that it will make better sense.

I have observed on the floor of the Senate in the past, that if Congress fails to effect such reforms, the day may come when the pendulum of reaction will fill the Halls of Congress and the White House itself with men who would return this country to a last lingering isolation. Foreign aid can be sustained only so long as the American people are willing to sustain it. Their good sense tells them that much is wrong with the foreign aid program; much that must be reformed.

I appreciate the support of the distinguished Senator from Oregon of the amendment I intend to offer. I think it will provide for us, with respect to the NATO countries, Japan, or any other self-sufficient foreign country, the basis upon which we can improve and strengthen our relationships. I believe the NATO alliance today is weakened because we cannot summon the resolution to stop subsidies to our prosperous NATO Allies, for these governments know that they are fully capable of maintaining their own armed forces without further help from the United States.

If we desire to strengthen the NATO alliance let us insist that each member with the capability do its share. Ending our subsidies will make it so much easier for the President to say to them that we expect more help from NATO, and more help from Japan, in carrying the heavy burden of foreign aid in the underdeveloped parts of the world which, up until this time, has so largely been borne by the United States alone.

How can we expect them to believe our plea if, on the one hand, we exhort them to greater effort while, on the other hand we continue to dole out subsidies to the very countries whose help we are asking?

I have made my address today in the spirit of constructive criticism of the foreign aid program and in the hope that my argument may lead to the kind of reform that will strengthen the program, and thus assure it the continued support of the American people. Before closing, I want to say that I have just received a written message from the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], advising me that he, too, wishes to be a cosponsor of the amendment I propose to offer. I am grateful to him for his expression of support.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I commend the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for his splendid presentation, and I ask that my name be added as a cosponsor of the amendment he has submitted today.

I agree with him wholeheartedly that the American taxpayer should not be asked to dig down again into his pocket to give further aid to countries which are already firmly back on their feet, and which, in some cases, are doing almost better than we are.

There can be no question about continuing economic assistance to the poor, underdeveloped countries as long as these countries are undertaking strong measures of self-help, nor can there be any question about providing military assistance to underdeveloped areas when the strategic situation makes it in the interest of the United States and the free world to do so. But the time has definitely come when we must cut off grants to the rich, free countries which are able to take care of themselves.

It is not enough for those of us who are Democrats to point out that the foreign aid program, which was established under a Democratic administration, was simply expanded and carried on, almost without change, by the Eisenhower administration. The fact that the previous administration did not have the wisdom to keep the program abreast of the surging changes in our fast-moving world does not relieve this administration of the responsibility of making adjustments in that program now.

I regret having to say this; but I believe there may be some truth in the charge, made by the Senator from Idaho, that the foreign-aid agency—under any of its recent names—and some of the career servants in it—dedicated though they may be—have for some years now proceeded on the theory that this is not a temporary, emergency agency, but is a permanent one, which for many years to come will be formulating annual budget requests and will be asking Congress for huge appropriations. The time has come to call a halt to this type of thinking and planning. I feel that we should make clear to the foreign-aid planners that Congress will support them only when we are convinced that they are examining every program, not to see what other projects we can now undertake with the dollars of American taxpayers, but to see whether the Americans have already done enough, so that we can call a halt and can pull out.

Last fall, I had the privilege of fulfilling a Senate mission to southeast Asia, along with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. It was a very worthwhile trip. It took us into nine countries, where we met both American officials and the leaders of the governments involved. We were treated with the utmost courtesy, and our questions were answered freely. But we came away with the firm conviction that the aid program had become a fully entrenched program—and was rapidly becoming ingrown with surplus personnel. We agreed that not only could the program stand considerable tightening up, but also that substantial cuts could be made in personnel without any risk to the effectiveness of the program. I cite these points merely to emphasize the one which both the Senator from Idaho and I are trying to make—namely, that foreign aid has become an institution. But it is not a sacred one, by any means; and we should examine it carefully before we appropriate money for any phase of it.

I am of the frank opinion that there are a number of countries in which foreign aid can, and should, be phased out

in the next few years; but I have no doubt that there are some in which we can stop grant aid here and now. These are the rich and affluent countries of Western Europe—the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, and Italy—and also Japan in the Far East. It is incredible to think that in 1962 these countries received nearly $400 million in grants from the United States. All of them will receive additional grants, under the terms of this year's foreign aid requests.

These countries are well able to meet their own economic and military needs. Their economies are booming in most instances. They have been able to contribute substantially to the assistance of the underdeveloped countries, and this has cut down our own aid efforts in this respect. For this we are grateful. But they are well able to shoulder their own responsibilities—particularly their military responsibilities—and they should do so.

Take Japan, for example, which has had the world's fastest-growing economy in recent years.

Since the end of World War II, when Japan was totally defeated and her economy in a state of collapse, the United States has given her more than $3 billion in foreign aid.

Thanks to this aid, thanks to the hard work of the Japanese people, and thanks to Japan's free political and economic institutions, Japan has become one of the world's foremost industrial nations.

For example, Japan's economy has been growing for the past decade at an average annual rate of 9 percent—the highest rate of any country in the world, higher than what Khrushchev boasts for the Soviet Union, higher than the fabulous growth rate of West Germany, and three times as high as the growth rate of the United States during the past decade. Japan's shipbuilding industry leads the world; she is first in her fishing industry, fourth in steel production, and the generation of electricity, and one of the top five in cement production. The Japanese people have the highest standard of living of any people in Asia, and it will not be long before Japan will rank among the richest nations of the world.

And, I repeat, our aid to Japan has contributed to this miraculous economic recovery and growth. The bulk of our aid to Japan has been good, wise, and necessary, and we have ample reason to be proud of what we have done. Apart from the moral aspects of helping a defeated and bankrupt nation to her feet again, consider the tremendous political significance of Japan's being so prosperous and so stable that international communism has no chance of making inroads in that country, either by infiltration or subversion or propaganda. Consider, also, the military significance of Japan's remaining in the free world, which her economic strength, her political stability, and her friendly relations with the United States have enabled her to do. Yes, the bulk of our aid to Japan for the past 17 years has been in our best interests.

But, Mr. President, Japan has for some time reached the stage where she no longer needs our aid in order for her to play her part in the free world. She is fully able to stand on her own feet. The $70 million of military aid which we have given her annually for the past few years could have been put to better use in other areas. If Japan needed that extra amount in her military budget, she could well have afforded to provide the extra money herself.

And, Mr. President, in view of the economic prosperity and continued growth of the European continent, it is equally as difficult to justify use of American grant aid. The Executive Commission of the European Common Market reported only last month that "many of the indicators available show that the pace of economic expansion (of the six Common Market nations) has been strong enough for the rates of increase forecast for 1963 still to seem attainable" despite the unusually severe winter which Europeans experienced this year. This means that the Common Market as a whole may again show an overall growth of more than 4 percent. French officials are reported concerned because they now expect a rise in the gross national product for 1963 of only 4.7 percent, compared with 6.3 percent last year. The rate of economic growth in the United States presently hovers between 2 and 3 percent.

During the late 1950's and the first 2 years of the present decade, the rate of economic growth in Europe was spectacular. Europe not only recovered from the holocaust of the Second World War, greatly aided by the Marshall plan, but continued to register a general economic expansion year after year. Holland, which is receiving $16 million in military aid for fiscal 1963, registered a striking 8 percent rise in the gross national product as recently as 1960. According to the London Economist (Aug. 11, 1962, p. 551), manufacturing production in the six members of the Common Market has increased faster than in other industrial countries of the world—including the United States—both before the Common Market came into being and afterwards. These calculations are for the years 1955–61, excluding the year 1958, which was a year of diminished growth for the six and of recession in the United States and elsewhere.

To be sure, the phenomenal European boom of the late 1950's is slackening out, and there are some sections of Europe which have not shared the general prosperity. But the economic situation in Europe remains one of self-confidence and prosperity, and our European allies are fully capable of paying for military and economic projects which they believe vital. According to an economic correspondent of the New York Times:

> While the rate of business investment in plant and equipment—a key to present prosperity and future growth—continues to give some concern, it is now evident that investment will not decline this year and, in most countries will show some further growth (in the OECD). (Edwin L. Dale, Jr., New York Times, May 30, 1963, p. 23.).

Germany, the country in which fears of an economic decline were strongest, now expects continued expansion. The Federal Economics Ministry in West Germany recently reported that "the most recent statistics indicate a definite improvement in the economic situation." The Federation of German Industries, the leading spokesman of the German business community, also expects further expansion. Private and official reports on Italy, which is receiving $70 million in U.S. military aid in fiscal 1963, also register hopes for a major expansion in general economic activities this year.

Why should the United States pick up the check for military and economic costs of the European Continent, when Europe is enjoying unprecedented prosperity? By 1960—

> "The more than 300 million people of Western Europe enjoy average incomes with purchasing power more than one-third higher than the per capita incomes of the 260 million who lived in the same region on the eve of the * * * war * * *. Industrial production * * * has more than doubled over the past two decades. Agricultural output—with few men on the farm—is over a third larger than in the immediate prewar years." Moreover, while this advance was uneven and left some of the backward areas almost unaffected, "the rates of growth of nearly all European countries for the 1950's alone surpassed those of the United States and Canada." Between 1950 and 1959, the combined gross national product of the 18-member countries of the OEEC * * * increased by 46 percent * * *. This was equal to an annual compound rate of over 4.3 percent—enough to bring about a 100 percent increase over 1950 by 1967. These are figures for total output. Industrial production rose a good deal faster. (George Lichtheim, "The New Europe" (New York, Paeger, 1963), pp. 88–89. Internal quotations and statistics are from J. Frederick Dewhurst, et al., "Europe's Needs and Resources" (New York, 1961).)

As the Senator from Idaho has made clear, the amendment would not in any way affect the U.S. contribution to the NATO infrastructure, nor would it affect any other multilateral commitment of the United States. It would relate only to the individual grants to individual countries. It would be our way of insisting that these countries maintain their own armed forces without American subsidy.

Nor would the amendment, as I see it, hamstring the President in any way in his great and continuing fight to keep the world free. The type of programing to which the amendment refers is the routine programing of an established Federal agency. The Congress will always listen with an open mind should events dictate that we must give additional help to any country where we have halted grants, and the President would always have the authority to continue assistance already allocated should there be an "undue economic burden." So this is not an amendment without a "fire escape," but it is intended to end American foreign aid to countries which no longer need it, and put the program on a firmer basis by removing from it elements for which it is severely criticized, and rightly so.

I concur with the Senator from Idaho. His proposal would render a service in the field of foreign aid by making the program acceptable and stronger. If it continues to grow, ultimately the whole

structure will collapse and come down of its own weight.

I have been a firm supporter of the principle of foreign aid in underdeveloped countries and all new nations trying to establish freedom and which are willing to set up democratic processes of government. In some instances I am willing to gamble in relation to countries which are of questionable allegiance. I refer to countries such as Ghana in Africa. At one time it appeared that that nation might have gone over to the Soviet side, but with the establishment of a sound and stable government and an indication being given of their willingness to adopt reasonable government control, it seems that that nation can now be independent and stand on its own feet and become a sound member of the community of nations.

That is the principal purpose of foreign aid. The purpose is not to continue subsidies forever to countries that have recovered. So I commend the Senator from Idaho for his continued leadership in that field. I have listened to him before on the floor of the Senate. I have dicussed the problem with him many times. Today he brings to the Senate and to the people of the United States a principle that must be adopted in the interest of our country.

Mr. CHURCH. I very much appreciate the persuasive case which the Senator from Utah has made for the amendment. He and I share common views on the foreign-aid program. We have both supported it in the past. We merely wish to see that excesses in the program are eliminated.

The Senator will be interested in knowing that when I made a speech on the floor of the Senate, some weeks ago, calling for an end to further aid to Japan, though the speech was not given much publicity in this country, it received very considerable notice in Japan.

As a consequence, I received a good deal of mail from Japan. The interesting thing about the mail was that I did not receive a single letter, either from Americans in Japan or from the Japanese themselves, which was adverse to my recommendation that the program now be ended. Both the Japanese and the Americans living in Japan recognized that we had accomplished its objective, that we had given aid when aid was needed, that Japan had fully recovered and was now one of the fastest growing industrial countries of the world, and that it would serve the interests of our common partnership to end the subsidy, both from the standpoint of the United States and Japan.

Not a letter took issue with my recommendation. This makes me feel even more strongly that the end result of such an amendment would not be to weaken our relationship with these rich countries, but instead to strengthen it.

Mr. MOSS. That is indeed remarkable. It underscores the desire to have freedom and independence as between countries, rather than a continuing subsidy.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the foreign aid amendment by my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], to bring an end to foreign aid to affluent countries.

Among the countries which have grown in wealth and which have ceased to be in need of outright foreign aid from America, are some that are in the European Common Market, which has become so protectionist that their unreasonably high tariffs are squeezing the poultry export industry in Texas and the rest of the United States out of Europe.

With our national goal of providing tax relief for our citizens, with our national security demanding constant heavy spending, these proposed cuts in foreign aid to countries no longer needing help should be given urgent attention by this Congress. We should cut off this $400 million in aid to the affluent countries, which we now give outright.

Cutting off handouts to the prosperous countries with high standards of living would set a much-needed precedent—a precedent for saying to affluent foreign nations:

"We have helped you in time of need. If the need arises, the American people stand ready to help again. But we have completed the historic chapter on 'Help to Friends in Need,' and are ready to write a new chapter called Do-It-Yourself Economics."

I commend the Senator again for his contribution to the subject, not only now but also in the past, and for his distinguished service on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Texas. I am grateful for his support.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I should like to ask the Senator a few questions. Perhaps they have already been covered in the Senator's comments. I thought, however, that some questions might clarify certain points with respect to my own position.

It seems to me that our theory that economic aid is the thing which stops communism has been pretty well blown up by the recent election in Italy, as well as those in other countries, in which the Communist Party increased strength despite the fact that the country was well off.

Particularly I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho whether, if the Senate should agree to the amendment to cut off aid from European countries and Japan, this would mean cutting off loans as well as grants?

Mr. CHURCH. The amendment is limited to grants only. It would not affect either loans or credit sales.

Mr. DOMINICK. Secondly, would the Senator's proposal cut down the amount of the foreign aid appropriation bill by the amount so eliminated?

Mr. CHURCH. I see no reason for not cutting it down. That is one of the purposes of the amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. On the question of Japan, I noticed the Senator said that in the past 10 years Japan's percentage of gross national product devoted to defense needs had been halved, despite the fact that the gross national product was increasing. Does the Senator know either the actual or equivalent dollar figures in that connection?

Mr. CHURCH. I do not have those figures readily available. I could supply them to the Senator. The only figures I have available, at this time, is the percentage of the Japanese gross national product spent for defense, which fell from 2.2 percent to 1.1 percent.

Mr. DOMINICK. In terms of dollars, has the amount gone up?

Mr. CHURCH. I cannot give the Senator an answer in dollar amounts. However, in terms of the growing economic capacity of Japan and of the Government's budget, the proportion of effort directed toward defense has gone steadily down, while we have continued grants-in-aid upon the argument that they induced the Japanese to do more. This argument is not borne out by the percentage figures.

Mr. DOMINICK. I say to my colleague the Senator from Idaho that we need to review and revise in some ways our foreign aid program. It seems to me this would be one step which might be very fruitful along that line. We are spending money now as though it came from a drain pipe. I do not see any purpose in doing so if we can find some method of changing our foreign aid program without damaging effects in countries which really need our assistance.

Mr. CHURCH. This is my objective. If we cannot discipline this program sufficiently to stop subsidizing the rich, how can we possibly expect to do the things necessary to make the program more effective in areas of the world toward which it is supposed to be pointed, the underdeveloped countries?

I believe the amendment has a genuinely bipartisan character. I hope it will have widespread bipartisan support.

In that connection, since I sent the amendment to the desk, I have been asked by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] to have their names added as cosponsors of the amendment; and I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the names of the four Senators will be added as cosponsors.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise in my own time briefly to comment on the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. I am pleased to be one of its cosponsors.

I have supported the Senator from Idaho on the principle of this amendment for the past several years. The Senator from Idaho has taken the lead in the Senate on this particular proposal for improvement in our foreign aid program.

I hope the administration is taking note of the increase in the number of voices speaking out against its foreign aid bill this year. I speak as a Democrat in opposition to the foreign aid bill.

If the administration took a nose count in this country it would find that a substantial majority of the taxpayers want a drastic reduction in the foreign aid bill and some major changes in the policy inherent in the foreign aid bill.

The Church amendment is only one of many amendments which will be offered to the bill. The Church amendment goes beyond the question of amount, and in final summation goes also to the proposal for some basic changes in foreign aid policy.

I have listened to the major witnesses for the administration: The Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk; the director of AID, Mr. Bell; and the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara. In my judgment, they are three of the most dedicated public servants of our generation. I have great admiration and high respect for them. They have presented the administration's point of view.

I have told them, in our Foreign Relations Committee hearings, that, although I have great respect for their position, I disagree with them in some very major aspects of the foreign aid bill.

Last week I said that from now until the end of the consideration of the foreign aid bill, until the final vote of the conference report on the foreign aid bill, I propose to speak with great frequency on the floor of the Senate on this subject matter.

I repeat my reason for following the policy. In my judgment, our foreign policy belongs to the American people, not to this administration. If the American people are to have an enlightened attitude about what our foreign policy should be, they must have the facts about it. I respectfully say they are never going to get the facts if they limit themselves to the press releases issued by the various agencies of the Government in connection with this bill. They will not get the facts if they limit themselves to what necessarily must be rather limited articles appearing in the press.

Therefore, I consider it my obligation to focus attention on some of the weaknesses of the bill. If it results in only a few people reading my remarks it may cause some of them to make it a matter of discussion at the precinct levels of America. In my judgment, if the great mistakes in foreign aid that we are making are going to be corrected, that decision will have to be determined at the precinct levels of America. I use the phrase "precinct levels" because this is a political issue. It should be, and necessarily is, in a political democracy. I say to Democrats, Republicans, and Independents alike that they have a responsibility as citizens to see that they inform themselves in regard to the foreign aid program and make known their wishes to their representatives in the Congress and to the President of the United States.

Since 1946 the foreign aid bill has cost the American taxpayer $100 billion. That is a tremendous sum of money. It should be enough to cause any citizen to stop, look, and listen, and ask this administration a few pertinent questions about this year's bill. We cannot continue to spend at the rate this administration is asking us to spend, which is a continuation of the rate of spending under 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, and keep a strong domestic economy. Our domestic economy is not strong.

Do not be fooled by the kind of testimony we received from the Secretary of the Treasury the other day that we have a gross national product of some $600 billion. Mr. President, the gross national product means very little unless there is a substantial net for the American taxpayer, for it is the net, and not the gross, which determines whether you and I are solvent.

The time has come, as the Senator from Idaho has pointed out, when we ought to stop grants to countries that can afford to pay their own way. That is what this bill deals with, as the Senator from Idaho said in answer to a question put to him by the Senator from Colorado.

But this is only a part of the reform that is needed, because great reform is also needed in the field of loans. To the American taxpayer I say, "Watch out for the propaganda issued by the State Department and by the AID organization concerning loans." Five years ago, 94 cents out of every foreign aid dollar was an out-and-out grant. In the early years of foreign aid, it was necessary to give away a substantial volume of dollars to rehabilitate war-stricken areas among the free nations of the world, principally Europe.

As I said this morning in the Foreign Relations Committee hearing, when Dean Rusk was before us, I do not agree with the views that have been expressed, by way of hindsight, that the Marshall Plan from the very beginning should have been a loan program. I do not believe it should have been a loan program from the very beginning. It should have become a loan program after a few years as Europe became economically rehabilitated and began to possess the earning power with which to repay loans.

But we must analyze very carefully the propaganda of the State Department and the Defense Department and AID and the White House on the matter of loans.

I have pointed out that 5 years ago, 94 cents out of every foreign aid dollar was grant money. For the last few years, it has been down to 65 cents. In my judgment the percentage of grants is still entirely too high. A tentative analysis that I have seen in the proposals of the administration this year is that it would get grants down to about 60 percent, leaving about 40 percent in loans. But that percentage is a breakdown of economic aid only. It ignores military aid, which is really all grant aid. It certainly is not good enough for the vote of the senior Senator from Oregon.

When the administration gets the foreign aid program down to a ratio of about 75 cents out of every dollar in repayable loans—and I will have something to say about what I mean by repayable loans in a moment—and 25 cents out of every foreign aid dollar for grants, I will be more interested in returning to the fold of supporting foreign aid.

By such a change, we could bring about a reform that would make it possible to continue a foreign aid program that will strengthen freedom around the world and maintain the strength of our greatest defense weapon, which is our own domestic economy.

Sixty percent in grants and forty percent in loans, I understand, is a fair estimate of the figure for this year. That is not good enough. When the administration talks about loans, we had better take a look at what is meant by loans. Senators will find that an exceedingly large percentage of the so-called loans are interest free, with only a service charge of three-quarters of 1 percent. There is usually a grace period of 10 years, which means that for 10 years those countries do not have to repay a dollar on the loans. I do not call that a loan program at all. The real danger is that such loans will never be repaid. If we do not mean business enough in connection with loans to charge a rate of interest that will repay the American taxpayer the cost of the use of the money, we do not meet the definition of a loan program.

For the Secretary of State and the Director of AID to continue to say, in answer to questions about this subject in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, that they consider it a loan program because it calls for repayment, causes us in rebuttal to call the attention of these dedicated public servants to what the history has been in regard to repaying loans of this type. Such loans usually end by being repudiated or usually end in diplomatic negotiated understandings that forgive many of the loans.

When I talk about repayable loans, I mean loans that are made at interest rates that will repay the American taxpayers at least the cost of the use of the money. I mean loans to be repaid in hard American dollars, not in the soft currency of some country, when we very well know that very little value will be collected, so far as the American taxpayers are concerned, through soft currency channels. Some loans are repaid, I admit, but not many. It is a small percentage of the supposed dollar value of the loan.

Whenever there is a loan that is spelled out in terms of the soft currency of some foreign country, it means, of course, that we cannot exchange the face of the loan for hard American dollars. Such a loan does not mean too much, because only a small fraction of the value of the loan, if anything, will ever be collected, for the benefit of the American taxpayers.

So when I say I am a "loan man," and not a "grant man," in order to characterize my position on foreign aid, I am urging, in the case of loans, that they be repaid in American hard dollars, the operation to be carried out on the basis of an interest rate charge that will at least repay the American taxpayer in-

terest equal to the cost of the use of the money.

Many people do not stop to realize that we do not have a quantity of American money that we can make available to some foreign country on loan. When we make a loan, in most instances the Treasury, in the first instance, must borrow the money it expects to loan. So the U.S. Treasury borrows the money it will lend to country X, Y, or Z, and pays the going market price for the cost of the money at the time it makes the loan.

Then it turns around and lends the money with only a charge of three-quarters of 1 percent.

So, as I said to the Secretary of State and to Mr. Bell, when they were on the witness stand the other day, "what you should tell the American people, what you have a duty to tell the American people, is that you are granting a subsidy over and above all the other subsidies. You are granting a subsidy to a foreign country that is a recipient of such a favorable loan to the tune of thousands, and in some instances over the years of the life of the loan millions of dollars, in an interest giveaway."

What I am pleading for is that we get the foreign aid program, in relation to its lending aspects, down to a sound financial basis, and that we make clear to the countries of the world that Uncle Sam is no longer in the giveaway business; that his whiskers do not really constitute a Santa Claus mask; that we are in the business of protecting the financial interests of the taxpayers and, through them, the economy of the country.

When the people of the country read press releases, as they will be reading them, and the news stories based upon the press releases of the State Department and AID, I want them to remember that when these press releases discuss loans, they do not mean loans of the kind that the average taxpayer is faced with when he goes to his bank to borrow money to refinance his home, or to buy a washing machine, or to meet the other family or business obligations.

The bill is honeycombed with a whole series of such undisclosed subsidies, not clear to the reader at the first reading of the bill. From time to time, I shall discuss some of the other subsidies as the debate progresses.

But I do believe the Marshall plan had to be a grant program for a considerable length of time.

There is no question about the fact that the European countries fought our war for us before we got into it. I have always held to the point of view that World War II was our war for quite some time before we got in it.

Mr. President, you and I know that there are still areas of resentment in Europe because we were as long delayed in getting into it as we were. They were our partners. They were doing the economic and physical bleeding in the protection of freedom against imperialist Germany and Mussolini's Italy. We had a great obligation to help rehabilitate Europe in part at our cost. It was in our self-interest, too. There is no doubt about that fact, in my judgment.

How well I remember the day—for I was sitting on the other side of the aisle in those days—when one of the most courageous and able Presidents in our history, President Truman, delivered his historic message at a joint session of the Congress, which came to be known as the message on the Truman Doctrine, and which proposed that the United States go to the assistance of Greece and Turkey.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that on that day where was only one speech made on the floor of the Senate following the joint session in which the President of the United States addressed Congress. The senior Senator from Oregon will always be pleased to leave that CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to his descendants, for I walked from the House of Representatives to this floor and, as a Republican, pledged my support to a Democratic President. I pointed out that no power in the world except the United States of America could stop Russia from trampling across Europe. We had a great obligation, not only to those countries, but also to ourselves, to come to the defense of freedom.

My position was the same in connection with the support of the Marshall plan. I have supported a foreign aid program in vote after vote in my many years in the Senate. I should like to return to supporting foreign aid, but I will not do so until foreign aid is so rewritten as to justify support. Therefore, last year, for the first time, I left the support of foreign aid completely. At every step of the proceedings I voted against the conference report. I have already announced that I shall vote against it again this year, unless foreign aid is drastically reformed.

Mr. President, it is not easy to take this position. I well know that there are two extreme groups in this country on this issue. There is the extreme right, which takes the position that we ought to get out of NATO completely, that we ought to get out of the United Nations completely, that we ought to cut ourselves off from international intercourse, and that we ought to go isolationist. Of course, there is always the temptation for one's critics, when one takes the position that I take, to charge one with being a neoisolationist. If one makes a suggestion for a modification of the foreign policy of the United States in respect to foreign aid or in respect to a good many other issues involved in the foreign policy, one must expect to be smeared as being a neoisolationist.

However, labels do not bother me. They never have, and never will. I am interested only in facts. I am satisfied that the people will see through labels and weigh the facts, and recognize that when one fights for a reform of the bad policies in the existing foreign aid program and tries to make it a good program, that that is good internationalism and sound Americanism, too.

Then there are the extremists, on the international front, who apparently have permitted themselves to be victimized by a dogma. I direct my remarks to those liberal groups in the country which seem to be very perplexed because the senior Senator from Oregon is not following them blindly in their so-called internationalism dogma, and I want to say to those liberal groups: "Stop calling names. Stop thinking in terms of labels, and stop analyzing the facts about this administration's foreign aid bill. If you analyzed the facts about this administration's foreign aid, in my judgment you will not support it either, but will ask drastic amendments and modifications in it."

I do not intend to be deterred in my determination to carry out my trust in respect to this piece of legislation by either the rightists or the so-called dogmatic internationalists, who are apparently perfectly willing to give away anything we have in the name of internationalism, because it seems to fit into the foreign policy dogma that has come to create so much myopia, particularly among liberals.

On June 12, following a speech I made in Portland, Oreg., to the Portland City Club, in which I called for drastic changes in the NATO program, the Portland Oregonian, not noted for its support of the senior Senator from Oregon, wrote an editorial that pleases me very much. I say to the editors of the Oregonian that I am human enough to appreciate an editorial such as they wrote on June 12 entitled "Morse Right on NATO."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in the Oregonian be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. To the editors of the Oregonian I say, "Thank you very much."

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

MORSE RIGHT ON NATO

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, of Oregon, is right in questioning the present value of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the methods now being promoted by the Kennedy administration to keep it alive in the face of allied resistance. NATO served a timely purpose—or, more properly, the presence of American arms in West Germany did—in discouraging Soviet bloc aggression against war-weakened Western Europe. It continues to guard threatened Berlin. But its broadscale function has been served. Conditions have changed.

We would not go as far as Senator MORSE if he advocates the immediate dissolution of NATO, or America's withdrawal from it, as he seemed to do in his City Club talk in Portland last Friday. But even that might be preferable to the United States' being a party to its dissolution by attrition of purpose and diversion of interests.

This newspaper suggested, when Germany and France entered into their recent military and political alliance, that it may be time for the United States to consider withdrawal of its troops. The problem, of course, is not to leave a vacuum into which Communist power will flow. Or to leave untended a situation in which the Western European nations may retrograde into their old enmities which offer so fruitful a field for war cliques to cultivate. If NATO is to be killed, it must be replaced.

We have little liking for the administration's desperate efforts to appease the British and French by multination manning of nuclear-armed ships and other vehicles of war. If a practical reason is needed, it is that

Congress is not going to turn over U.S. nuclear weapons to General de Gaulle, and the French are not going to accept the U.S. veto on use of nuclear weapons in another guise.

The time is running out when any nation—Canada included—will accept the U.S. veto of decision in the use of nuclear arms stationed on that nation's soil for free-world defense. We may consider this silly of other nations, but there it is. Nationalism is not exclusive to Africa. And the nuclear lodge is no longer exclusive, either.

The European Common Market has hardened the economies of its member countries. It has also strengthened them militarily and is bringing them much closer together politically. It is reasonably plain that the continued dominance of NATO by the United States will become intolerable, in time. It may be well to prepare our own exit while there remains some semblance of good feeling.

In this era of nuclear stalemate between the Soviet Union and the United States, the danger of Communist invasion of Western Europe, which was acute about the time of the Korean war, is no longer a major hazard. Certainly defensive forces are needed in Western Europe, if only to prevent the Soviets and their satellites from seeking a haven from U.S. missiles and war planes while they level U.S. bases at long range and receive payment-in-kind. But is that America's role? We doubt it. Germany is strong again. France wants to go its own way. The smaller NATO nations appreciate our aid, but more on economic grounds than military. We would be obliged to make some separate alliances, as with Turkey, but these would only confirm what we are doing now under the NATO name.

Senator MORSE is speaking responsibly in raising the question of perpetuating NATO beyond its usefulness. A thorough reexamination of the question is overdue.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope that the Oregonian will continue to present to the people of my State—and that other newspapers across the country will do likewise—the facts that are developed in this historic debate which is now underway in Congress on the foreign aid program.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to say that the executive branch is being entirely candid about this year's foreign aid bill. This burst of candor comes in the foreward by AID Administrator David Bell to the summary presentation of the foreign assistance programs to Congress. There, in black and white, the foreward asserts:

> The proposals for 1964 include no major innovations.

They are candid about it. They are truthful about it. But that is the point for an attack. The question is, Why do they not attack?

The Mansfield amendment of 1959 served notice on the executive branch of the Government that Congress wanted the number of countries receiving aid reduced. We wanted a report from the administration each year showing what countries were being eliminated from the program of supporting assistance.

I discussed this subject with the Secretary of State when he was on the witness stand this morning. I asked for a detailed memorandum from the State Department on this subject. I want to know to what extent the executive branch of the Government has kept faith with the Mansfield amendment; for, in my judgment, the Mansfield amendment has been largely disregarded. I do not intend to permit that fact to go unnoticed. Also, in a future speech, I shall discuss the Morse amendment in respect to military aid to Latin American countries in connection with internal security problems. It is my opinion, as I indicated to the Secretary of Defense the other day, that that amendment, too, has become a dead letter. Under the system of checks that it is our duty to impose upon the executive branch of the Government, I do not believe we can permit the executive branch to conduct an end run play around the policy position of Congress set forth in provisions such as the Mansfield and Morse amendments. To all intents and purposes, that has been the end result. Those amendments have been turned into dead-letter provisions of the foreign aid law; and no one is more responsible for permitting that situation to develop than Congress itself.

Mr. President in regard to the statements by Mr. Bell, the Director of AID, that the proposals for 1964 do not include any major innovation, there is no basic change, despite evidence on every side that the American taxpayer is increasingly fed up with the albatross of foreign aid which has been hung around his neck each year for a decade and one-half.

What in the world was the Clay Committee convened for, if it was not in recognition of the fact that there was a pressing and long overdue need for fundamental changes in the aid program.

In order that there may be no doubt, I think the Clay Committee report is, on the whole, a sound one. As the debate progresses I shall point out that, so far as I am concerned, I do not think the Clay Committee report goes nearly far enough in regard to the proposed reductions in the foreign-aid program. It appears that we have borrowed and cherished the classic French statement that the more things change, the more they remain the same. I may add that that phrase is about all that France has given us in recent times.

We are still playing the old guessing game which the American taxpayer has lost annually over the years. Under the rules of this contest, the gentlemen downtown work out their astonishingly complicated program, doubtless in ways which would give even the stoutest computer a nervous breakdown as spectacular as the Comiskey Park scoreboard after a home run. They then try to guess how deeply the Congress will cut their mystical masterpiece, and apparently they add to the original request the amount of the envisaged cut. For their part, many tortured gentlemen on the Hill feel compelled to guess at the guess made by the executive officials, and then to cut the program more than the executive officials anticipated.

Good playing form at this Mad Hatter's tea party demands that—along with the call "move down, clean cups"—there be anguished cries from both sides about intolerable damage to the fabric of our Nation. I scarcely need point out that the taxpayer—in the form of Alice—has gotten the dirty cup each time. Now the very curious thing is that, once the party is over, the gamesmen seem able to accept the decision with relative tranquillity, and the Nation's fabric is still there, to be theoretically rent at the next annual installment of the contest.

Also from Mr. Bell's foreword we learn that:

> After a searching review of the foreign aid program for 1964 * * * the President now finds it possible to reduce his original budget request by more than $400 million.

To some, this may seem encouraging; after all, the request as it stands is only—and I stress the word "only"—some $600 million more than the amount approved by the Congress last year. But to me this is really not very impressive. I remember that, in 1960, the Bureau of the Budget cut about $750 million from the departmental requests before the program came to the Congress. There is no new policy here.

Then Mr. Bell—for whom I personally have a very high regard, as I have said before—unwittingly makes a bad matter worse by writing:

> The intention is * * * to put into more effective practice the concepts established by the Congress in 1961.

The fact is that we in Congress have never been able to make more than modest adjustments in the bills presented by the executive branch.

Everyone should know that members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have labored mightily each year to promote major changes in the foreign aid program. But each time we have been stymied by our inability to get at the philosophic concepts on which the executive branch requests rest. We do not have the resources or the time completely to revise the whole program. Therefore, we have been forced to use a paring knife, when a meat cleaver is required.

I have worked hard in the past to cut down on the aspects which I find most unnecessary and distasteful, such as wasteful military aid and "supporting assistance," and to improve the administration of the useful and needed instruments of technical assistance and developments loans. Year after year I have consoled myself with the marginal improvements we have effected, and with the hope for a new deal. But last year my hope and my patience became exhausted, and I voted against the program. I am not too sure that Congress will be able to override the entrenched interests, here and abroad, that support the foreign-aid program as it has stood for these many years.

One of the most powerful lobbies in the United States today is composed of the vested business interests which are dependent, in their operations, on huge military expenditures and on a defense economy, rather than a free economy, and who find to their profit the continued building up of our extremely large foreign-aid program. Already this year, when the administration's witnesses presented their interesting testimony, which they repeat again and again, we have learned how large a percentage of our foreign-aid funds provided for the manufacture of supplies is spent in the United States. But, Mr. President, when we analyze that argument, its implica-

tions do not make us very happy. We ought to be asking whether the policy is sound and whether in the long run we are helping the economy of our country by subsidizing great business concerns in our country, through a very large foreign-aid military defense program. We are asked to continue to vote for the program, in part because American businesses make money out of it. But that is a rather sordid situation, and really is a shocking one, when we stop to analyze the ethics involved.

I have voted, and will continue to vote for every dollar necessary for the defense of our country; but I say to the great defense industrialists in this country, "Do not think that I am going to vote for a continuation of foreign aid on the basis of the argument that you keep men at work and keep your plants busy in connection with the manufacture of tanks and other weapons of war."

That argument is given as justification for a continuation of the foreign-aid program. However, it is very important that we separate these two concepts. In my judgment, we cannot justify a foreign-aid program merely on the ground that it results in the expenditure within the United States of public funds for the construction of nonproductive goods which are necessary for defense. We can justify spending whatever amounts are necessary for defense; but we cannot justify continuation of a military aid program merely because its continuation keeps a certain number of people at work and results in profits for the owners of those defense establishments. After all, Mr. President, a tank is not a good device for peacetime transportation; a jet fighter plane does not make a good commercial air transport plane. No economically productive good results from the use of a missile or a machinegun or a bullet. Yet in whatever amount they are necessary to protect our security, we must have them.

The point I am seeking to make is that there are those who lobby heavily for a huge foreign aid program on the ground that it serves a selfish interest of a relatively few in the United States. I say to some of the labor leaders in our country, "My criticism goes to you, too."

There are too many shortsighted labor leaders. If a tapering off of a defense plant or a cutback in military expenditures is suggested, we see lobbyists in uniform from the Pentagon Building, industrial lobbyists from industry, and labor spokesmen as lobbyists. There is a triumvirate of powerful political lobbyists. But we must stand up against them. The lobbyists for foreign aid, on the basis of the fallacious argument that I have heard from the Secretary of State, from Mr. Bell, and from the Secretary of Defense, must be pinned to the mat.

The mere fact that a large percentage of the money is spent in the United States is no justification whatsoever for the appropriation of the money in the first instance. The question is whether or not the expenditure of that money for the purposes set forth in the foreign aid bill is in the longtime national interest of our republic. That is the issue. In my judgment, it is not. It becomes a matter of degree, I admit. It becomes a problem of tapering off as rapidly as we can taper off with safety to the security of our country. But the tapering off should bear no relationship whatsoever to the profits of industry or to the jobs of workers. I make that statement to the union halls of America. I say, "You are entitled to full employment. No one will fight harder, and no one can present a record that shows he has fought harder, than the senior Senator from Oregon, during his many years in the Senate, for full employment for those in our country who are ready, willing, and able to work."

But, Mr. President, American labor is not entitled as a matter of right to continue to work in a defense plant the moment that the defense plant is no longer needed or ought to be reduced in the quantity of goods it produces.

Such action calls for some planning. There has been little of it since 1946, when I was one of the cosponsors of the Murray full employment bill, which was also a part of the law of this land, and has gathered dust and cobwebs almost from the day the bill was signed into law.

I am fed up with the argument of industrialists, military lobbyists, and labor leaders that we must not touch the foreign aid bill, because if we should touch the foreign aid bill, we would reduce profits, throw men out of work, and close plants. Whole communities would be up in arms. In the past few years we have had examples of what happens when we start to reduce and taper off huge foreign aid expenditures as they affect military aid.

The responsibility of the Government is to proceed with a transition plan which would transfer the expenditures from nonproductive military foreign aid expenditures into great expenditures that would help to expand the economy of our country, so that we would not get statistics such as those cited by the Senator from Idaho to the Senate today showing how we are lagging behind one nation after another in production. He has shown that we are lagging behind Japan, France, Italy, West Germany, and England. One of the reasons why our production is lagging is that much of our production is going into nonproductive production, so far as the civilian economy is concerned, for war plants do not create wealth. I desire to repeat that statement. It is an elementary principle of economics. I am told that a great many people are working in a war plant. I suggest that those who make the argument that it is expanding the economy get the argument out of their heads. We must put people to work in industry and in occupations that expand the civilian economy. We would create new wealth out of which new jobs would result. We have not yet scratched the surface of the expansion possibilities of a civilian economy in the United States.

I do not intend to let the spokesmen of America use the argument of bribery—for that is what it amounts to—that, "You ought to vote with us, because if you do not vote with us, some men are going to be put out of work and plants will close."

I say to the administration, "You have no right to a single dollar of foreign aid, except that minimum amount, whatever it is—and that is what the debate is all about—which will best serve our national interest and carry out our obligations to the free world with reciprocity on their part of service to freedom. Then come forward with your plan or plans for expanding the civilian economy of this country so that men now at work in tank factories will be at work in tractor factories and in factories manufacturing goods which will create new wealth for an ever-increasing expansion of the economy of our country."

Mr. President, we need not scratch our imagination very deeply to see what a great economic crusade that would be and how much human happiness such action would produce. But, of course, the barrier in the way of all of us is the constant threat of Communist Russia and Communist China to supplant the kind of civilian economic freedom for which I am raising my voice in plea this afternoon with the economy of enslavement by communism. That is why we are in the paradoxical situation in which we must try to figure out where the balance is. I shall resolve doubts in favor of more for defense than may be needed and more for foreign aid than may be needed, but we do not have to go to the extreme of a defense budget this year of more than $52 billion, and a foreign aid program, military, and economic, of $4.5 billion, in round numbers. They have gone too far again. The taxpayer cannot stand it any longer. The American taxpayer, with increasing vigor, is trying to get across to the administration that he will not stand it any longer.

In a responsible government the reasoned judgment of a substantial majority should be followed. They have a right to that reaction from any administration, whether it be Democratic or Republican.

It is my view that very rapidly there is developing in our body politic a reasoned judgment on the part of a substantial majority of our people calling for a change in our foreign aid program.

That is why the senior Senator from Oregon has been willing to lead with his chin on this issue, so to speak, which is very unpopular in some quarters. In my judgment, the popularity of my position will increase more and more as the American taxpayer becomes more and more enlightened.

We as Senators have an obligation to take the facts to the American people and not to let this administration, after cursory hearings and with very little public attention being given to the matter by the administration or by the Members of Congress, slip this program through the Congress again without full debate.

So, unpopular as my position may be in some quarters, I intend to do my share, at least, in stirring up debate over the subject matter so that the American

people may understand it better and make their wishes known to this administration.

I have such confidence in the judgment of the American people, once they have the facts, and such confidence in the analysis of the foreign aid bill that I have been making over the past several years, that I am perfectly willing to run all the risks that may be involved in standing up and being counted in opposition to my party's proposal for a foreign aid bill as it has been submitted to this Congress in the form of the bill now being considered in hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

We have a clear duty as a Congress to try to create the kind of aid program which would truly reflect American interests and benefit the international community. And I yield to no one in my continuing concern for those objectives. However, those objectives are not met by the present foreign-aid bill which is but a repetition of the traditional program tossed up to us again this year.

Mr. President, I reiterate my position to allow for no chance of misinterpretation. Like Alice, I have become disgusted with the mad tea party. No longer will I join my committee colleagues in the despairing annual effort to push the shoddy and overstuffed doormouse into the teapot.

My duty to my constituents and the dictates of my conscience will force me to register a protest vote against the foreign aid bill when it comes before this body if it resembles its present form.

I shall offer and support with evidence and argument a series of amendments which, if adopted, will reduce the foreign aid expenditures by at least 25 percent. I joined in cosponsoring one of those amendments this afternoon, when I joined in cosponsoring the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

I close by saying that it is my judgment, after long and detailed study of the bill, that the bill can be reduced in total amount by 25 percent without in the slightest weakening the security of this country. To the contrary, in my judgment it would strengthen the sesecurity of this country, because it would strengthen the domestic economy, which is crying out for strengthening.

I shall not propose an across-the-board 25-percent cut. The total amount of cut which result from adoption of the amendments I shall offer or support would, at a minimum, be 25 percent. In some instances I shall propose the striking of an entire amount. That goes along with the proposal I shall make later, to supplement the proposal of the Senator from Idaho, to eliminate certain countries entirely from receiving a single dollar of grant money in fiscal year 1964.

In some instances we could safely reduce the amount involved by 50 percent; in some instances by 40 percent; and in some instances by 10 percent. In a few instances I shall support an increase in the amount, where the facts warrant an increase.

But the total amount, in my judgment, should be reduced not 1 cent less than 25 percent.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Medford Mail Tribune in my State, under date of May 16, 1963, published an editorial which was called to my attention yesterday. It is called A Reply to a Letter. It is one of the most devastating answers, in my judgment, to a non sequitur we have heard in this country on civil rights for many years. I have heard it stated in one form or another over the years on the floor of the Senate. It is a common non sequitur used by southern editors in their editorial writings. It is a non sequitur which is supposed to cause those who live in the North to surrender, to give up on the matter of civil rights.

The editor in Medford, Oreg., Eric Allen, has written a reply to this fallacious argument.

I shall read the editorial in part, and later I shall ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in full in the RECORD.

The editor says:

We received the following letter the other day:

"To the EDITOR:

"A correspondent of ours in Oregon tells us that you have shown an interest in the South's racial problems on your editorial page.

"We southerners are delighted to see that other parts of the Nation are becoming interested in the race problem and welcome the sincere desire to help.

"Would you on behalf of your subscribers welcome into your community several hundred Negro families from the South? If you will write such a welcome in the form of an editorial we will give it wide publicity throughout the South and will help raise the necessary transportation cost for these Negro migrants.

"Perhaps you would print this letter in your letters-to-the-editor column.

"We believe that the most nearly Christian solution to the race problem is migration and dispersion throughout our Nation. I am mailing you under separate cover statistics on this subject which may interest you.

"Sincerely,

"ROBERT B. PATTERSON,
"Secretary, Citizens' Council.

"GREENWOOD, MISS."

I am sure no one is surprised that such a letter came out of Greenwood, Miss.; but, of course, there are many other communities south of the Mason-Dixon line in which that bigoted organization known as the White Citizens' Council reigns, along with its hooded copatriots, the Ku Klux Klan.

Mr. Patterson got his answer from this Oregon editor. Listen to a part of it:

No, Mr. Patterson. We would not welcome "several hundred Negro families from the South" here—not so long as they are shipped off like a bunch of diseased cattle just to get them out of your way.

You, Mr. Patterson, and your colleagues and your and their forebears, held Negroes as slaves until 100 years ago. Since then you have exploited them, refused them adequate education, refused them even a chance to improve themselves. You have prevented them from learning skills which would have made it possible for them to rise on the economic ladder.

You, Mr. Patterson, and your fellows, for generations have treated these fellow human beings like subhumans, subject to lynchings, beatings, intimidation, night-riding.

I digress from the editorial long enough to say that all one has to do is look at the photographic evidence in Life magazine and the newspapers of the country in recent days to see how right Mr. Allen is. What a shocking betrayal of the ideals of constitutional government—policemen in one community after another in the South, including Cambridge, Md., have been subjecting Negroes to a shameful disgrace, to the great loss of our prestige around the world.

These photographs are front page in the newspapers of the world, free and Communist.

As Senators know, for years I have stood up against police brutality within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. I have carried on the fight against the proposal to change the Mallory rule, although there are bills pending in the Congress to surrender to the police of the District of Columbia the great, precious constitutional protections of the Mallory rule. If we surrender it here, we shall have surrendered the principle nationwide.

If anyone had any doubt about any of the many speeches the senior Senator from Oregon has made on this floor over the years, calling upon the Senate always to be on guard against unchecked police power, he only has to look at the shocking pictures of cruelty and brutality practiced by various southern police departments in recent weeks against Negroes. Humane principles cry out against it.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in continuity.

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

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune, Mar. 16, 1963]

A REPLY TO A LETTER

We received the following letter the other day:

"To the EDITOR:

"A correspondent of ours in Oregon tells us that you have shown an interest in the South's racial problems on your editorial page.

"We southerners are delighted to see that other parts of the Nation are becoming interested in the race problem and welcome the sincere desire to help.

"Would you on behalf of your subscribers welcome into your community several hundred Negro families from the South? If you will write such a welcome in the form of an editorial we will give it wide publicity throughout the South and will help raise the necessary transportation cost for these Negro migrants.

"Perhaps you would print this letter in your letters-to-the-editor column.

"We believe that the most nearly Christian solution to the race problem is migration and dispersion throughout our Nation. I am mailing you under separate cover statistics on this subject which may interest you.

"Sincerely,

"ROBERT B. PATTERSON,
"Secretary, Citizens' Council.

"GREENWOOD, MISS."

No, Mr. Patterson. We would not welcome "several hundred Negro families from the South" here—not so long as they are shipped off like a bunch of diseased cattle just to get them out of your way.

You, Mr. Patterson, and your colleagues and your and their forebears, held Negroes as slaves until 100 years ago. Since then you have exploited them, refused them adequate education, refused them even a chance to improve themselves. You have prevented them from learning skills which would have made it possible for them to rise on the economic ladder.

You, Mr. Patterson, and your fellows, for generations have treated these fellow human beings like subhumans, subject to lynchings, beatings, intimidation, nightriding.

You and your ilk, Mr. Patterson, under the guise of States right, have made and kept an entire group of people second-class citizens—when, indeed, you permitted them any of the dignities and privileges of citizenship at all.

You and your ilk, by collusion, subterfuge, and even more overt methods—including, most recently, dogs, hoses and bombs—have prevented them from voting, from serving on juries, from attending your schools, even from using common lunch counters or restrooms.

You say they are ignorant, irresponsible, lazy, unclean, diseased. In many cases this is true. And you are to blame; you and your determination to maintain your privileged status by holding others down, by depriving them of the dignity and opportunity to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness to which each American—regardless of color—is entitled.

No, Mr. Patterson, we would not accept your offer, because it is a brutalizing, evil, hypocritical offer; nearly as evil and brutalizing and hypocritical as the slave trade itself.

We do know that, inevitably in times to come, Americans whose skins are black will come here to live and seek livelihood. And we know that it will bring problems—difficult and serious problems, just as it has in Detroit and Chicago and Los Angeles and San Francisco, and Portland, and in other smaller communities.

We will not welcome these problems, because we have so far been without them, and no one likes to borrow trouble.

Still, when the time comes, we are convinced that men of good will—and they are legion—will do their utmost to see that the problems are settled with fairness, justice and honor.

One-sixth of the nation's population has dark skin. And these people, as never before in history, are demanding the right to be treated simply as Americans, and not as inferiors, as people set aside from the stream of life.

They are demanding the right to make their own choices, and not to be shoved around, or to be shipped off like a group of slaves just to satisfy the malevolence of racist citizens' councils.

We must, if we are to live up to the ideals which made America great, learn to live side-by-side with each other, and to deny equal opportunities to none.

This will not be easy for anyone—white or Negro. There are agonizing times ahead. But the challenge is one of the greatest Americans have ever faced.

They can meet it if—and only if—they can bring themselves to do unto others, all others, as they would have others do unto them.

E.A.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am proud that there is an editor in my State with the courage, foresight, and enlightenment of Mr. Allen, who called a spade as it should be called in his reply to the racist, Mr. Patterson, who wrote this letter thinking that the non sequitur of the letter would leave Mr. Allen and others without reply.

SPEECH BY JOHN M. THORNTON TO BENNING RIDGE CIVIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, turning to another matter, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point—and it is a particularly fitting speech in view of the remarks I have just made on the civil rights issue—a speech delivered by John M. Thornton, chairman of the National Capital Voters Association, to the Benning Ridge Civic Association.

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

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, tonight, I wish to announce to you the recent birth of an organization whose broad and meaningful program is destined to become a rallying cause for the leaderless people of the District of Columbia. It was conceived of by a group of enlightened residents here who envision a glorious future soon to unfold for the disfranchised citizens of this the capital of the Western World—citizens who are convinced that even while we await that opportunity there is much we can do to prepare ourselves for a meaningful use of the ballot—that we could act now to combat the forces which have made our community a breeding ground for crime and delinquency, that we must act immediately to stem the tide of rising illiteracy and dropout through insisting upon quality education for the public's children.

Perhaps you have already heard or read something of the National Capital Voters Association, Inc., which last August received from the recorder of deeds its official charter for operation in the District of Columbia. In compliance with the purpose and objectives as stated our charter sets forth the following and I quote:

"The purpose of this organization shall be to organize and guide the citizenry of the District of Columbia in an effort to persuade it to exercise its franchise in a manner that will be more advantageous to the community.

"To educate and stimulate interest and to disseminate information in relation to political candidates, measures, or vital questions and to strive for the goal of 'Every Citizen—A Voter.'"

The principles and ideals set forth in this charter are based upon the premise that an enlightened citizenry can secure good government and guarantee personal security through full participation of all in the political and social life of the city such as self-government and free access to the ballot offers. This concept goes further * * * it is based on a conviction that the right to the franchise bestows collective pride upon a community, inspires common concern, and protects the individual dignity of its people. From this sense of concern for the community's welfare there will ultimately derive a more wholesome society with improved patterns of behavior and a feeling of well-being which can only come from a sense of participation. What is happening to the Negro now under the present arrangement is that he feels outside looking in just as has traditionally been his lot—with his leaders selected and imposed upon him.

Since 1874, residents of the District of Columbia in the Nation's Capital have been completely disfranchised without the fundamental right to the ballot for almost a century in this Capital of the free world—this city the citadel of the freedom and democracy which we seek so hard to export. Is it any wonder then that the population in Washington does not assume the seriousness and responsibilities of first-class citizenship or that the masses of us are so lacking in political sophistication and the community spirit?

Citizens of the District granted the right to vote in their respective Democratic and Republican party primaries, only for President and Vice President 8 years ago will in addition for the first time in their lives be permitted to vote in the general election for the President and Vice President next year. To qualify as intelligent voters and thus, to make their individual and collective votes count, each and every voter must have summary knowledge of issues affecting their lives politically, socially, economically, and will need training in the procedures and political tactics to get the most out of the vote cast. Voters must be provided with certain basic facts in order to fully weight these issues and to question their impact upon their individual lives and the general well-being of the entire community. A candidate's past record must be reviewed in this light and a study of his proposed platform thoroughly studied in order to estimate what can be expected from the selection of their choice.

The national average of eligible voters actually going to the polls on election day throughout the United States is only about 60 percent. Some States which have been voting since 1789 have not at times been able to do this well. This sad story is compounded by the fact that it is well known that the percentage of Negro voters is much lower than 60 percent. This is the tragic story of one of democracy's failures. To muster even a 60 percent voting average in the District of Columbia instruction of citizens will be of prime necessity among its Negro majority and that we who have undertaken this job face a Herculean task.

Recognizing the enormity of this job—of what will be necessary to overcome the political lethargy of the majority population, the Capital Voters Association has set for itself the task of preparing ourselves and others for the most effective use of the ballot while mobilizing our people for an assault upon the forces of immediate destruction of our youth and the undermining of our common lives. There is much that the majority Negro population can do now to raise the quality of public education, to stem the rising tide of dropouts and to stabilize our community against the routing procedures of the housing agents and blockbusters adopted in the last few years. Do not forget that we constitute 54 percent of this city's population and our children count more than 84 percent of the total in the public schools of the District.

Our organization has a program conceived and dedicated to the welfare of the vast majority and is determined to reach citizens in every section of the District of Columbia—at the grassroots level where we think political action and citizen responsibility must begin—down under among the multitude too long forgotten and persistently "spoken for."

This is where we propose to direct our attention. While our program is still largely in the formative stage, we can announce a successful workshop on leadership which though small drew the attention of the delegates to the immensity of the issues vitally affecting the majority population. Together with instructors to be trained and prepared at a coming seminar to be held at Howard University, March 30, we plan to reach every corner of this city. We have already acquired a listing of some 50 churches, community centers, halls, etc., where these local meetings will be held. We intend to expand this listing until we have reached and scheduled meetings throughout this city. With the cooperation of various fraternal, religious, labor and civic leaders of every educational, social, and economic level we anticipate distributing thousands of pieces of literature

explaining the purpose and objectives of our organization and concentrating on mobilizing the majority populace in the city's broadest and most unique program of arousing the people to their citizenship responsibility. We trust the communication media, the newspapers and radio of the District will assist us in keeping you further informed of our program and work. A major cost will of course be the printing and distribution of materials with other services donated by genuinely concerned volunteer workers.

Therefore, we call upon you singularly and collectively, organizations and institutions to join us in this great effort to:

1. Educate the local residents on responsibility and requirements of good citizenship.
2. Stimulate interest in community, civic, and political affairs such as improvement in the quality of education in our public schools and the prevention of dropouts and delinquency.
3. Encourage a thirst for political know-how and a determination to improve the city and the lot of all its people.
4. Cultivate interest in political issues, the records of political figures whether nominated, appointed, or elected.
5. Guide citizens in an effort to persuade them to use the ballot in a manner that will most benefit the community as a whole.
6. Help provide and support the political and social machinery necessary for developing native leadership through the ranks that may be trusted to genuinely represent the cause of the majority.

Our aim is to make every citizen a good citizen, a responsible citizen, and a voting citizen into one who understands, respects, and defends the sacred right and the power of the ballot.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF 65TH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION—RECONSIDERATION OF ACTION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the action taken on Order No. 226, Senate Resolution 159, authorizing the printing of the 65th Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document, be set aside, and that Senate Resolution 159 be restored to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION OF INDEBTEDNESS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate resume the consideration of S. 412, Calendar No. 174.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 412) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill before the Senate is open to amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there has been a request that the absence of a quorum be suggested at this time. Another Senator made the request that the absence of a quorum be suggested, and I do so.

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 the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an identical bill (H.R. 242) has been passed by the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the further consideration of H.R. 242, and that the Senate now proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 242) to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the bill would authorize the Veterans' Administration to waive certain indebtedness owed the United States by the veterans or their spouses on account of defaults on guaranteed or direct loans. The new authority permits waiver under certain circumstances in which waiver is now denied. Specifically, waiver would be permitted where there is a determination that the default arose out of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran or that the collection of the indebtedness would otherwise work a severe hardship upon the veteran.

Although existing law provides some authority for waiver, the Veterans' Administration believes that administrative action granting total forgiveness of indebtedness on the basis of hardship would be very questionable in the absence of specific authorization. Consequently, the Veterans' Administration has officially requested the enactment of the proposed legislation to clarify the law and to effect more equitable settlements in hardship cases.

The new authority applies to hardship cases only. It would not authorize the Veterans' Administration to grant complete waiver where the veteran's financial situation is such that he could arrange to pay all or a substantial portion of the indebtedness without severe hardship on himself or his family.

The Veterans' Administration believes that the resulting financial loss to the Government would be small and that any increase in administrative cost would not be significant.

The minority views on this subject point out that other Federal Government programs do not have the waiver provisions in some similar cases of default. I must remind the Senate that the original purpose of the legislation for veterans' housing was a special program intended to help the veteran obtain decent housing for himself and his family. The percentage of default has been amazingly low. Mr. Gleason stated that it was 0.02 percent over the life of the various programs—one-fifth of 1 percent.

Therefore, we should not try to compare this program with those of the Farmers Home Administration or the Federal Housing Administration. This is a special veterans' program and, I might add, one of the most successful housing programs Congress has enacted.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, not later than December 31 of each year, a written report concerning each case in which a waiver of indebtedness has been made under the authority of the amendment made by the first section of this Act. Such report shall include, together with such other information as the Administrator deems appropriate, the name and address of each person with respect to which a waiver of indebtedness has been made and the total amount of such waiver.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this amendment would require the Administrator to submit an annual report to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives showing each case in which he has exercised the authority granted by this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator from Texas whether the amendment relates to the concern expressed in the majority policy committee with respect to the bill when it was cleared for Senate action.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The majority policy committee read the minority views that were expressed in the report, and this amendment was requested by the majority policy committee. The amendment provides for an annual report so that both the House and the Senate may review such actions as might be taken under the bill.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the amendment provides that the Veterans' Administration shall report to the House and the Senate each year all the cases in which the Veterans' Administration has taken action under the special discretionary power.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator is quite correct. Each body would be enabled to see how the power was exercised.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the report be made to committees or to the Houses of Congress?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The report would be made to the committees of the House and Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Which committees?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Of course, the reports would be available to all Senators; they would not be the private documents of the committees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, whenever such discretion is exercised, the Administrator must give the cases his consideration and make certain that, in his opinion, they are true hardship cases, and that information will be reported to the Senate and House, together with the amounts of money involved.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator is quite correct. The amendment relates to each case in which the authority is exercised—not only the totality, but each case, so that each House of Congress will have before it annually the information as to how the power has been exercised.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the report dated February 15, 1963, from J. S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to Hon. LISTER HILL, chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on the bill S. 412; and the Administrator's supplemental report dated April 8, 1963, to Chairman LISTER HILL, pointing out that H.R. 242, which is now before the Senate, and S. 412 are identical in terms.

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

FEBRUARY 15, 1963.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following comments are furnished in response to your request for a report on S. 412, 88th Congress.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for waiver of recovery from veterans of indebtedness to the United States resulting from the payment of loan guaranty claims or from default on direct loans, under circumstances in which waiver is now denied. Specifically, the bill would provide that where there has been a default and loss of the property the Administrator may waive recovery if he determines "that the default arose out of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran or that collection of the indebtedness would otherwise work a severe hardship upon the veteran."

The law now provides (38 U.S.C. 1820) that the Administrator may "pay, compromise, waive or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right of redemption" with respect to matters arising under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, which deals with the loan guaranty and direct loan programs of the Veterans' Administration. For many years this general authority with respect to waiver has been implemented by regulations which establish standards authorizing waiver (1) when the veteran was not at fault in the creation of the indebtedness and (2) where recovery would defeat the purpose of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience.

These regulatory standards are like those payments or overpayments of benefits under our programs as specifically set forth in provisions of the code dealing with benefits generally (38 U.S.C. 3102). However, it has not been considered that general waiver of debts due the United States by reason of default on guaranteed or direct loans should be granted out of compassion or because of such factors as existing hardship and present or near future inability to pay an indebtedness.

This has not prevented appropriate compromises which, in some instances, involve a relatively small payment on the outstanding indebtedness. Moreover, these standards permit waiver of the right to offset the amount of the inedebtedness against benefits otherwise payable to the veteran where it is found he was without fault and that the circumstances show that the offset would work such a hardship on him as to defeat the purpose for which such benefits are payable.

We recognize that the authority of the Administrator to waive or release claims in connection with the loan assistance programs is cast in broad terms. However, we have felt that without a specific legislative indication that total forgiveness of the indebtedness could be granted on the basis of financial hardship, it would be very questionable whether it would be proper to interpret and apply the waiver authority to that extent.

In this area we are dealing with an indebtedness incurred by the veteran as a result of his original voluntary act of negotiating a loan guaranteed or made by the Government and the obligation he concurrently assumed to pay the Government in the event it was required to fulfill its obligation on the guaranty. The matter has been considered as materially different from overpayment of gratuitous benefits, such as compensation and pensions, which involves a mistake on the part of the Government. In the latter circumstances, a full waiver of recovery is sometimes granted pursuant to statutory authority.

In the light of experience, we believe that the law respecting waiver of loan indebtedness should be clarified to provide in specific terms for general waiver under conditions provided in the proposed legislation. The enactment of the bill would not, however, permit general waiver of the indebtedness where such action would be contrary to the purpose of the loan program. It is not intended, therefore, to be used for granting complete waiver of the veteran's liability where his financial situation is such that he can arrange to pay all or a substantial part of the indebtedness without severe hardship on himself or family.

Liberalization of the waiver authority as contemplated in the proposed legislation would involve some reduction in the amounts which are now recovered from veterans. However, it is believed that the resulting financial loss to the Government would be small and that any increase in administrative costs would not be significant.

For the foregoing reasons, we recommend favorable action by your committee on S. 412.

We were advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there was no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to presentation of a similar report to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on H.R. 242, a bill which is identical in substance with S. 412.

Sincerely,

J. S. GLEASON, Jr.,
Administrator.

APRIL 8, 1963.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committe on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This refers to your request for a report by the Veterans' Administration on H.R. 242, 88th Congress, which was passed by the House of Representatives on March 18, 1963.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration.

The bill is identical, in substance, with S. 412, 88th Congress, on which we submitted a favorable report to your committee on February 15, 1963, a copy of which is enclosed. The Administrator's views expressed in that report are equally applicable to H.R. 242.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. FABLE, Jr.,
Acting General Counsel.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators who signed the minority views, I ask unanimous consent to have the minority views on S. 412 printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the minority views (Report No. 189) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS OF SENATORS GOLDWATER, PROUTY, TOWER, AND JORDAN (IDAHO)

We are opposed to the enactment of this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to provide that where there has been a default and loss of property by a veteran the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may waive recovery if he determines that the default arose out of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran or that collection of the indebtedness would otherwise work a severe hardship upon the veteran.

The Administrator now has the authority by law (title 38, ch. 37, United States Code) to pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right of redemption with respect to the loan guaranty and direct loan programs of the Veterans' Administration. According to the testimony of the Veterans' Administration at the hearings, the authority to waive has not been exercised where default arose out of a hardship or present or near future inability to pay an indebtedness. However, the waiver authority has been used in cases where the default arose not because of fault on the part of the veteran but of fault on the part of the Federal Government.

In the majority of hardship cases, compromise settlements have been reached between the Veterans' Administration and the veteran, involving a relatively small payment on the outstanding indebtedness. Several cases were cited during the hearings by officials of the Veterans' Administration in response to a request for an illustration of the term "compelling reasons" which would be considered for waiver under the proposed bill. One involved a blind veteran against whom an indebtedness had been established without any fault on his part; another concerned a veteran whose home was washed away by a flood. A compromise was reached with the blind veteran whereas the record indicates no compromise was reached in the case of the veteran who suffered the loss of his home by flood. Thus, in the only cases cited by the Veterans' Administration to support their request for additional waiver authority, one

was settled by a satisfactory compromise payment and, while a compromise was not reached in the other, we are unable to understand why, inasmuch as the two cases appear to be indistinguishable as to indebtedness, both veterans being clearly without fault. For example, in a case where a flood caused a change in a river channel which destroyed some 20 acres of the most productive part of the borrower's farm, the Farmers Home Administration reduced the claim on the basic earning capacity of the remaining part of the farm.

It should be noted that two other agencies of the Federal Government, which operate loan guarantee and direct loan programs, Farmers Home Administration and Federal Housing Administration, may compromise, adjust, or reduce claims but neither have the authority to waive or forgive an indebtedness.

We believe that the present authority is sufficient for the Administrator to effect satisfactory settlement and therefore the additional authority proposed by this legislation in the light of the hearing record is not advisable.

BARRY GOLDWATER.
WINSTON PROUTY.
JOHN G. TOWER.
LEN B. JORDAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 242) was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill, S. 412, will be indefinitely postponed.

DEFINITION OF THE TERM "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES"

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 175, S. 625, and that it be made the pending order of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 625) to amend sections of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration Facilities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. 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 the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SAUDI ARABIA ACCEPTS AMERICANS OF JEWISH FAITH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of this body shares my satisfaction that one instance of gross discrimination against American personnel overseas has been ended. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post of June 12, entitled "One Ignominy Less," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I request the same privilege for an article from the New York Times of June 10.

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

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the "ignominy" referred to in both items was the refusal of the Royal Government of Saudi Arabia to permit American citizens of Jewish faith to serve in our military installations and other government missions on Saudi territory. Throughout much of the postwar period the United States enjoyed important base rights in Saudi Arabia, notably at the SAC base near Dharan. Americans of Jewish faith, however, could not be stationed there.

I could never understand why a single airbase was worth the price of agreeing, even under protest, to make arbitrary distinctions among the American personnel whom we assigned there. The record reveals that I protested such official recognition and maintenance of discrimination; and I submitted amendments, which were adopted by the Senate, protesting such discrimination and asking that it be ended, even at the expense of the withdrawal of our forces from that base. Obviously the Saudi Arabian Government felt strongly about the question. Clearly, Saudi Arabia was bitterly hostile toward Israel. But our laws, Mr. President, made no valid distintion among Americans, whatever their race, religion, or national origin; and our laws should not make any such discrimination. The people being discriminated against were Americans, not Israelis. The policies of the Saudi Arabian Government were wrong. In fact, I think they were invidious and reactionary. I am ashamed that we knuckled under to them so long. Indeed, as I have said, I did everything in my power, as did several of our distinguished colleagues, to end the discriminatory practices. Senator Lehman, of New York, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators led the fight against such practices.

In 1956, for example, the Senate declared that any attempt by a foreign power to discriminate among Americans on religious grounds was "inconsistent with our principles." Two more recent statements by the Congress acquired the force of law. Section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 states:

> The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to support the principles of increased economic cooperation and trade among countries, freedom of the press, information and religion, freedom of navigation in international waterways, and recognition of the right of all private persons to travel and pursue their lawful activities without discrimination as to race or religion.

Even more relevant to the Saudi Arabian case was section 108 of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1962, which states:

> It is the sense of Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is repugnant to our principles; and in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this title these principles shall be applied as the President may determine.

I am proud to have had something to do, together with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], in putting the Congress on record in favor of equal treatment for all Americans overseas. In fact, I believe in equal treatment for all Americans, wherever they may be.

In the case of Saudi Arabia, this particular section has evidently been implemented at long last. I am gratified that the Royal Government of Saudi Arabia has seen fit to permit the stationing of American citizens, regardless of their religion, on its territory. Without drawing farfetched conclusions as to the motives for this concession, let me second the concluding words of the Post editorial:

> All Americans will be glad that Saudi Arabia has taken a step closer to modern times and that the United States no longer feels it necessary to practice discrimination on its own citizens in order to appease a foreign ruler.

The editorial puts it very well; the fault was clearly on both sides: on the Saudi side, for trying to impose warped national prejudices on a sovereign foreign power; and on the United States, for putting up with this indignity for reasons of expediency.

Laws may not be able to change the hearts of men, but circumstances can change the actions of men. We are seeing the truth of this axiom in the United States. The vast majority of Americans agree with President Kennedy that our dedication to freedom rings hollow so long as millions of American Negroes are denied the substance of freedom. This is more than a question of domestic politics; it is a principle which should guide the conduct of Americans abroad, as well as at home. In every segment of our national and international life it is incumbent upon us to behave like the free men we are. If we are intolerant of anything, it should be of intolerance itself. I trust, therefore, that the ignominy of our previous relations with Saudi Arabia will never be repeated anywhere in the world.

Mr. President, the dropping of this restriction is one bit of good news which certainly merits reporting and consideration.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 12, 1963]

ONE IGNOMINY LESS

Sometimes, in the pursuit of national interest, a country must swallow its pride and its principles. This is what the United States did when it acceded to a Saudi Arabian demand that no Jewish personnel be permitted among the American missions in King Saud's country. The airbase at Dhahran was adjudged as a major strategic asset and thus the United States reluctantly went along with the Saudi Arabian attempt to impose national prejudice arbitrarily on American citizens.

But possibly as a byproduct of Saudi Arabia's concern with Washington's attitude on the civil war in Yemen, the restriction has been quietly dropped. In a letter to Congressman CELLER, the Defense Department has noted that Americans of the Jewish faith are among the units stationed in Saudi Arabia. (The lease on the airbase expired last year, but there is still a training mission in the country.)

Saudi Arabia is to be commended for ending its distinction as the most fanatic of the Arab countries in applying religious tests to all who set foot on its soil. The acceptance of King Saud's Diktat on this matter was an ignominous surrender of principle by the United States that was rightly criticized no matter how persuasive the arguments of expediency may have seemed. All Americans will be glad that Saudi Arabia has taken a step closer to modern times and that the United States no longer feels it necessary to practice discrimination on its own citizens in order to appease a foreign ruler.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, June 10, 1963]

SAUDI ARABIA LETS JEWS IN U.S. UNITS SERVE ON HER SOIL

WASHINGTON, June 9.—U.S. servicemen of Jewish faith have been serving in Saudi Arabia for several weeks, despite strong objections in the past by the Saudi Government to their presence there.

A Defense Department spokesman said today that their presence had been approved by the Saudi Government.

This reversal of the long-standing Saudi policy that no persons of Jewish faith be among the U.S. troops assigned to Saudi Arabia was understood to have been a result of recent international developments and not of negotiations.

One such development might have been the U.S. attitude toward the recent involvement of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Republic in the civil war in Yemen.

The United States has supported United Nations efforts to get Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Republic to withdraw their forces from Yemen.

Washington has also recognized the republican government of Yemen. Saudi Arabia has backed the royalist forces in trying to regain control of the Government.

The U.S. lease agreement with Saudi Arabia for use of the Dhahran air base expired more than a year ago.

The lease agreement bound the United States not to send to Saudi Arabia any person objectionable to the Saudi Government. In practice that came to mean that no persons of Jewish faith were sent among troops or civilians involved in construction or operation of the air base.

This lease clause was the cause of repeated complaints by Jewish organizations protesting Washington's concurrence.

TROOPS WERE REDUCED

While the dropping by the United States of Dhahran as a base has caused a reduction of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia, there is still a training mission there and Air Force units occasionally take part in maneuvers with Saudi troops.

Details on numbers of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia were not available tonight.

In the Yemen civil war, Egyptian troops, supporting the republican regime, launched attacks on Saudi territory.

These were denounced by the United States, which warned President Gamal Abdel Nasser that his country was jeopardizing its relations with the United States.

Subsequently, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Republic agreed to end their support of the opposing Yemen factions. However, this agreement does not yet appear to be fully effective.

The first word that persons of Jewish faith were among U.S. units in Saudi Arabia came from Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of Brooklyn.

Mr. CELLER said in a radio interview in New York last night that the new policy had been disclosed in a letter from Roswell L. Gilpatric, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

LONGSTANDING BAN EASED

The refusal of Saudi Arabia to admit Jewish visitors put the U.S. Government in an anomalous position for many years.

Not only servicemen but American diplomats, Congressmen, businessmen, and tourists have been affected. Washington was involved because of the importance it accorded Saudi Arabia in two areas: the cold war and oil.

Saudi Arabia accounts for about a fourth of the oil production of the Middle East. The concession is held by the Arabian American Oil Co., which is owned jointly by the Standard Oil Co. of California, Standard Oil of New Jersey, Texaco, and Socony Mobil.

As early as 1950, the State Department defended the refusal of Aramco to employ Jews as a matter of national interest. It did this in a statement to the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, which thereupon upheld the employment questionnaires used at Aramco's New York headquarters.

This ruling was challenged by the American Jewish Congress. After a long battle, the State agency, now called the Commission on Human Rights, reversed itself last fall, and ordered Aramco to stop asking job applicants about their religion.

The company said it would appeal to the courts, but a settlement was reached in which the company promised to withdraw the protested questions.

Nobody available last night could say whether the company had sent any Jewish employees to Saudi Arabia.

AN IMPORTANT BASE

The Dhahran airfield was established in World War II. Later it became an important civilian transport base, serving Trans World Airlines among others.

Early in 1956, during negotiations for a renewal of the agreement for use of the base, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles confirmed to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that American Jews were not sent to military or diplomatic posts in Saudi Arabia.

"We don't like to acquiesce," he said, "but we have to recognize that Saudi Arabia is an ally."

In response, on July 26, the Senate adopted a resolution declaring that any attempt by a foreign country to discriminate among Americans on religious grounds was "inconsistent with our principles."

This appeared to have no effect. In January 1957, on the eve of the arrival of King Ibn Saud on a state visit, Mayor Wagner announced that there would be no official welcome for him.

Secretary Dulles commented that the snub had only stiffened the monarch's position when the question of the ban on Jews was discussed with him in Washington.

TWO MESSAGES OF HOPE AND CHALLENGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the first 15 days of June have been the occasion for an uncommonly high level of oratory. On June 1, my good friend, Lady Jackson, or Barbara Ward, as she is best known in this country, delivered a truly remarkable address in Williamsburg, Va., in commemoration of the 50 days in 1776 when the Virginia Declaration of Rights was framed.

Mr. President, as I recall, the able and distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] placed in the RECORD the full text of that address, and made appropriate comments in regard to it. Subsequently, the President of the United States has made three major pronouncements on the challenges our Nation must confront.

We are indeed fortunate to have as President of the United States one who so well understands and can so well express the aspirations and ideals of the American people. In his remarks on education and on civil rights, and, above all, in his commencement day address at American University, where his subject was our foreign policy and peace in this thermonuclear age, he rose to the highest traditions of his office. He has made every American proud of him. All of us should be grateful to the President for doing this, because he speaks with eloquent and moving persuasion in voicing the conscience of the Nation.

Mr. President, it is a curious irony of our history that many of the eloquent statements of American ideals have been made by foreign observers of this Nation. No one has surpassed de Tocqueville's description of the excitingly unique and radical character of American democracy. Earlier there were the declamations of Lafayette; later, the inspired passages of Lord Bryce.

Miss Ward, too, shows a sympathetic understanding of American ideals that any American might envy. The framers of the Virginia Declaration assume their full stature in the words of this gifted Englishwoman. Looking back to a period when our now mighty Nation was "13 separate colonies, not yet certain whether neighbors would be ready to share sovereignty, even less certain whether the power of Britain could be successfully withstood," when "to seawards lay uncertainty and hostility; inland, a vast unknown where French pretensions and Indian enmity had still to be reckoned with," she recalls the "magnificence of their audacity" in speaking "not as beleaguered citizens, but as heirs and perpetuators of human freedom itself." This was a period in which the inhabitants of so wild and remote a land might have been expected to be obsessed by parochial concerns and all too tangible fears. Under these circumstances, their affirmation of human rights and liberties was an event

that, as Miss Ward rightly says, "should still leave us speechless with surprise."

Miss Ward is too much of a humanitarian and too much of an activist to allow us to indulge for long in flattering memories of the past. She perceives that the true significance of the declaration of rights lies in the universal terms in which it is formulated. At the very moment when Edmund Burke, the great English philosopher and statesman, was speaking of the "rights of Englishmen," these Virginia burghers were asserting that "all men are equally free and independent," "all have certain inherent rights."

This was a commitment to which, as Miss Ward observes, we have not always been true. Though we have overcome the barriers to transportation and communication that made the universalism of this declaration seem visionary, we have not always shown equal concern about the rights of other men. Though we have created wealth and power beyond the wildest speculations of those early settlers, we have appeared hesitant about investing in the future welfare and liberty of the less developed nations.

Paradoxically, Mr. President, we have both overestimated and underestimated the difficulties of aiding other countries in their quest for development. Despite showings to the contrary in public opinion polls, many politicians believe that American taxpayers have found the burden of foreign aid too heavy to sustain. At the same time, there are frequent expressions of disappointment at the length of time it has taken our relatively small investment abroad to show results.

Mr. President, I find myself in disagreement with some of my colleagues about foreign aid. I happen to believe that it is a wise investment for the future of our Nation and the future of the world. I find that most Americans agree with me. The most recent public opinion poll, and I believe I inserted the text of that poll in the RECORD several days ago, shows that in the period of the last 5 years approximately 58 percent of all Americans polled support actively foreign aid, 12 percent were uncertain, and some 30 percent were opposed. So if we were to take the 12 percent that were uncertain and divide it proportionately, we would find that approximately 65 percent of the American public supports foreign aid.

I have been a practical politician, I trust. I find that if we can gain the support of 65 percent of the public on any issue, we have a most amazing record. If we can get 50 percent plus one, we are doing well.

In our State, after some months of recount of the 1,300,000 votes cast, we found that a majority of only 91 votes was enough to elect a Governor for 4 years. So the significance of the public opinion poll which has been cited here should not be underestimated.

I do not believe that foreign aid has been a failure. I do not believe it has been maladministered. However, I believe that there have been times when our investments in foreign aid have not produced the results we would like.

I believe that is true of practically every investment one could make. Slightly more than a year ago investments in the stock market took a tumble. But that does not make me opposed to American stocks, nor make me think that the stock market is an evil institution. Investments require a degree of risk.

But critics of foreign aid apparently feel that when we put money into an oversea program, it should automatically yield political and economic dividends.

I know of no investor of the United States who really feels that when he invests his money, there is an absolute guarantee of a profit, a dividend, or a reward on the investment. The American investor is willing to take a risk. But the risk is a contemplated and calculated one. He feels that the risk of loss is less than the risk of gain. We must have somewhat the same attitude in terms of foreign aid. We must be willing to venture. We must be willing to try. We must be willing to run the risk of defeat and loss as well as to search for the exhilaration and the glory of victory and gain.

So today, as in other days, I find myself in opposition, or at least with a different point of view than some of the more outspoken critics of our foreign aid program.

The program deals with people in many lands and affects lives of people that have different cultures and traditions. It ought to be clearly understood that this kind of program has some limitations. It is extremely difficult to administer, particularly because the administration must take place a long way away from home base.

So let us be a bit tolerant and understanding of the program, and at the same time keep a watchful eye on it.

The greatest difficulties of foreign aid today are the limitations that have been built into it by the Congress. It is literally impossible to administer the program in a businesslike manner, particularly when the Administrator is shackled and tied down so that he has very little room for movement.

We in the Congress have our responsibility. I have advised and counseled the Administrator of foreign aid to speak forthrightly to Congress. If we desire to hold the Administrator accountable for foreign aid administration, he should administer it.

I should like to see Mr. Bell, the new Administrator of AID, demonstrate the courage which I think he has by frankly telling the Congress that he would like at least a year or two to administer the program without being tied down, and without being limited in his discretionary and administrative powers. If he will tell the Congress that and ask for that kind of program, he will be in a much better position to be able to respond to his critics a year from now.

We make it very difficult for any administrator. I believe that the time is at hand for administrators to say so. I think they should say:

"Give me the opportunity to administer the program, and if I cannot do a good job, recommended that I be dismissed. But if you want to administer it and have me only as titular head or as the front man, I want you to know that I am not going to take the responsibility for all the problems. You are going to share in them, too."

As I see it, the foreign aid program has built into it many provisions which limit the administrative capacity of any good administrator. If that is the nature of Government, I ask that it be minimized. I ask that we be somewhat understanding of those who are responsible for the program.

Barbara Ward called to our attention, for example, the problems that we face in foreign aid administration. That is why I have commented upon them. She also called to our attention another area in which we are now seeking to make some progress. I refer to arms control and disarmament, because today we extended the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as we well should. Here again there are many criticisms of the Director and of the Administrator. I desire to say only that that Director and Administrator has a fine record of public service. Mr. William Foster has served under three administrations, the Truman administration, the Eisenhower administration, and now the Kennedy administration. He has proved himself to be a faithful, loyal, dedicated, and competent public servant. I do not think anyone needs to worry about this distinguished American doing anything that would weaken the security of our Nation.

I believe the time is at hand for Members of Congress to recognize that there are other patriots besides those who are elected. There are patriots in the executive branch of the Government, just as there are here in the legislative branch. I see no reason to feel that we have a monopoly upon the desire to protect the security of our country. I cannot but believe that the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Administrator and Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, all of whom make disarmament policy, are equally concerned about the security of the United States. As compared to any Senator, I do not think they are more concerned, but I do not think they are less concerned. I do not believe for one minute that those men whom I have mentioned—the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the men who ultimately formulate our arms control and disarmament policy—would ever make a recommendation that would in any way threaten the security of our country. I challenge those who say to the contrary. That is why the Senator from Minnesota has taken an active interest in supporting the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It puts together that machinery that makes possible a better formulation of our policy relating to the critical and complex subjects of disarmament.

The quest for disarmament is another area in which, as President Kennedy points out, we have sometimes too easily yielded to discouragement. Admittedly, there are sound reasons for feeling pessimistic about the prospects for peace. We have been engaged in a thermonuclear arms race with the Soviet Union for a good many years now, and the race has only increased in intensity with time.

Too many of us have come to contemplate calmly the possibility of a war that would destroy the world.

As I said earlier today, there is no action which can be taken today without risk. The risks of the arms race need to be contemplated, as well as the risks of disarmament. I challenge those who say that the arms buildup is the sure way to peace to show me any evidence from history.

I said, with equal candor, that a sad tale of frustration and defeat has characterized the efforts of man to find a way to curb the arms race and to bring about any meaningful and effective kind of disarmament. Nevertheless, Mr. President, we must seek it. We must try to find a way to preserve the peace.

Against this corrosive fatalism—this sitting back and contemplating the possibility of a war which could destroy the world—we can and must set the President's courageous affirmation:

> No problem of human destiny is beyond the reach of human beings. Man's reason and spirit have often solved the seemingly unsolvable, and we believe they can do it again.

Until we shake off the lethargy of despair, until we become convinced that this manmade problem can be solved by man, and devote the best of our thought and energy to solving it, we shall make little progress toward a lasting peace. In calling on us to examine our attitude toward the possibility of attaining peace at home and abroad, President Kennedy has correctly identified a major element of the problem.

Neither the conditional suspension of nuclear testing in the atmosphere nor the agreement to revive negotiations for a comprehensive test-ban treaty is a substitute for disarmament. They are small though significant steps toward a vastly more important objective. What matters is that they are seen in this light. They express the hope that men of good will can break through the distrust and inertia that prevent both sides from dealing with the basic problem. They represent the concrete initiatives of a man whose vision of a world at peace transcends the fears and rivalries of our time.

In her Williamsburg address, Miss Ward exhorts Americans to regain the daring and perseverance, the firmness of conviction and universality of concern, that she finds in the men of 1776. It seems to me, Mr. President, that these are the preeminent qualities of President Kennedy's recent speech at American University; and, indeed, the other speeches to which I have referred.

The past 2 weeks have been a very bright and challenging period not only for Americans but also for the world. I believe the President of the United States has been serving at his best, giving this Nation the leadership he promised. He has been giving leadership in the field of education, knowing full well that a nation is no better than an enlightened people. He has called for equal opportunity for every citizen of this country, so that all may share the benfits of education.

The President has spoken out on the whole issue of human rights, of civil rights, placing this in proper context and proper perspective, as a moral issue and not merely a political issue.

I submit that no American true to his faith, religious or political, can rest easily or can be comfortable so long as he knows there is discrimination and social injustice in a part of the pattern of American life. Thank goodness it is not the pattern. It is only a part of the pattern. It is a spot upon our countenance, and it needs to be cleansed, and it will be.

I predict that this year of 1963 will be a year known in the annals of history, in the days to come, every bit as memorable and great as the year 1863.

In January 1863 there was the Emancipation Proclamation, a promise.

In the summer of 1963 the Emancipation Proclamation will be realized and fulfilled. It is 100 years later, but the time has arrived.

Members of Congress serving in the 88th Congress can be proud of the fact that by an accident of history they are serving at a time every bit as memorable and as great as the time when Abraham Lincoln served in January 1863, when the great Emancipator gave to the world the Emancipation Proclamation.

This is an exciting period in which to live. Of course, it is challenging and demanding. At times it is very worrisome. But only periods such as this can qualify for the words "exciting" and "challenging."

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 15, in conjunction with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I submitted S. Con. Res. 42, a concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on National Security Affairs.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate that the functions of the proposed committee are intended to be construed broadly; that when we refer to "all matters pertaining to national defense, foreign policy, and national security," we intend this to include the whole spectrum of policies and programs dealing with these subjects.

The Congress in 1947 established certain principles concerning our national defense which basically were designed to codify the lessons of World War II and project them into the future. It was far more than a mere Unification Act, for all recognized the need to correct the inadequacies of the plans and preparations that existed prior to and early in World War II for the mobilization of our economy and resources to meet wartime requirements. Foreign policy considerations and the military structure to support such policies had long been recognized as a part of the national security problem, but too little attention had been paid to plans that would assure our mobilization base and our economy being prepared to support efforts to meet these two basic problems.

It was these experiences and the growing complexity of modern war that led to the plan for corrective legislation exemplified in the National Security Act of 1947. The Congress in that act established a National Security Council to provide the President with a mechanism to constantly study the broad security problems facing the Nation. It also established an agency called the National Security Resources Board, which was to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. The responsibilities of this Board have passed through several successor agencies until now they are vested in the Executive Office of the President, where they are assigned to the Office of Emergency Planning. The head of the National Security Resources Board was a statutory member of the National Security Council and his successors have continued to serve in this capacity.

Many studies of national security problems have tended to overlook the fact that without plans for a sound mobilization base and without a mechanism to provide the President a sound and realistic basis upon which to evaluate the objectives, commitments, and risks that must be considered in connection with our domestic, military, and foreign policies, our entire national security planning might fail. Therefore, in the functioning of the Joint Committee which our concurrent resolution is designed to bring into being, I wish to assure all the Members of the Senate that these important nonmilitary security problems will be a continuing part of the congressional evaluation of our national security matters.

DEFINITION OF THE TERM "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES"

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 625) to amend sections of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration Facilities."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that the unfinished business is Calendar No. 175, S. 625; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, unless there is other Senate business, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, June 19, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 17, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

W. Michael Blumenthal, of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Eugene G. Fubini, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice John H. Rubel, resigned.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Christopher L. Gholston, Jr., Laverne, Ala., in place of D. L. Capps, transferred.

Herbert Allen, Newton, Ala., in place of A. M. King, retired.

ALASKA

Margaret E. Watson, McKinley Park, Alaska, in place of N. I. King, resigned.

ARIZONA

Mary M. McCarrell, Chambers, Ariz., in place of Peter Balcomb, resigned.

William E. Wood, Douglas, Ariz., in place of C. O. Rice, deceased.

Edward I. Kacer, Palo Verde, Ariz., in place of J. J. Fuhrman, Jr., resigned.

Charles F. Adams, San Carlos, Ariz., in place of C. H. Higgins, resigned.

Ara O. Sparks, Whiteriver, Ariz., in place of D. S. LeBaron, deceased.

William R. Rowley, Yarnell, Ariz., in place of A. E. Loudermilk, retired.

ARKANSAS

Lewis E. Pruitt, Gurdon, Ark., in place of Claxton Steed, deceased.

Austin A. Stovall, Imboden, Ark., in place of J. D. Fortenberry, retired.

Franklin L. Brown, Marianna, Ark., in place of J. E. Hunt, deceased.

Donald E. Eddington, Tyronza, Ark., in place of L. W. Freeman, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Irene V. Hunter, Buttonwillow, Calif., in place of W. D. Tracy, retired.

Lena M. Butler, Byron, Calif., in place of M. B. Chaim, retired.

Evelyn E. Kuraisa, Camp Richardson, Calif., in place of L. M. Latta, retired.

Fae S. Freude, Frazier Park, Calif., in place of J. M. Rautenbush, deceased.

Betty J. Laskey, Johannesburg, Calif., in place of M. B. Hord, deceased.

Eugene T. White, Laguna Beach, Calif., in place of W. E. Parke, retired.

Ray A. Crettol, Lathrop, Calif., in place of E. F. Schobert, retired.

Loren A. Kibby, Mount Hermon, Calif., in place of A. E. Lacy, retired.

Murrel C. Jensen, Murrieta, Calif., in place of R. C. Tarwater, retired.

Kathryn S. Wilson, Pasadena, Calif., in place of R. R. Holmquist, transferred.

Marshall C. Kelley, Rialto, Calif., in place of W. P. Martin, resigned.

Eric Lundquist, Sanitarium, Calif., in place of J. H. Reavis, retired.

Mila M. Waltz, Santa Margarita, Calif., in place of M. L. Cogan, retired.

James R. Chapman, Winters, Calif., in place of E. V. Roseberry, retired.

COLORADO

Kermit R. Hurst, Palisade, Colo., in place of M. C. Huber, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Robert V. Laws, Canterbury, Conn., in place of W. F. Newton, retired.

DELAWARE

James C. Bowdle, Dover, Del., in place of H. K. Heite, retired.

FLORIDA

Herman E. Raulerson, Pierson, Fla., in place of N. S. Jackson, retired.

GEORGIA

James M. Herring, Barney, Ga., in place of M. B. Folsom, transferred.

Francis E. Allen, Cairo, Ga., in place of R. P. Wight, retired.

GUAM

Alejandro P. Cruz, Agana, Guam, in place of T. R. Santos, resigned.

IDAHO

William E. Farley, Kellogg, Idaho, in place of A. E. McKinley, retired.

Calvin J. Whittaker, Leadore, Idaho, in place of N. G. Andrews, retired.

ILLINOIS

Charles H. Parker, Ashmore, Ill., in place of L. H. Watson, transferred.

Joseph E. Powell, Chenoa, Ill., in place of C. G. Missal, retired.

Anne G. Barker, Frankfort Heights, Ill., in place of H. L. Russell, resigned.

Delmar R. Haun, Nashville, Ill., in place of W. H. Weihe, resigned.

Robert C. Johnson, Richton Park, Ill., in place of Veronica Scheidt, retired.

Lelan D. Graham, West York, Ill., in place of R. L. Ryerson, retired.

INDIANA

Gayle A. Smith, Boston, Ind., in place of S. E. Howard, retired.

David F. McGuire, Solsberry, Ind., in place of C. W. Hudson, resigned.

IOWA

William J. Walrod, Belmond, Iowa, in place of G. E. Jenison, transferred.

Harold L. Leazer, Corydon, Iowa, in place of B. H. Swegle, deceased.

Robert E. Lynott, Jr., Hawarden, Iowa, in place of G. R. Sawyer, retired.

Marjorie G. Rogers, Lucas, Iowa, in place of I. D. McCauley, retired.

W. Cecil Coleman, Mount Auburn, Iowa, in place of H. J. Greenwalt, retired.

Joseph J. Mazur, Rowley, Iowa, in place of W. H. Rehberg, deceased.

KANSAS

Donald C. Ratcliff, Belle Plaine, Kans., in place of W. L. Hartley, deceased.

Edgar L. Tressler, Colony, Kans., in place of A. I. Cox, retired.

John P. Lenahan, Eudora, Kans., in place of J. M. Grimes, retired.

Donald G. Sands, Holton, Kans., in place of R. H. Moore, deceased.

Larry K. Harris, Moscow, Kans., in place of J. E. Wright, transferred.

Ellen M. Mohney, Ozawkie, Kans., in place of Guy Baker, deceased.

Anna J. Mills, Russell, Kans., in place of R. K. Artas, retired.

LOUISIANA

Jacob E. Foil, Bogalusa, La., in place of D. W. Graves, retired.

Frank E. Walters, McDade, La., in place of N. V. Baker, retired.

MAINE

Gordon L. Stitham, Mars Hill, Maine, in place of L. V. Keenan, retired.

Allan G. Pinkham, Moody, Maine, in place of D. L. Moody, retired.

William D. Duhamel, Old Orchard Beach, Maine, in place of R. H. Morse, deceased.

MARYLAND

William F. McNutt, Fallston, Md., in place of R. C. McNutt, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Margaret C. Hahn, North Hadley, Mass., in place of R. F. Hahn, retired.

MICHIGAN

Everett E. Underwood, Brethren, Mich., in place of E. G. McNamara, retired.

August W. Delgoffe, Menominee, Mich., in place of C. S. Duby, deceased.

Barbara J. Tryban, Mullett Lake, Mich., in place of V. E. Roberts, deceased.

Clarke D. Gordon, Saline, Mich., in place of M. C. O'Neill, retired.

John P. Grynwich, Sawyer, Mich., in place of E. A. Westhauser, resigned.

Frederick W. Rawsthorne, Jr., Trenton, Mich., in place of P. E. Teifer, retired.

William Salerno, Yale, Mich., in place of R. H. Peacock, retired.

MINNESOTA

Richard M. Melbye, Hitterdal, Minn., in place of Clifford Hitterdal, retired.

Clarence J. Schaber, Rogers, Minn., in place of Otto J. Scharber, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Eupal G. Byram, Golden, Miss., in place of Lela Epps, retired.

Fred A. Jackson, Sturgis, Miss., in place of T. A. Hamill, retired.

Ann G. Wise, Washington, Miss., in place of Aileen Rawlings, retired.

MISSOURI

Dorothy A. McDaniel, Gray Summit, Mo., in place of V. R. Thornhill, retired.

Poly B. Sims, Koshkonong, Mo., in place of H. M. Swain, retired.

William C. Brandenburg, Wellsville, Mo., in place of R. G. Smith, deceased.

MONTANA

Herbert Oster, Melstone, Mont., in place of L. N. Field, retired.

NEBRASKA

John I. McKelvey, Falls City, Nebr., in place of A. E. Elam, retired.

Nellie L. Lockard, Stella, Nebr., in place of R. C. Briggs, transferred.

NEVADA

Vivian A. Crammer, Pahrump, Nev., in place of F. L. Turner, resigned.

NEW HAMPHIRE

Agnes P. Pascoe, West Ossipee, N.H., in place of W. H. Pascoe, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Mateas P. Serna, Magdalena, N. Mex., in place of Hezekiah Hall, retired.

NEW YORK

John J. Murray, Albany, N.Y., in place of H. A. Goetz, retired.

William J. Hopkins, Jamesville, N.Y., in place of F. D. McClenon, retired.

Wilfred F. Smith, Livingston Manor, N.Y., in place of E. K. Homer, retired.

William J. Barber, Nyack, N.Y., in place of H. E. Wadsworth, retired.

Sister Mary Dominic Scheg, Stella Niagara, N.Y., in place of Sister Mary Leontine, retired.

Thomas J. Byrne, Suffern, N.Y., in place of A. J. Kennedy, retired.

Helene R. Scharett, Union Hill, N.Y., in place of G. G. Batchelor, retired.

James E. Hawes, Valois, N.Y., in place of D. S. Sutphen, deceased.

Roy E Laine, Wading River, N.Y., in place of C. G. Kemp, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Evelyn W. Jarvis, Engelhard, N.C., in place of T. M. Matthews, retired.

Thomas F. Trivette, Lewisville, N.C., in place of M. M. Stimson, retired.

Oliver C. Tew, McLeansville, N.C., in place of R. D. Mullis, resigned.

William M. Young, Walkertown, N.C., in place of Eva Walker, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Clarence L. Olson, Kindred, N. Dak., in place of L. D. Larsen, deceased.

Fred H. Tufte, Northwood, N. Dak., in place of O. H. Halverson, retired.

Donald Smith, Souris, N. Dak., in place of F. V. Frykman, resigned.

OHIO

Charles W. Perry, Holland, Ohio, in place of R. H. Benton, resigned.

Charles E. Wellman, New Knoxville, Ohio, in place of E. H. Katterheinrich, retired.

Grover J. Neikirk, Republic, Ohio, in place of H. D. Anderson, transferred.

Janet M. Lesher, Spring Valley, Ohio, in place of A. M. Krug, retired.

Ralph H. Gibson, Wharton, Ohio, in place of H. W. Baker, Jr., transferred.

OKLAHOMA

Harold W. Thomason, Boynton, Okla., in place of L. K. Hawkins, transferred.

Alan N. Case, Marland, Okla., in place of J. B. Carson, retired.

Margaret B. Moody, Ratliff City, Okla. Office established January 1, 1953.

OREGON

Bettejane B. Cass, La Pine, Oreg., in place of M. G. Miltenberger, deceased.

Robert L. Snider, Roseburg, Oreg., in place of C. W. Carstens, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ward Johns, Adrian, Pa., in place of N. F. Skinner, retired.

Donald P. Fischer, Bethlehem, Pa., in place of J. W. Dawley, retired.

Wayne H. Winton, Centerville, Pa., in place of E. A. McBride, retired.

Adeline M. Waters, Gifford, Pa., in place of Elizabeth Shelley, deceased.

Theresa A. Catale, Hillsville, Pa., in place of W. W. Gilmore, retired.

Alvin R. Marshall, Hollsopple, Pa., in place of C. R. Baker, retired.

Russell R. Weaver, Jackson Center, Pa., in place of J. H. McConnell, retired..

Victor N. Deane, Kane, Pa., in place of J. G. O'Connor, deceased.

Russell J. Greenawalt, Kempton, Pa., in place of E. M. Albright, retired.

Herman O. Todd, Lake Como, Pa., in place of A. E. Vouaux, retired.

Harold R. Hockman, Mingoville, Pa., in place of Harry Walizer, resigned.

Ned M. Hartsell, Oil City, Pa., in place of L. J. English, retired.

Jerome A. Frank, Saint Marys, Pa., in place of D. A. Phelan, retired.

Roger G. Eshelman, Terre Hill, Pa., in place of B. E. Weaver, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John P. Sullivan, Jr., Jackson, S.C., in place of J. C. Greene, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Richard V. Bell, Hecla, S. Dak., in place of R. C. Bonzer, retired.

Daniel C. Wiest, Newell, S. Dak., in place of P. A. Wiest, retired.

TENNESSEE

Millard M. Brown, Livingston, Tenn., in place of C. C. Gore, retired.

Billy V. Taylor, Mercer, Tenn., in place of C. G. McCauley, retired.

Bobby L. Price, Mosheim, Tenn., in place of L. F. Robinette, resigned.

Horace M. Hughett, Robbins, Tenn., in place of Berbin Ellis, retired.

TEXAS

Shirley R. Clark, Cleburne, Tex., in place of H. G. Littlefair, deceased.

Ladislav L. Zbranek, Hardin, Tex., in place of Elizabeth Davis, retired.

Talmage E. Gilbreath, Iowa Park, Tex., in place of F. S. May, resigned.

Ollie T. Bullock, Milano, Tex., in place of J. D. Yoakum, transferred.

Ann M. Postlethwait, Sabine Pass, Tex., in place of C. J. Woerner, resigned.

Oleta B. Coleman, Splendora, Tex., in place of P. W. Davis, retired.

UTAH

Kay F. Probst, Midway, Utah, in place of N. A. Burgener, retired.

VERMONT

Justin M. Lanou, Irasburg, Vt., in place of N. H. Pike, retired.

Dwight H. Cooley, Passumpsic, Vt., in place of E. J. Filgate, transferred.

VIRGINIA

William E. Scheid, Falls Church, Va., in place of W. H. Sealock, deceased.

E. Brown Porter, Max Meadows, Va., in place of T. E. Simmerman, Jr., retired.

WASHINGTON

William H. Boyes, Monroe, Wash., in place of C. H. Currie, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Frederick T. Newbraugh, Berkeley Springs, W. Va., in place of A. S. Henry, retired.

Floyd F. Edmunds, Bramwell, W. Va., in place of S. M. Gordon, retired.

Virginia L. Eddy, Friendly, W. Va., in place of Lula Griffin, retired.

Martin M. Strganac, McMechen, W. Va., in place of P. J. Burke, retired.

Howard E. Shamblen, Mammoth, W. Va., in place of E. C. Bess, resigned.

WISCONSIN

James W. Hankerson, Fair Water, Wis., in place of E. G. Zellmer, retired.

Jon D. Lysdahl, Grantsburg, Wis., in place of H. R. Olson, retired

Orlen E. Heldt, Merrill, Wis., in place of W. C. McLaughlin, retired.

Neil E. Schell, Norwalk, Wis., in place of A. G. Willgrubs, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 17, 1963:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

John H. Cook, Dozier.
Carrie M. Mann, Pleasant Grove.
James T. Carroll, Stevenson.

ARIZONA

Marion L. Massey, Jr., Claypool.
Hettie M. Black, Hereford.
R. Odie Shipp, Miami.
Merle W. Heap, St. Johns.

ARKANSAS

Henry W. Allen, Jr., Brinkley.
Harry L. Smith, Elm Springs.
Harry L. Bealer, Helena.

CALIFORNIA

Richard L. Byington, Boron.
Irving A. Cleek, Chico.
John B. Kluglewicz, Costa Mesa.
Mary L. Johnson, Keyes.
Rosalie L. Rhodes, Lakehead.
Ruth A. Winters, Loleta.
Edward F. Austin, Moffett Field.
Beverly J. Clark, Occidental.
Dessa L. Pinkham, Pescadero.
Irvin J. Burt, Roseville.
Ralph B. Gump, Tarzana.
Paul Medows, Woodland Hills.

COLORADO

Marie P. Burg, Hideaway Park.
Laurence Montano, Leadville.

CONNECTICUT

Joseph A. Rajcula, Brookfield.
Lolita C. Splaine, East Granby.
Charles E. Hatheway, Ellington.
Charles W. Latimer, Pleasant Valley.
William F. Csere, Portland.
Leopold A. Szczygiel, Uncasville.

FLORIDA

Carl P. Geiger, Cocoa.
Ralph D. Marshall, Estero.
Luther W. Reel, Winter Haven.

GEORGIA

Joseph R. Bowers, Fayetteville.
Gladys A. Walker, Marshallville.
C. Lawrence Mize, Toccoa.

HAWAII

Steven K. Kaneda, Wailuku.

IDAHO

Donald W. Heath, Winchester.

ILLINOIS

John R. Frymire, Enfield.
Theodore C. Geocaris, Mount Prospect.
Kenneth Cole, Norris City.

INDIANA

Robert H. Wilson, Albion.
Melville A. Mix, Jr., Brownsburg.
Virginia E. Ross, Brownsville.
Charles J. Murray, Jamestown.
James E. Rainford, Lake Village.
Glendon R. Hinshaw, Mooresville.
Maurice G. Whitaker, Paragon.
Robert H. Meier, Westphalia.

IOWA

Ronald L. Grant, Bondurant.
James A. Anderson, Casey.
Kenneth A. Madigan, Council Bluffs.
Clifford S. Heng, Cylinder.
Vernon M. Hill, Davis City.
Leonard R. Brasel, Dow City.
Helen A. Bellmann, Durango.
Frederick W. Neumann, Fairfield.
Iva M. Mauck, Garwin.
Myrtle M. Hawbaker, Hillsboro.
Don H. Richards, Hinton.
Arthur G. Meyer, Holstein.
Leland J. Gorshe, Hornick.
Daniel J. Gibbs, La Motte.
Clarence E. Pittman, Morning Sun.
Leon L. Wilson, Nevada.
Marjorie I. Trusty, Oakdale.
Derrel D. Waring, Reasnor.
Florence K. Hamilton, Riverside.
Irvin F. Husmann, Scotch Grove.
Rex V. Ritz, Selma.
Gordon L. Elwood, Silver City.
Alwin M. Zwanziger, Strawberry Point.
Cecil C. Ramsdell, Toledo.
Glenn W. Fleck, Vinton.

KANSAS

Willis J. Ross, La Harpe.

KENTUCKY

M. Aileen Hall, Betsy Layne.
Lee R. McNeely, Jr., Burlington.
Walter E. Burkhart, Cawood.
Lester G. Nanny, Murray.
Matthews Fletcher, Pewee Valley.
William E. Amyx, Jr., Shelbyville.
Jean P. Crouch, Verona.
Kenneth E. Brock, Worthville.

LOUISIANA

Edward W. Cruse, Alexandria.
Leslie C. Sutton, Baker.
William J. Broussard, Carencro.
Edward J. Hymel, Destrehan.
Irene T. Nash, Gibson.
Roma H. Williams, Many.
Norman C. Terherst, Newllano.

MAINE

Thomas W. Adell, Readfield.
David H. Hackett, South Harpswell.
Robert B. Kessell, South Paris.
Fernald K. Linscott, Springfield.
John R. McLean, Vassalboro.

MASSACHUSETTS

Francis J. Mooney, Andover.
Howard M. Hayden, Athol.
John F. Keefe, Dracut.
Charles P. Aspesi, Fayville.
Harry W. Vozella, Franklin.
Edward F. O'Leary, Holliston.
Marion O. Lantagne, Linwood.
Lydia J. Hartnett, Millville.
William A. Latraverse, Northbridge.
John G. Barry, South Hadley.
George E. Owens, Jr., Wayland.
John D. Foley, West Acton.
Joseph M. Steinmann, West Concord.

MICHIGAN

Donald G. Bachman, Sr., Ann Arbor.
Kathryn E. Warner, Bridgeport.

Noble G. Haver, Jr., Durand.
John J. Cheney, Elmira.
John P. Funkey, Hancock.
Thomas E. Wilhelm, Petoskey.
Leola A. Rugg, Shaftsburg.
Glenna A. Brooks, Somerset Center.

MINNESOTA

Gordon W. Van Den Einde, Blomkest.
LeRoy H. Grundel, Carlos.
Grant D. Vagle, Lake Bronson.
John E. Murphy, Marshall.
Eugene C. Howe, Palisade.
Wilfred F. Greenheck, Pillager.
James L. Harlan, Plainview.
Darold J. Osterloh, St. Francis.
Albert L. Gutzke, Waverly.
John E. Patterson, Westbrook.
Francis R. Tangen, Winger.

MISSISSIPPI

Samuel L. Westmoreland, Houlka.
Felix L. Sweatt, Shaw.

MISSOURI

Erwin H. Schmidt, Barnhart.
Bernetta L. Faulkner, Centerville.
J. Warren Campbell, Edwards.
Allen E. Buetzer, Forest City.
Lawrence O. Kinyon, Forsyth.
Elmer C. Smith, Frohna.
Marcella F. Boyer, Herculaneum.
Amherst W. Maphies, Jericho Springs.
Robert A. Woodward, Lamar.
Lucille D. Howerton, Leonard.
Harold C. Jacobs, Palmyra.
Leland S. Reid, Point Lookout.
Marvin L. Steele, Unionville.

MONTANA

Robert J. Williamson, Belt.
Una V. Hopkins, Custer.
Alberta E. Harrington, Garrison.

NEBRASKA

Richard L. Hart, Bridgeport.
Eldon W. Marsh, Brunswick.
John C. Bounds, Grant.
Ferol G. Carney, Lisco.
John P. Munnelly, Omaha.
Keith R. Carson, Pilger.
Charles F. Obrist, Steinauer.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

George A. Clement, Chester.
Royce C. Morse, Lebanon.

NEW JERSEY

John Cook, Florence.
Rita M. Kosminsky, Liberty Corner.
Robert G. Reeves, Sr., Mauricetown.
Herbert J. Jackson, North Bergen.

NEW YORK

Laurence M. Sucher, Alton.
Frances W. Flynn, Burke.
Everett H. Enstine, Calverton.
Clyde W. Barber, Castile.
James J. Connolly, Catskill.
Joseph A. Peckovitch, Cementon.
Walter A. Glynn, Craryville.
John J. Powers, Jr., Eagle Bridge.
Clifford J. Vincent, Jr., East Berne.
Marian C. Laing, East Otto.
Dominick D. Formisano, Gardiner.
Olga A. Mihanowich, Glenham.
Mildred H. Burd, Greenwood.
Alexander G. D'Imperio, Harrison.
Carl J. Barry, Kent.
William J. Holahan, Middleport.
Edwin D. Jennison, Sr., Milton.
Michael J. Vickio, Montour Falls.
Fraser Bushey, Mooers Forks.
Samuel R. McKernan, Olcott.
George W. Voorhis, Jr., Piermont.
Margaret M. Vaughan, Rush.
John G. Davis, Stone Ridge.
Clarence M. Pulling, West Lebanon.
Leo F. King, Woodbourne.
Raymond A. DuFour, Wynantskill.

NORTH CAROLINA

Isabel H. Glover, Bailey.
Thomas E. Dixon, Benson.
Marvin N. Farmer, Blanch.
Charlie O. Williams, Central Falls.
Louise N. Blankenship, Fairview.
Louise C. Pittman, Gates.
Robert W. Phillips, Hudson.
Albert F. Waller, Kinston.
James Napier, New London.
R. Wayne Ward, Staley.
Charles R. Isgett, Winston-Salem.

NORTH DAKOTA

Joseph R. Walter, Devils Lake.
Ronald E. Monson, Edinburg.
Clements H. Weigum, Hazen.
Gilbert W. Kessler, Martin.
Donald B. Tweten, Reynolds.
William J. Gust, Jr., St. Thomas.

OHIO

Frank I. Miller, Ada.
Thomas F. Fenton, Chandlersville.
Robert J. Healea, Dennison.
William A. Beard, Eaton.
Robert L. Lowry, Green Camp.
Frank L. Biggs, Pataskala.
John Karalius, Rock Creek.
Beatrice A. Shoemaker, Sedalia.
Jack A. Pancher, Uhrichsville.
Marlin F. Gehres, Wren.

OKLAHOMA

Don A. Neumeyer, Council Hill.
Jack E. Clement, Fairfax.
Finis Ward, Foyil.
Ernest E. Buffington, Westville.
John H. Tynon, Wyandotte.

OREGON

Richard J. Halverson, Garibaldi.
Susan H. Wick, Keno.
Halford A. Dudley, Rhododendron.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles H. Gough, Ashland.
Bernard F. Cooney, Jr., Austin.
Jack A. Lanager, Clearfield.
Patrick J. Moran, Gladwyne.
Emily T. McDaniel, Groveton.
Stephen W. Ochs, Lucinda.
Roland E. Dunkelberger, New Bloomfield.
Dorothy M. Sherbondy, Ruffs Dale.
Henry J. Schwalm, Valley View.

PUERTO RICO

Emilio A. Hernandez, Aguada.

RHODE ISLAND

Katherine M. Purnell, Clayville.
Francis M. Burns, Pawtucket.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Phillip C. Seigler, Batesburg.
Robert A. Jolley, Jr., Greenville.
David B. Brockman, Greer.
James C. Riley, Piedmont.
Margaret H. Leary, Troy.
Thomas W. Suber, Whitmire.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lyle R. Haug, Brandt.
Kathryn A. Hight, Deadwood.
Hugen M. Kelsey, Fedora.
Christian B. Jordan, Fort Meade.
Elmer T. Fitzgerald, Rapid City.

TENNESSEE

Harvey G. Fitzgerald, Humboldt.
Walter F. Church, Roan Mountain.
Betty S. Watkins, Talbott.
Jeff J. Blanks, Jr., Trezevant.
Joseph W. Gore, Wartrace.

TEXAS

Erwin O. Dallmeyer, Burton.
Harry C. Rathjen, Canadian.
Michael M. McCully, Clarendon.
S. Reese Upshaw, De Leon.
Grover C. Gibbs, Jr., Glen Rose.
Douglas L. Garrett, Hempstead.
John L. Boyd, Lake Dallas.
Carlos I. Palacios, Laredo.
John R. Cullers, Shamrock.
Preston R. Wheeler, Slaton.
Leopoldo Martinez, Jr., Zapata.

UTAH

Harold P. Green, Grantsville.
Robert D. Nevin, Riverton.

VERMONT

Helen A. Howrigan, Fairfield.
Robert W. Swann, Roxbury.
Robert H. Lawrence, South Hero.
Collise A. Brown, Waterville.

VIRGINIA

Charles H. Mason, Alexandria.
John H. Glass, Dewitt.
Herman L. Bundick, Painter.
Joseph C. Rucker, Shenandoah.
Archibald E. Sutton, Tappahannock.

WASHINGTON

Arvith M. Christiansen, Belfair.
Paul B. Coffey, Chewelah.

WEST VIRGINIA

Norman Armstrong, Pickens.
Carl R. Shaffer, Tunnelton.

WISCONSIN

Robert A. Weinhold, Adell.
John F. Rochon, Florence.
Mathew E. Lang, Gillett.
Echo I. Fisk, Holcombe.
James G. Omachinski, Menasha.
Russell J. Myers, Monroe.
Cora D. Manthei, Pleasant Prairie.
Mary E. Suihkonen, Sheldon.
Arden A. Johnson, Trempealeau.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Memorial Day at Gettysburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, this year, as always, the Gettysburg Memorial Day Committee conducted appropriate and impressive ceremonies at the National Cemetery in that historic Pennsylvania community. An outline of these ceremonies follows, as well as the principal address of the day which was delivered by the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States:

CHESTER S. SHRIVER. On behalf of the Gettysburg Memorial Day Committee, the citizens of this community and our Commonwealth, we extend to you a most cordial welcome to the 96th annual service as we commemorate Memorial Day here in the National Cemetery in Gettysburg.

We are highly honored to have present for this service today, one of our own citizens from Gettysburg and Adams County, a man who has served this community in a dedicated spirit, for many years in business, education, and public service to this State and our Nation and at present on an international level. It is my honor and pleasure to introduce to you, His Excellency, the Honorable

John S. Rice, U.S. Ambassador to the Netherlands.

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN S. RICE, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE NETHERLANDS

Ambassador RICE. It is fitting that we have another illustrious personage address us at this national shrine. Our speaker is not only a distinguished citizen of the United States but one of the world's great statesmen.

During his career as leader of the U.S. Senate, he particularly distinguished himself as a great unifier. He has the canny ability to bring people together to work for responsible government. His great leadership was recognized by the people when they elected him to the second highest office of our country.

It is a privilege and honor to present the Vice President of the United States.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Vice President JOHNSON. On this hallowed ground, heroic deeds were performed and eloquent words were spoken a century ago.

We, the living, have not forgotten—and the world will never forget—the deeds or the words of Gettysburg. We honor them now as we join on this Memorial Day of 1963 in a prayer for permanent peace of the world and fulfillment of our hopes for universal freedom and justice.

We are called to honor our own words of reverent prayer with resolution in the deeds we must perform to preserve peace and the hope of freedom.

We keep a vigil of peace around the world.

Until the world knows no aggressors, until the arms of tyranny have been laid down, until freedom has risen up in every land, we shall maintain our vigil to make sure our sons who died on foreign fields shall not have died in vain.

As we maintain the vigil of peace, we must remember that justice is a vigil, too—a vigil we must keep in our own streets and schools and among the lives of all our people—so that those who died here on their native soil shall not have died in vain.

One hundred years ago, the slave was freed.

One hundred years later, the Negro remains in bondage to the color of his skin.

The Negro today asks justice.

We do not answer him—we do not answer those who lie beneath this soil—when we reply to the Negro by asking, "Patience."

It is empty to plead that the solution to the dilemmas of the present rests on the hands of the clock. The solution is in our hands. Unless we are willing to yield up our destiny of greatness among the civilizations of history, Americans—white and Negro together—must be about the business of resolving the challenge which confronts us now.

Our Nation found its soul in honor on these fields of Gettysburg 100 years ago. We must not lose that soul in dishonor now on the fields of hate.

To ask for patience from the Negro is to ask him to give more of what he has already given enough. But to fail to ask of him—and of all Americans—perseverance within the processes of a free and responsible society would be to fail to ask what the national interest requires of all its citizens.

The law cannot save those who deny it, but neither can the law serve any who do not use it. The history of injustice and inequality is a history of disuse of the law. Law has not failed—and is not failing. We as a nation have failed ourselves by not trusting the law and by not using the law to gain sooner the ends of justice which law alone serves.

If the white overestimates what he has done for the Negro without the law, the Negro may underestimate what he is doing and can do for himself with the law.

If it is empty to ask Negro or white for patience, it is not empty—it is merely honest—to ask perseverance. Men may build barricades—and others may hurl themselves against those barricades—but what would happen if the barricades would yield no answers. The answers will only be wrought by our perseverance together. It is deceit to promise more as it would be cowardice to demand less.

In this hour, it is not our respective races which are at stake—it is our Nation. Let those who care for their country come forward, North and South, white and Negro, to lead the way through this moment of challenge and decision.

The Negro says, "Now." Others say, "Never." The voice of responsible Americans—the voice of those who died here and the great man who spoke here—their voices say, "Together." There is no other way.

Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact. To the extent that the Proclamation of Emancipation is not fulfilled in fact, to that extent we shall have fallen short of assuring freedom to the free.

Mr. SCHRIVER. Thank you very much Mr. Vice President for this most inspiring message and tribute that you have rendered here upon this occasion. We deeply appreciate the fact that you have taken your time from your busy schedule, to lead our Nation and the world upon this observance of Memorial Day.

And as a special gesture of high esteem for your dedicated service to the peoples of the world, may I present you with this citation of merit from the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, the only organization, chartered by Congress, to represent the Grand Army of the Republic, and who by their General Order No. II in 1886, proclaimed May 30 annually as Memorial Day. As their commander in chief, may I present this special citation to you.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of June 15, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, 5th District, Texas)

HOUSE KILLS NEW AREA REDEVELOPMENT FUNDS

A major victory in the fight to slow down Federal spending was achieved by the House of Representatives this week with the defeat of President Kennedy's request for an additional $455 million to continue the Area Redevelopment Act, 209 to 204; 152 Republicans and 57 Democrats voted against the spending bill; 189 Democrats and 15 Republicans were in favor of it. The bill would have provided additional authorization for loans and grants to carry the area redevelopment program for the next 2 years. The House vote will not end the program, but will slow it down and should result in additional savings of the taxpayers money. Chief arguments against appropriation of new funds were based on the minority report of the Banking and Currency Committee which pointed out the lack of accomplishment of the program in its first 2 years of operation and the record of using Federal funds to transplant unemployment and to create new businesses and jobs at the expense of those already existing.

Some examples from the minority report: (1) The Area Redevelopment Agency approved a loan to the Ponchartrain Hotel Co., Detroit, Mich., in the amount of $1,894,525 to assist financing a 432-unit motor hotel with the claim it would add 450 jobs. Since the hotel occupancy rate for Detroit in 1962 was only 54 percent, it is clear the new motor hotel will not add even one hotel job on a net basis to the economy of Detroit. At best, employment at the new facility will result in a corresponding decrease in employment at existing hotel facilities. As a matter of fact, a net decrease in hotel employment for Detroit might easily be the result if the new facility forces existing hotel facilities, already suffering from excessive capacity, into bankruptcy. (2) The Agency approved a $418,000 loan to the Tomahawk Paper Co., of Tomahawk, Wis., to establish a papermill to make household tissues. Present capacity of that industry, without addition of this new plant, as of January 1, 1963, is in excess of current consumption in the United States by more than 400,000 tons. The 73 new jobs claimed for this new facility simply means that corresponding unemployment will be transplanted to existing plants which are only operating at 84 percent of capacity. (3) In Dorchester County, Md., an application has been made for a loan to build a $2 million plant to process soybeans into poultry feed. The plant would be in the heart of the Delmarva Peninsula, made up of parts of Delaware, Maryland and Virginia, which accounted for nearly 30 percent of U.S. poultry production just after World War II, but now represents less than 10 percent. Since Delmarva's share of the poultry business has shown little inclination toward growth, other feed companies in the area claim a new plant would cost more jobs than it would create. Typical of the reaction of the citizens: "This ARA is supposed to be creating new jobs, but they're just about ready to take mine away"—"We could hardly complain if this were a privately financed operation, but it just isn't fair to use our tax money to build a plant to drive us out of business."

In my remarks during debate I pointed out: The ARA on April 15, 1963, approved a $68,250 loan to the Farm Ranch Cooperative Association of Wetumka, Okla., to establish a feed and grain mill. I have introduced a bill to place co-ops on an equal taxation basis along with the rest of business. But my question is this: Is not this using taxpayers' money to set up a tax-exempt business in competition with a tax-paying business? In answering my question, Congressman HARVEY, of Michigan, said in part: "In our hearings and the press there have been cited instance after instance of the ARA being used for the purpose of promoting more competition in a particular field where competition was not needed."

My principal objection to the area redevelopment program is the use of it to establish Federal criteria for designating distressed areas and this is just not possible. More than one-third of all the counties of the country have been declared eligible areas—depressed areas. Common sense tells us that in this period of reasonably good prosperity, that just is not true. With the House action this week we have taken at least a short step toward the return to the encouragement of private business, the only real way to increased economic growth and the creation of new jobs.

MUZZLING CONGRESS

A subtle move seems to be underway to muzzle Congress. For the past week one Member has objected to all special orders, that is requests of Members for time to speak on the floor on subjects not directly related to the legislation of the day. Later

in the week a second Member decided that the other Members would be limited to only one insertion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and would not be permitted to use extraneous material in connection with floor speeches. He effectively used this form of censorship by objecting when unanimous consent was required to put such remarks in the RECORD. I strongly objected to this abridgement of the rights of all Members of Congress, those with whom I disagree as well as those whose views I find compatible. The House as a forum for debate and the expression of views must not be subject to the censorship of an individual Member or group of Members. If the President is making mistakes, one of the best ways to cover up is to stop criticism by Members of Congress and this is the real danger in the actions now taking place in the House. As I stated on the floor, "I shall not set myself up as a censor of any other Member of the House, nor do I think any other Member has that privilege." I will certainly not be silenced in presenting views I think are important to the people of my district and the Nation, or in criticizing the President when, in my opinion, his actions threaten the freedoms of our people and the security of the Nation.

KOREAN TAXES AGAIN EXTENDED

The Tax Rate Extension Act of 1963 extended for another year excise taxes and Korean war taxes. I opposed the extension and joined in the minority report to point out: (1) This is a tax increase bill. Expiration of tax rate increases imposed temporarily for 2 years to meet a specific crisis cannot be properly referred to as tax reduction. On the contrary any bill to continue these temporary rate increases can only be regarded as bills to increase taxes. (2) There is a moral obligation to remove tax rates which were sold to the people as temporary taxes. (3) A basic solution to removing these taxes and enacting an overall tax cut in all brackets is to cut Federal spending. (4) Excise taxes hit those of lowest income hardest of all.

ARCHITECT OF FAILURE TO HEAD DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

The man the President is sending to deal with Khrushchev, to reach an agreement which could result in total disarmament of the United States, is Averell Harriman, the architect of failure in our policies of combating the Communist conspiracy. Appalling as the President's announcement that we were suspending nuclear testing in the atmosphere and were entering into top level negotiations with the Soviets in Moscow, was to the American people, the naming of Harriman as the top negotiator is simply beyond belief. It was Harriman who arranged the coalition government of Laos at the Geneva Conference which is now resulting in the complete takeover of Laos by the Communists. In fact, Mr. Harriman has been involved in many of the disastrous agreements, particularly regarding Rumania. If the President insists on continuing to send the Nation on a suicidal course in international affairs, the least he can do is to put an engineer at the throttle who will recognize danger signals when they are flashing.

American Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on May 28 some of my colleagues attacked American liberalism by way of equating the platform of Americans for Democratic Action with that of the Socialist Party and the publicly stated position of the Communist Party. This linkage is frankly false because it attempts to directly associate liberalism with socialism and socialism with communism. This tortured logic, if extended, as was done on the floor, allows no difference in principle, philosophy, and methodology between liberalism and communism and democratic socialism and communism.

Mr. Speaker, such reckless charges violate the American tradition because they neither deal with the merits of any issue nor bear any resemblance to the truth. These allegations attempt to relegate to the ash heap those practices which are traditional, appropriate, and proper in American political life. I would hope that my conservative colleagues would call liberals to task if they ever link conservatism with reaction and reaction with fascism.

A cursory knowledge of American politics should clearly demonstrate that liberals are not Socialists and Socialists are not liberals and both are antitotalitarian and therefore anti-Communist. By the same token, conservatives are not reactionaries and reactionaries are not conservatives and both are antitotalitarian and therefore anti-Fascist. The test we must apply is how well do the liberals and conservatives meet today's challenge through use of democratic processes.

In this time of continual crisis, which we have faced since the beginning of the cold war, we need liberals and conservatives who participate fully, vigorously, and effectively in the dialogue on the great issues affecting Americans today—how to enhance the freedom of all Americans, abolish poverty and regain full employment, protect our security by encouraging independent nations elsewhere, and maintain peace.

Ours is an open, strong society. Its strength rests on a vigorous clash of ideas competing in the open. It is in this context that liberals and conservatives must battle. The subverters of our Constitution—the Communist Party, the White Citizens Councils, the John Birch Society and their fellow travelers—shun the marketplace of ideas and instead pursue conspiratorial avenues of political influence that inject fear and falsehood into American politics.

I propose to discuss only two items: the meaning of the ADA platform and the application of the liberal and conservative ideologies.

The ADA platform covers many items. This is so because ADA is a multiinterest national political organization. Its members are interested in domestic and foreign policy and so ADA takes a stand on a whole host of issues from the problems our aging face through making the United Nations a better instrument for freedom and peace. The ADA stand is not always correct. As a member of its national board, I do not agree with every policy ADA supports. And I dare say no member in ADA agrees with each and every ADA position. That is always the case in a democratic organization which arrives at its positions after discussion and debate, where ideas clash and one policy prevails over another.

Liberalism and ADA will be judged by their purposes and goals, their past achievements and future accomplishments. ADA has stood the test of time, for as President Kennedy told the 16th annual ADA convention, held in May of this year—a convention I had the honor to address and, yes, even criticize ADA in a serious but friendly vein—"you have contributed an indispensable ferment to American politics and looking back you can take satisfaction that on the whole, time has confirmed the rightness of your judgments."

Mr. Speaker, I request that President Kennedy's message to ADA's 16th annual convention be inserted in the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

Liberalism and ADA stand for affirmative goals. The fulfillment of the individual in a just and responsible world is our goal. ADA believes that its goals can be achieved in only one way: through the democratic process. ADA practices democracy by participating in election campaigns, generating ideas, stimulating thought. Its performance is always in public for all to judge, evaluate, accept or reject.

ADA welcomes to its ranks only those whose devotion to political freedom is unqualified. Those who apologize for segregation have no place in ADA. Those who apologize for Russia, China, Yugoslavia, Cuba, Spain, the Dominican Republic under Trujillo, Venezuela under Jiminez, have no place in ADA.

But let us examine what the conclusions of two recognized scholars are about ADA. Prof. David Shannon of Columbia University in his book, "The Decline of American Communism," concludes that ADA was one of the most important factors after World War II, in converting the non-Communist left into the anti-Communist left at home and abroad. ADA fought the Communist issue on preservation of principle without violating democratic procedure. We did not engage in the recklessness of false accusation and scare tactics as so many who use the issue of communism solely for political profit.

Prof. Max Lerner of Brandeis University in his preface to "Americans for Democratic Action"—a book incidentally sympathetic with ADA's philosophy but not uncritical of ADA—says:

> There can be no doubt that without the ADA American political thought and action would have become more extremist at both ends, left and right.

The ADA record in support of expanding democracy is clear. We believe in more freedom at home—a vigorous defense of the Bill of Rights and immediate implementation of the 14th and 15th amendments.

Today as in past years we oppose imperial expansion and internal dictatorship. To those who resist dictatorship, Communist or otherwise, and support democracy, we lend our support. We look toward a world where all people may share our freedom—a world without aggression, a disarmed world subject to effective inspection and control.

We are disappointed, however, that too many conservatives too often have not upheld their acknowledged belief in constitutional process and the rule of law. For the greatest contribution of conservatives to American democracy would be to rid their organizations, such as Americans for Constitutional Action, of undemocratic John Birch Society members and its equally undemocratic fellow travelers and at the same time join American liberals in supporting comprehensive civil rights legislation, that is real and not a sham, to fulfill the constitutional mandate of the 14th and 15th amendments. The conservatives' failure to meet this responsibility will mean that the American people are the losers, for it is the American ideal that will remain unfulfilled.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have not gone into the subject which fascinates ADA and administration critics: namely, that ADA'ers run this country. Judging by ADA's criticisms of the administration, one could never imagine that ADA is running the country. Furthermore, glaring inaccuracies in statements made by my conservative colleagues lead me, for one, to wonder how much credence can be given to their arguments on substantive issues. I refer specifically to Mr. HALL's remarks appearing on page 10739 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. HALL said that "the 35 ADA'ers in key administrative positions include" ABRAHAM RIBICOFF as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Arthur Goldberg as Secretary of Labor. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, I believe, has been elected to the U.S. Senate from Connecticut, and Arthur Goldberg, of course, is the newest member of the Supreme Court. This is but one example of how out of date are many of the thoughts of my conservative friends.

J.F.K. TO ADA

I am happy to send my greetings to the 16th annual convention of ADA. During these years, you have striven valiantly for social progress and civil freedom at home and for liberty and peace in the world. You have done this in the face of clamor and criticism, and you have seen the causes for which you have fought move steadily ahead toward fulfillment. You have contributed an indispensable ferment to American politics. Looking back, you can take satisfaction that time has on the whole confirmed the rightness of your judgments.

Now again we look to the future. This strong country of ours faces all of the problems that come with a complex and changing economy in a revolutionary world. This administration—in the field of economic and monetary policy, in education, in the care for the sick, retarded, and the aged—has put forward programs to provide a greater participation in the American life for all of our citizens. This country cannot turn its back on the urgent problems of the day: four and a half million unemployed, an inadequate educational system, a growing tangle of urban blight, pockets of poverty that reproach our affluence, a large segment of our citizens still denied their civil rights, the massive problems of the developing nations and, above all, the overwhelming need to turn the world's momentum toward destruction into an equivalent momentum for production and peace.

I may not always agree with ADA on how these goals should be pursued, or they with me; but I salute the role you have played—and will continue to play—in supporting new initiatives and new ideas, in freshening our political dialog, and in countering those who reject the future, doubt the present and labor to keep us mired forever in the past.

Message by Congressman Ben F. Jensen, of Iowa, to the Delegates to the World Feed Conference From 100 Foreign Nations on This Side of the Iron Curtain Now Being Held in Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MESSAGE BY CONGRESSMAN BEN F. JENSEN, OF IOWA, TO THE DELEGATES TO THE WORLD FEED CONFERENCE FROM 100 FOREIGN NATIONS ON THIS SIDE OF THE IRON CURTAIN NOW BEING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, being a member of the congressional delegation to this conference to devise ways and means to help feed the hungry people of this troubled world, I am impelled to make the following remarks which I hope you will all take in the spirit in which this statement is made.

We welcome you here in the United States of America, land where God has been good to us, by giving us such a plentiful supply of sunshine and rain, and rich productive soil which our farmers keep productive by good soil and moisture conservation practices which was started here only 27 years ago, to the end that, we have a surplus of feed, food, and fiber and which we want to share with you folks across the seven seas, but we want to be sure it reaches the people we want to help, which we know it has not to a marked degree up to this time. So I say without fear or favor that unless you leaders, here representing your respective countries, see to it henceforth that, the right people do receive these commodities, then your time and money attending this conference has to a marked degree been wasted.

Your time and money will also have been wasted in coming here unless on your return home you do not start a crusade to establish a land reform program in your respective countries if such a program has not already been established in your homeland.

It has been my good fortune to visit some 40 foreign nations and to observe the problems of the people there, and it was crystal clear to me that most of those problems were found in the nations where most of the land was owned by the great powerful land barons, who had for past centuries permitted their once-productive soil to wash away, blow away, and erode away and thus become unproductive to the end that hunger, strife, and internal unrest is now and has been for centuries past, the order of the day as all of you well know who come from such countries as I have just described.

I will refrain from naming those countries, but I will name some of the countries abroad who have since World War II established a land reform program: Pakistan, India, Japan, Formosa, and Thailand just to name a few. We are all glad and relieved to know that, in all those nations, hunger and internal unrest and strife is gradually disappearing, and as a consequence, the Communist conspiracy to rule them and the entire world is being effectively blocked.

Land reform programs were established in all those nations by peaceful means. The government took little to great blocks of land paying a reasonable price to the owners, divided it up in small economic acreages which were sold at a reasonable price to the former peasant farmworkers on a long-term payment basis, at a low interest rate, and also made necessary farm machinery available to the new owners with irrigation where needed, along with technical farm advice by people experienced in the art of good farming, many of them former U.S. farm boy graduates of the State Agriculture College at Ames, Iowa.

It is noteworthy that the only ineffective land reform program that has recently been established is in Cuba, where Castro by armed force, and by rolling heads in typical Communist style, took complete control of every farm and every segment of the Cuban people, their industries, churches, and schools. All of which is doomed to failure, and must be eliminated from the Western Hemisphere and soon and by force if necessary as the last resort. Now even though that is another story, nonetheless if not soon brought to heel, the peace of the entire world will be in jeopardy.

Thus my friends I pray and plead and admonish every one of you to unite with us in cutting away this cancerous growth from our body politic before it engulfs all of us in another world war more destructive to life and property than all the wars that have been fought on this earth.

In closing I beg of all to remember always that, Uncle Sam covets nothing that does not belong to the people of the United States of America. We seek only peace and freedom for ourselves and for you. Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain.

Flag Day Address by Senator Morton, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17, 1963

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address given by my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], at the national convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in Milwaukee on June 14, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

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

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORTON, OF KENTUCKY

Do you agree that the legislative branch of Government is indispensable? Or do you prefer rule by Executive rather than rule by representative? The keystone of our representative form of government has recently been challenged, and to this new issue, which traverses all American tradition and crosses all party lines, may we address ourselves tonight.

In this country, Government, like the flag, stands for the people.

The flag was a dear subject to an uncle of mine, R. C. Ballard Thruston, and he wrote a history of it which was adopted and printed by the 69th Congress in 1926. Reading his treatise, I noted that the flag evolved from

the personal flags of the English and Scottish kings. Take note, not the flags of the English and Scottish peoples, but the kings. The flag was the king's.

This difference between a king's flag and a people's flag symbolizes the challenge to American representative government.

Not long ago, self-government, implemented by the representative system, would never have been questioned in this Nation. For by self-government, and that alone, Americans have been free, are free, and shall be free. But there is a new doctrine. This scheme has sprung up inside this Nation. Its spokesmen are our fellow citizens—free men kept free by the institution their doctrine subverts.

The doctrine has no name, but it is the doctrine of the master planner. Its sponsors consider themselves the elite, the ruling class.

What precisely do they have in mind? I shall read you a statement of this doctrine. One of our richest and most prestigious scholarly foundations issued it. Its author, having raised the question of how are we doing with respect to the processes of democratic self-government, concludes this way:

"It is the third branch of government, the legislative, where things have gone awry. Whether we look at city councils, the State legislatures, or the Congress of the United States, we react to what we see with scarcely concealed contempt. This is the area where democratic government tends to break down—the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process."

To rectify conditions as he sees them, the author would amend the Constitution to increase the terms of Representatives to 4 years, to decrease the terms of Senators to 4 years, and to hold all congressional elections in presidential election years.

The author of this is a Senator. Had he been from another branch of the Government, his opinion would not have been so shocking. It could have been written off as another typical example of the new party line.

And this line separates not Republicans from Democrats but rather the arrogant, self-appointed omniscients of rule by the few from us old-fashioned types who continue to believe in the virtues of limited government and balanced power, the twin bulwarks of free society But, as I said, he is a Senator and the former mayor of a great eastern city. I have unwavering faith in JOE CLARK's sincerity. His reasoning I question.

He is correct in every count if:

(1) If the measure of our democratic representation is its speed in bowing unthinking to every decree from the Executive.

(2) If legislative productivity be judged by the amount of debt piled on the living as well as the unrepresented generations to come.

(3) If he would reduce the legislative, the powerful right arm of the people, to a spineless bunch of yes men who hear no evil, see no evil, and speak no evil.

Let's look more deeply into this doctrine. Let's put our finger on its basic assumptions. Besides taking for granted that the people are not receiving true representation from those they elect and, in most cases, re-elect, its says that a tiny handful of willful minor deities can do the job. Can they? I doubt it.

They have tried and failed. Irving Kristol, editor of "Basic Books," writing in the New Leader, has this to say about such a regime.

"The basic fault * * * is that it suffers from delusions of managerial omnicompetence. Its vaunted (philosophy of government) too often seems to amount to nothing more than a ruthless opportunism in small matters of politicking and administration, combined with a self-righteous and doctrinaire obstinacy on large matters of policy."

And what is the end result of rule by this elite? Mr. Kristol expresses it thus:

"In sum, that very sophistication and wide-ranging thoughtfulness which makes (the elite) so intellectually attractive also seems to make it so practically ineffectual. In politics intelligence and imagination are qualities to be desired, but it is a misfortune when they are not subordinated to a readiness to look reality in the face, to recognize its plain features, and to act with a simple decisiveness. It requires strength of character to act upon one's ideas; it requires no less strength of character to resist being seduced by them."

In other words, this ruling elite thinks it can make no mistake, but it does.

The doctrine of the ruling class would remove our only protection from the Executive's poor judgment. The legislative branch embodies that protection. But if every Member of Congress, was elected with the President, don't you see that the majority would be a pack of coattail riders, rubber stamping every proposal from the White House regardless of its value.

That is not the function of Congress, nor is it anything but the abdication of reason to vest so much power in the Executive. The United States has thrived on the system of checks and balances, the limitation of power.

Walter Lippmann, the columnist, once wrote:

"The genius of the American system is that it limits all power—including the power of the majority. Absolute power, whether in a king, a president, a legislative majority, a popular majority, is alien to the American idea.

"For a decision which has to be enforced against the determined opposition of large communities and regions of the country will, as Americans have long realized, almost never produce the results it is supposed to produce. It is necessary to postpone the decision, to respect the opposition, and then accept the burden of trying to persuade it."

We respect the opposition. That is important. We respect it because we recognize our own limitations. We are aware that we can be wrong, and we take that into account in our affairs.

The ruling class, however, would not allow for that. In essence, they are right. If you disagree with them, you are wrong, and they would bury you.

Delusions of managerial omnicompetence are part of the false underpinning of the ruling class doctrine. The other part, I said, was disbelief that representatives truly represent.

If you take a quick look at the 88th Congress, you'll see that few bills have passed, that for a long time none were, and that the Senate almost as soon as it convened got tied up in a filibuster over one of its rules of procedure. I can understand how someone develops reservations about the legislative process.

But if you take a long look at Congress, you will see much more. It is, in fact, the meeting ground for the countless and contradictory needs and interests that arise from this gigantic and very complex Nation.

Its task, with respect to all sides, is to reconcile the contradictions, to determine priorities and find and reflect the national will. The difficulties become gargantuan because Congress is the voice of the people in a Nation of some 180-odd millions.

The national will, how can it emerge from the diversities and inner confines of this country? The considered judgment of the whole people can only come—never easily and never perfectly—from the sober deliberations of responsive and responsible legislative assemblies.

And each one of these assemblies is composed of thoughtful and hardworking men and women—responsive to the ballot box but, more basically, responsible to certain enduring standards of right and justice that tradition has deposited, experience has tempered, and time has tested.

I do not think I either exaggerate or glorify when I say that the Congress, at the apex of our representative system, has always been the national forum in which this painstaking process has gone forward.

"Process" is the key word. Senator CLARK uses this same word, but he seems not to understand its real meaning. The political process which produces the national will is, of necessity, disorderly and often disorganized; it is inherently slow and deliberate; it refuses to conform neatly to any textbook of rules and procedures; it defies perfectly logical analysis.

For one reason, no political process accurately mirroring the scope of our society and purporting to serve it could possibly be other than complex—filled with competition and conflict.

The second reason is more important still. The focus of all of America's institutions, their dependence and their ultimate strength is people: individual citizens, free men and women. In times of greatest crisis we are most acutely aware of this fact. Then, the slick flow charts and the scientific procedures go out the window and what we have left are dedicated citizens who discharge their duty not because the rules say they must but, quite simply, because it is the duty that they freely assumed.

The Congress, too, is preeminently a human institution. And as I have already noted, it is indispensably the deliberative forum which echoes the multitude of America's competing and conflicting interests—echoes and then refines them. Its purpose is not just to respond but to represent. Its typical mode of operation to weigh and to balance—and only then to decide, in about equal parts by acting, by not acting, or by acting in ways that could not possibly have been predicted at the outset of the process. The ballot box and its own best apprehension of the national good are, equally, its benchmarks.

The difficulties of Congress and other legislative bodies boil down to the fact that they represent the people. The legislative is the epitome of the democratic system. No President of the United States shall ever be as close to the citizens of Milwaukee as Representatives ZABLOCKI and REUSS. Consequently, no President shall ever protect the interests peculiar to this city as will its elected representatives. If the incumbents don't, the people will trade them in on a new model. What holds for Milwaukee in this respect also holds for every other community of the Nation.

Yes, I think the legislative branch is indispensable. It is the single limb of American Government that is close enough to you to be called, in a real sense, yours—whether you live in Maine or California, Minnesota or Mississippi.

Earlier, I mentioned the flag. Do you know that whenever either House of Congress is in session the flag flies above its Chamber? This is appropriate because the flag stands for us.

But if you strip the powers of Congress and give them to the Executive you may as well haul down that remarkable standard and trample it in the dust.

For when Americans release their individual freedom and make a king, they will have desecrated the flag.

I hope such will never occur. I believe it never shall, because so long as we know from what our freedom comes, we shall see to it that that billowing, bright-colored cloth we unashamedly call Old Glory floats above the great Houses of self-government.