than 100,000 separately collated volumes of bibliographies.

And yet, it is painfully apparent that the human capacity to absorb knowledge is almost minuscule in comparison to the fantastic amount of information available.

For example, the average person reading 12 hours a day, for 50 years, can at best read about 16,000 to 18,000 technical books in a lifetime. We have about 30 million books in the world today.

The enormous gap in our capacity to store and retrieve information and at the same time meet the demands and responsibilities of our society has created the most costly and wasteful drain on our resources, which is without parallel in the entire history of mankind.

The appalling figures speak for themselves. One major U.S. company spent more than $250,000 and 5 years of research in an attempt to solve an electronic switching problem only to learn that the information was available 6 months before the project started.

A cloud seeding experiment has recently been made at a cost of $3 million. Shortly after completion of the experiment, it was learned the same information has been obtained at a cost of $256,000.

We could never exhaust this catalog of waste. It is, however, sufficiently dramatic to make us responsive to meet the greatest challenge of our time, a challenge fraught with power to either suffocate our progress or ennoble the aspiration and welfare of mankind.

Indeed, the harnessing of power from scientific knowledge through data processing and information retrieval will surely surpass the rich rewards derived from harnessing atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

It should be a source of concern to all of us that the Soviets appear to be so efficient that Dr. Finley Carter, director of the Stanford Research Institute, was prompted to state:

"In order to better know what American scientists are doing, one must read Soviet journals of abstracts."

John Gunther, the well-known American reporter writes:

"Russian abstracting services are so complete and so well developed that it has come to the point where American scientists learn about new accomplishments by Americans in their field from Russian abstract journals."

The importance of centralizing information has been attested to as one of the key factors in the success the Soviets have had so far. As pointed out by Dr. Michailov, director of the Institute of Scientific Information of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences:

"Nine years of operational service of the Institute of Scientific Information under U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences justify completely the establishment of a centralized documentation agency, since it is only within a centralized documentation service that the world's overall output of scientific publications can be processed and synthesized. Besides, the centralized system of information provides a fair base for effective mechanization and automation development."

The above is supported by Prof. Boris M. Tareev, also from Vinity, who states:

"Experience gained from information work in the U.S.S.R. and in other countries indicates that the complex and important task of providing complete, i.e., 'total' information on all recent scientific and technical developments throughout the world can be accomplished by a central scientific information institute which has at its disposal many highly qualified specialists, suitable technical equipment, and sufficient funds for acquisition of current literature from many different countries. The Institute of Scientific Information is such a center in Russia."

In my bill, H.R. 1946, I proposed the establishment of the National Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center to ameliorate some of the abysmal shortcomings and dangers to which facts and figures just stated bear witness. For it is readily apparent that the lack of a central organ, amidst hundreds of abstracting devices and countless specializing information services, lacking efficiency and control over duplication of research projects costing billions of dollars is a deadly danger to the survival of our country.

The timing and need for the center which I have proposed have never been more urgent and necessary. The responsibilities of our Government to our citizens and the scientific community must be met at once with energy, dedication and leadership worthy of our heritage.

"The cries for help from our scientists are desperate and justly demanding. The distinguished vice president of Tulane University, Dr. F. R. Cagle, only a few months ago succinctly captured today's mood of our scientists by saying:

"I speak as a scientist complainant * * * as a biologist frustrated by the difficulties of obtaining articles essential to my research * * * as a bewildered administrator participating in decisionmaking * * * as a frightened observer of the literature problems of my biologist colleagues * * * as an angry critic of our Government for failing to have concern about technical information programs * * *."

It is therefore of little surprise that my proposal has received such gratifying response and support.

The distinguished soldier-scientist, former Chief of Research and Development in the Department of the Army, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, recently pointed out:

"I believe you of industry, our academic allies and the agencies of Government need to get together and back what I think is needed here—let's call it SATIC—A Scientific and Technological Information Center—a national clearinghouse for the most complete and comprehensive acquisition, translation, and exchange of information that we can get from all segments of our Nation and from the rest of the free world."

A Washington University editor writes:

"Above all, in this country we need a central agency to coordinate the overall information effort; winnow the total production; and pick up the loose ends like foreign publications, research bulletins, graduate theses, Government reports and papers delivered at conferences. Organizing and operating such an institution would be an effort no bigger than others we have made, no more ponderous than others the Government has shouldered and carried home. It would deserve to be called investment rather than extravagance."

One of the most distinguished foreign critics on information retrieval, whose expert advice and services have been solicited by various Government agencies for many years, including the National Science Foundation, whose record of objective scientific analysis is unassailable, professor of mathematical logic and linguistics, Y. Bar-Hillel, has recently stated:

"There could, for instance, hardly be any doubt that the establishment of the institution corresponding to the Russian All-Union Institute of Scientific and Technological Information could greatly improve the existing situation in the information field in the United States and could be an overall improvement."

Needless to say, there are many others who voice similar views. Clearly, the establishment of a national center is the most urgent need and merits the highest consideration and priority.

The benefits to be derived from the establishment of a national center are too numerous and too obvious to need further elaboration here. However, there is one outstanding bonus which can be had. It is less obvious, and, therefore, I shall detail some of the hidden rich rewards awaiting the realization of a national center.

We are all too familiar with the current shortages of scientists, the costly expense involved in obtaining a technical education and the difficulty of attracting students to pursue degrees in science. And yet, notwithstanding these obstacles, the establishment of a national center could double the number of scientists by cutting wasteful duplication and mountainous literature searches which consume as much as 70 percent of our scientists' time.

Never before in history have we faced such a titanic challenge. The hour is fast approaching when we must act or be left behind, adrift in a fog of technological confusion. The rewards in accepting this great challenge are boundless. The decision is ours.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 31, 1963

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

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

O Thou God of grace and glory, when with each new day Thou dost spread the mantle of light about us as purple morning breaketh, fairer than morning, lovelier than daylight, dawns the sweet consciousness we are with Thee.

We would yield our flickering torch to the flame of Thy redeeming love, facing whatever the day may bring, sustained by a faith that will not shrink, though pressed by every foe.

Strengthen us, we pray, to carry our share of the burden of mankind's climb to the kingdom of Thy love and to the radiant realm where Thy will shall be done in the Nation and in all the earth. Toward that shining goal our puny mortal strength is unequal to the tests and tasks of the decisive days which are upon us. We dare not trust our own devices and counsels. Because Thy completeness flows around our incompleteness, from the lowly earth where our weary feet so often stumble and falter, may the exultant notes of our faith and hope rise like the lark on morning wing, singing its song at heaven's gate.

For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 30, 1963, 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.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, knowing some very important subjects will be before the Senate today for discussion, every Senator should be in a position to be in attendance instead of being present at some committee meeting. For that reason, with one exception, I object to any committee meeting today while the Senate is in session. I understand that the committee headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is desirous of concluding, or at least continuing, with a hearing today. That committee is excepted from my request.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there have been inferences in the press to the effect that political partisanship may be motivating the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the chairman of the Republican policy committee, the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] in their attitudes toward the nuclear test treaty.

It is most disturbing to me, Mr. President, to witness this effort to fan the flames of partisanship on a matter of such urgent and overriding national importance. I must reject any such inference insofar as it involves the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] or the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] or, for that matter, any other Senator—Republican or Democrat.

Both are men of the highest patriotism, and have shown time and again a mature and unqualified capacity to place the national interest in foreign relations above partisan consideration. They have consistently supported the main body of American policy through several administrations—administrations of both parties.

Their attitude is entirely in order. It is their responsibility as Senators—not as Republicans—in positions of great responsibility to be most prudent and careful in the consideration of this proposed treaty. And may I say that the same applies to the majority leader and the rest of the leadership on this side of the aisle.

It would have been, indeed, inappropriate at this time for the Senator from Illinois, no less than the Senator from Montana, to have gone to Moscow for the ceremony of signing the treaty.

There is a great backlog of legislation in process in the Senate at this time, highly important legislation to the Nation in many fields; and both the minority leader and the majority leader must continue to try, as we have been trying, to bring this legislation to the point of decision in the Senate.

As it is, an exceptionally appropriate bipartisan group will go to Moscow from the Senate—not necessarily to approve, but to represent the Senate for the signing. That is as it should be, for an occasion which involves the constitutional responsibility of the Senate to advise and consent with respect to treaty ratification. The Senators who are going—the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT]; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the deputy majority leader, whose name has long been associated with this effort; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has great knowledge of the subject matter of the treaty; the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Republican in this body, wise with a long experience in the Senate and in foreign relations and atomic energy; and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], ranking Republican of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees—this group of Senators who are going, Mr. President, is admirably equipped to represent the Senate with dignity and wisdom on this highly significant occasion of worldwide significance.

This bipartisan group, Mr. President, of which I personally am extremely proud of, is in keeping with the spirit of bipartisanship which has guided the policy of the United States from the outset on the matter of nuclear testing. In a matter which involves the safety of the Nation and the health of our people, and particularly our children, there is no room for partisanship. Certainly a treaty which would seek to prevent precisely those nuclear explosions which are most contaminative of our physical environment can be regarded as such a matter. Certainly, too, this proposed treaty has implications for the safety of the Nation.

I do not prejudge, Mr. President, the Senate's action with regard to the treaty. But the records of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], and of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] in matters of this kind, as I have noted, offer great assurance that the question of the treaty will be examined in terms of the highest national interest and free of partisanship.

Moreover, Mr. President, both parties in the campaign of 1960 adopted positions clearly in line with what has now been achieved in the initialed treaty to end nuclear testing. I must say, in all honestly, that the Republican platform is clearer on this point than the Democratic platform. But I am sure that this is primarily a matter of draftsmanship, and is not indicative in any way of a lesser desire on the part of Democrats to bring about an end to these dangerous tests. Democrats as a whole are just as concerned as Republicans when the safety and health of the Nation are at stake. In any event, Mr. President, I read into the RECORD at this point the reference to nuclear testing in the Republican and Democratic platforms of 1960.

The Democratic platform, 1960, section II, under the heading "Arms Control," states:

> A primary task is to develop responsible proposals that will help break the deadlock on arms control.
>
> Such proposals should include means for ending nuclear tests under workable safeguards, cutting back nuclear weapons, reducing conventional forces, preserving outer space for peaceful purposes, preventing surprise attack and limiting the risk of accidental war.

The Republican platform, 1960, under the heading "Foreign Policy," states:

> We are similarly ready to negotiate and to institute realistic methods and safeguards for disarmament and for the suspension of nuclear tests. We advocate an early agreement by all nations to forgo nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and the suspension of other tests as verification techniques permit. We support the President in any decision he may make to reevaluate the question of resumption of underground nuclear explosions testing, if the Geneva Conference fails to produce a satisfactory agreement. We have deep concern about the mounting nuclear arms race. This concern leads us to seek disarmament and nuclear agreements. And an equal concern to protect all people from nuclear danger leads us to insist that such agreements have adequate safeguards.

Again I say that I am extremely proud of the bipartisan group which has been selected to represent this body and this country at Moscow. I do not believe that under any circumstances a more capable group, or men of greater integrity and patriotism, could have been selected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the generous statement by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I need no defense for my conduct. I have always been willing to assume full responsibility for what I say and do. Under the Constitution the Senate has the duty and responsibility to advise and consent to a treaty. That action must constitute an independent judgment, and that judgment I will render under my oath, according to my conscience, and within the limit of my perception as I can bring it to bear.

I recall that once a President sought assistance in building up support for a League of Nations. Members of my party followed him throughout the country. He returned from that tour a broken and dejected man. It always hurt me to think that happened to a great scholar who was then the President of the United States—Woodrow Wilson.

For myself I try never to embarrass the President of the United States. I shall always bend over backward to make certain that he is not projected into any awkward situation.

Ten days ago I went to the Press Gallery of this body. The question was asked whether I had been invited to go to Moscow. The answer was that I had not been invited, directly or indirectly, remotely or otherwise, by anyone, anywhere, at any time.

Second, I stated that if I were invited, I would not go. I made that statement publicly on a number of occasions. In so doing, I closed the door for myself and for anyone else who might undertake to

invite me. I will never embarrass anyone. I made that abundantly clear. Not the least, of course, of the considerations that entered into that decision is the fact that we are beset with so much work. I did not feel that I could take time off and go to Moscow for that purpose, since the occasion was a ceremony of signing, and no negotiation was involved.

I am deeply grateful to my distinguished friend from Montana for the generous statement that he made on the floor of the Senate. Beyond that, I know of nothing I need say. I have neither encouraged nor discouraged any Member of this body from taking that trip if he were invited to go. Every Senator has equal prerogatives. I do not feel that it is either my responsibility or my prerogative to undertake to tell other Members of this distinguished body what they should do under those circumstances. So I leave the case there.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last night the President of the United States asked me to go to Moscow as a representative of the United States in the final ceremony preliminary to the signing of the test-ban treaty. Of the 100 Members of the Senate, I do not believe there is anyone who dislikes the thought of a foreign trip any more than I do. But when the President of the United States asked me to take the trip in the interest of the United States, I did not think I had any right to fold my hands and tell him that I did not want to go, and that I am not going.

Mr. President, when any program is initiated that looks toward the easing of tension throughout the world, and has for its purpose the averting of a war throughout the world, even though such program offers only a faint hope—and in my opinion that is what the proposed test-ban treaty does—I do not think I have any right to say that I am not interested in any effort for peace in the world regardless of whether it promises immediate and early success or not.

Mr. President, as one Member of this body who was asked to go to Moscow I can say that I have not been asked to commit myself in any way. I understand that no Member of the Senate will be asked to sign the treaty. I agree that Congress should examine every line of the document when it is submitted to us for our approval or disapproval. It is proper that we should weigh the benefits of approval against any possible disadvantages or risks which we may run. It is probable that we may have to weigh our hopes against our fears. I have heard it said that Congress ought not to be represented at this meeting because Congress did not participate in writing the treaty. May I say that many Members of the Congress were shown the treaty 10 days ago—a week ago last Monday. I have examined it closely. I have read and reread it from end to end and from the middle towards both ends. I know that probably half the Members of the Senate have had the same opportunity that I have had.

I do not believe it is a proper function of the legislative branch of Government to write treaties. It is our function to approve or to disapprove them after they have been prepared by the executive branch of the Government.

In this case I must say that the executive branch of the Government did seek the approval of three committees of the Congress before finally authorizing the initialing of the treaty a week ago.

My position now is that, unless I am shown more evidence than has appeared to date that the treaty will be disadvantageous to the United States, I expect to support its approval when it comes before the Senate for a vote. I reserve the right to vote as I believe proper when the time comes and after full hearings have been held.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. My speech has expired, too.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if I may say only a word about what has been transpiring, as one Republican Senator I am very pleased that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] have consented to serve on this delegation. I understand fully the reservations which my distinguished and beloved colleagues have made.

I never thought that there was any implication in a Senator's going that he would necessarily vote for a treaty. I have thought that it represented merely a visual demonstration of the fact that in the great affairs which face our Nation the parties grasp hands in terms of fundamental purpose, and certify that this is the way they conceive the destiny of our country to travel the paths of peace; and, as President Eisenhower said in that famous phrase, go the extra mile to seek to attain it.

For myself, I am very pleased that such distinguished members of my party are to attend the signing of the treaty, together with equally distinguished members of the majority party. I do not feel it will compromise their independence of judgment whatever.

I thoroughly agree with the majority leader and with the minority leader in the fine statements they have made today. I agree with the President that it is a necessary demonstration of solidarity of our country in a moment of what could be great achievement and that this will be its visual evidence. I could not think of finer representatives for the Senate of the United States than those who have consented to attend.

(At this point Mr. RIBICOFF took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

TRIBUTES TO JOHN D. RHODES, UPON RETIREMENT AS OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES, U.S. SENATE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would offer brief testimony today to one who, after 44 years of service, is retiring from service to the U.S. Senate.

I often think of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an amazing compendium wherein is recorded actually the unfoldment of this Republic. Everything can be found there—reports which come from the executive branch, allusions to reports from committees, prize-winning essays by youngsters, columns by our pundits and commentators, and everything—but everything—including poetry, whether highly edifying or of the doggerel variety, and great prose. All appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It has often baffled me how readable the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is. Not only is it readable, but also it is authoritative and it is authentic, because everything that happens in the Congress is found there, and it is always in perfect order.

It baffles me when I think of the readability of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because, when all is said and done, I think it will be agreed that Congress is really the home of the split infinitive, where it finds its finest fruition; this is the place where the dangling participle is certainly nourished; this is the home of the broken sentence; and if there were no dashes I do not know what our distinguished Official Reporters would do. This is the home where, with impunity, we can ignore the comma and the period, we can ignore the colon and the semicolon, we can ignore the exclamation mark and the question mark; and yet, somehow, out of this great funnel it all comes out all right, and it is always readable. And when it goes out, in thousands of copies, to be used by high school youngsters in debate or by college debating teams or by that great concourse of people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, including the executive and judicial branches, it is authentic, and, above all else, it is readable; and the reason why it is readable, Mr. President, is to be found in the endeavors of the distinguished group who are the recorders of Senate debate.

I read their names into the RECORD: John D. Rhodes, Gregor Macpherson, Herbert N. Budlong, Charles J. Drescher, Francis J. Attig, Nicholas J. Cinciotta, Julian R. Serles, Jr., Joseph J. Sweeney.

At the top of the list is our old friend, John Rhodes. He has been in the service for 44 years. I think he began when Thomas Riley Marshall, of Indiana, was sitting, Mr. President, where you are sitting, in his capacity as Vice President of the United States.

When John Rhodes first served the Senate, he could look upon John Bankhead, of Alabama, with whose brother, William, I served when he was Speaker of the House of Representatives.

He served the Senate with that great tower of strength, Joe Robinson, from Arkansas.

Hiram Johnson, from California, was then in the Senate; as was Frank Brandegee, from Connecitcut.

Albert Fall, of New Mexico, was then a Member of the Senate.

James Wadsworth, of New York, who then served, after finishing his distinguished service here, went back to his State and became a candidate for and was elected to the House of Representatives, where I made his acquaintance. He became a firm friend of mine.

Lee Overman, from North Carolina, was then in the Senate; as was Warren Gamaliel Harding, from Ohio, who later became President of the United States.

Tom Walsh, the great inquisitor from the State of our distinguished majority leader, Montana, also served.

Tom Gore was here from Oklahoma.

Charles McNary, of Oregon, who once occupied the place I am now privileged to occupy, served in the Senate then.

Boies Penrose, from Pennsylvania, was then serving in the Senate, as I recall.

Morris Sheppard, from Texas, was also then serving.

Reed Smoot, of Utah, then served.

The great Carter Glass, of Virginia, was a Member of the Senate at that time or soon thereafter.

Claude Swanson, of Virginia, also served in the Senate then.

From the State of Washington there was Miles Poindexter.

The great Robert La Follette, the senior, was in the Senate at that time.

And Irvine L. Lenroot, once a court reporter himself, was then a Senator from Wisconsin.

So, Mr. President, John Rhodes has looked upon the Senate for 44 years. He and his former colleague, Mr. James Murphy, as senior reporters, made the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD readable. People like me get their names in the marquee lights, sit under the television cameras, or get into the headlines, for their brief and shining hour, but it could not be that way unless there were humble servants serving this great body, who, in the language of a great statement long ago, "also serve who only stand and wait."

John Rhodes, I have come to know you as "John." I have a deep and abiding affection for you. I am distressed that you had such a long tour in the hospital.

How delighted we are that on this day, as you terminate your service with the U.S. Senate, you can be here and that we can salute you and can place upon you the accolade that you so richly deserve, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it falls to me to join the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] to inform the Senate of the retirement of Mr. John D. Rhodes, who for so long has headed the extraordinary skilled group of shorthand experts and English scholars who report the debates of the Senate.

It is an occasion of both happiness and sadness. I know that all other Senators join with me in wishing John Rhodes many years of busy and satisfying leisure. I know the Senate shares with me a certain sadness in knowing he will no longer be here every day to see to it that our words are properly and accurately recorded for the RECORD.

In any event, I express my personal gratitude and the gratitude of the Senate to John Rhodes, a distinguished public servant who in serving the Senate so well for so long has performed an exceptional service for the Nation.

In conjunction with these remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to me dated July 10, 1963, and a biographic sketch of John Rhodes, prepared by the Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Johnston, be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1963.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: It is with keen regret that I have come to the conclusion that after my 43 years of service as Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate I should retire and turn the duties of the office over to younger members of our corps.

All the members of our corps are dedicated to their service and are loyal to the Senate. Since you have been the majority leader we have endeavored to carry out what you wanted done, even to anticipating your desires at times, and in our close relations you have ever been courteous and cooperative.

We have been careful in the selection of the members of the corps, and I know they will continue to work with you for the smooth running of the Senate and the accomplishment of the public good.

Permit me to thank you for your uniform courtesy to me as I have endeavored to carry on in my office.

Respectfully,

JOHN D. RHODES.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

John D. Rhodes, Official Reporter of Debates of the U.S. Senate, is about to retire, after 44 years of service to the Senate in that capacity.

Mr. Rhodes was born in Jackson, Ohio, on January 19, 1880. His family moved to Washington in 1886, and he was educated in the elementary schools and Eastern High School of the District of Columbia. He then studied law at Columbian University (now George Washington), graduated in 1902, and was admitted to the bar of the District of Columbia and the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States.

As a young man, he diligently studied the art of shorthand writing, which he used in his law classes. About the time he completed his study of shorthand—during his senior year in law school—the principal of the shorthand school passed away, and Mr. Rhodes was asked to assume his duties as teacher. He taught the Pitman shorthand system and trained scores of ambitious students in the intricacies of this method. Shorthand reporting was a highly regarded profession. The financial return was sufficient to warrant its consideraton as a future career, and Mr. Rhodes became intrigued by the opportunity to engage in the practice of the art as his chosen profession, as competent reporters were in great demand.

In 1907 he accepted a position with an established firm in Washington, and was soon actively engaged in reporting committee hearings in the Senate and House of Representatives.

One of the attractions that drew Mr. Rhodes to the reporting field was the opportunity it gave him to meet outstanding political, financial, and industrial figures, and in a fashion participate in the recording of their words for posterity. In his first year of reporting he was requested to report the annual convention of the Shorthand Reporters Association, in Biltmore, N.C. The president of the association that year was the venerable and much-loved Benn Pitman, of Cincinnati, who had popularized Pitman shorthand in the United States. Another event in the life of the young reporter in the same year was when he journeyed to Annapolis to hear a lecture by Mark Twain—possibly his last public appearance on the platform. Governor Warfield, of Maryland, had asked Mr. Clemens to come and lecture in the state house, the proceeds to be donated to some worthy charity. It must have been a great thrill to report the lecture, but, according to Mr. Rhodes, when the speaker responded to a demand for an encore, he lifted his pen and focused his eyes on the speaker. He was charmed by the magnetism of the man who had entertained tens of thousands from the public platform. Mr. Rhodes recalls that Mr. Clemens was attired, as usual in his all white evening clothes, as he contended that black was depressing.

At this time the reporting corps of the House of Representatives and the Senate, particularly the latter, were considered the acme of the profession, and young reporters looked up to the gentlemen who graced those aggregations as the very best in what were recognized as exclusive careers. Little did Mr. Rhodes dream of ever becoming a member of the Senate corps, and much less eventually to become the senior member of the group.

In the early days all the reporters used pens—the stenotype not having been invented. All the reporters in the Senate are pen writers, as it is necessary for them to be able to move rapidly from one position to another, especially when a Senator cannot be heard above the confusion that occasionally prevails.

It is said that when Daniel Webster was a Member of the Senate, and it was announced that he would make an address, Members of the House and others would gradually drift in, so that the Senate would soon be crowded. This has been true, to an extent, in modern days, when orators like Borah, Bailey of North Carolina, or other eloquent speakers have made extensive addresses.

When the Democratic Party won the election in 1912, and Woodrow Wilson became President, one of the first activities of the Congress was revision of the tariff, and Senator Furnifold Simmons, of North Carolina, chairman of the Finance Committee, assigned the responsibility of reporting hearings to Mr. Rhodes. The hearings were exceptionally lengthy and tedious. He was commended for his professional service.

When the U.S. Chamber of Commerce was formed, in 1912, Mr. Rhodes was made the Official Reporter, which position he filled for 18 years, covering conventions in many cities.

During these eventful years, Mr. Rhodes maintained one of the busiest general shorthand and reporting businesses in Washington, handling all classes of reporting. Some of the legal cases were of national interest. Among many was the trial of Edward L. Doheny, involved in the so-called oil cases. Mr. Rhodes also reported most of the cases tried by Frank J. Hogan, a leading Washington trial lawyer.

In 1930 Mr. Rhodes was selected by former Representative Robert W. Bonynge, the American attorney with the Mixed Claims Commission, to report the proceedings incident to the trial of the issues arising out of the "Black Tom" explosion and fire in New York Harbor. The claims amounted to millions of dollars. This assignment necessitated a trip to The Hague, Holland, with a reporting and transcribing staff. Mr. Rhodes was assisted in the reporting by Mr. Gregor Macpherson, now an Official Reporter of the Senate, and Mr. Allister Cochrane, now deceased, then an Official Reporter in the House of Representatives. The party also included Messrs. Joseph and Elmer Koons, now on the staff of the Official Reporters of the Senate, and Mr. Charles Parkman, assistant to the Official Reporters of Debates in the House of Representatives.

In 1918 Mr. Rhodes served as a captain in the U.S. Army, being assigned to the Judge Advocate General Corps.

In 1919, on the death of Mr. E. V. Murphy, who from the time of the Civil War had been an Official Reporter of the Senate, Mr. Rhodes was invited to join the corps. He then began his career in the Senate, which has covered the intervening 44 years. The Senate was then engaged in debating the approval of the Versailles Treaty, which involved the question of our country's becoming a member of the League of Nations. Mr. Rhodes participated in the reporting of the debate on this highly controversial issue. The debate was of a very high order, with leading orators taking part—William E. Borah, Hiram Johnson, Henry Cabot Lodge, and other outstanding public men.

Mr. Rhodes has reported many interesting historical sessions of the Senate, as well as many addresses in the Senate by heads of state of foreign governments, when guests of the Senate—including Winston Churchill, Madam Chiang Kai-shek, Konrad Adenauer, and other figures of world renown.

The most dramatic occasion Mr. Rhodes recalls during his career of reporting was when Gen. Douglas MacArthur returned from the Far East, and was received in a tumultuous meeting of the two Houses of Congress. On this occasion, the general made one of his most eloquent addresses, concluding with the quotation of an excerpt from an old barrack room ballad—"Old soldiers never die; they just fade away." The general gave Mr. Rhodes the text he used on this occasion, and with the general's permission Mr. Rhodes presented it to the Library of Congress.

The Official Reporter has never assumed the role of speechwriting, but he is par excellence a trained grammarian, and he uses his editorial ability with the perfection of a skilled craftsman. In the editing of the Senate debates, for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, his knowledge of words and phrases, selecting the proper punctuation and inserting the correct dates and quotations, if any correction appears necessary, he has no equal.

Mr. Rhodes experiences a feeling of pride, as he looks back over the years, with the full knowledge that he has played an important part in the correct recording of our political history, as it has been made day by day in the U.S. Senate, for almost a half century.

John Rhodes played an important part in instructing the younger members of the corps of Official Reporters of Debates in the ideals and traditions of that office. Those who have had the benefit of his advice and counsel will always remember him with esteem and affection.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, day in and day out, our Official Reporters—John Rhodes, Gregor Macpherson, Herbert Budlong, Charles Drescher, Francis Attig, Nicholas Cinciotta, Julian Serles, and Joseph Sweeney—struggle with our voices, our English, and our restlessness. They not only have to figure out what we are saying and take it down, but they have to be sprinters and acrobats as well.

And the assistants—Elmer Koons, Willard Pruett, Placidino Zagami, Joseph Koons, Wilbur Smith, Thomas Loftus, Perry Smith, and Hilda Clardy—work and sweat over the verbiage which pours over their desks from session to session.

These folks must have to take some sort of indoctrination course, because, in spite of the harassment they are subjected to, they retain their sense of humor and their good dispositions.

Over the years, they become part of the Senate and part of the family, and we feel a personal loss when one of them decides to break away.

When John Rhodes steps down today after more than 43 years of service, the Senate will lose one of the family—one who made us mind our p's and q's and yet found time in the midst of a busy day to lend a helping hand. No tribute could adequately express our deep affection and attachment for this man. We shall miss his warmth and his friendship. I hope that he and Mrs. Rhodes can now find time to do the things they held off doing, and that they will have many more happy years together.

I certainly hope they will return many times to visit Vermont.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing congratulations to my good friend Mr. Rhodes, who has been of service to me and, of course, to all other Members of the Senate, in doing what my good friend from Illinois has so ably stated—helping to correct the RECORD. I congratulate him for the work he has done for the past four decades and for the responsible service he has performed in the Senate.

Many persons have had an opportunity to know and to work with him; and they include many great men. Some of them were mentioned by my good friend from Illinois. He overlooked mentioning a great Senator from my State, Huey Long, under whom Mr. Rhodes also served. All have profited from his untiring and extremely competent efforts to report the proceedings of the Senate.

All of us regret his leaving the Senate, but we are hopeful that in retirement he will find time to do the many things he has been wanting to do but which he has been prevented from doing because he was fully occupied in the business of the Senate.

I conclude by saying I wish him well during the vacation which he really and truly needs.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to our good friend John Rhodes, who is leaving the service of the Senate.

No one in the world can possibly appreciate the services of the reporters of the U.S. Senate as much as do Senators themselves. A moment ago the distinguished minority leader referred to the fact that they must even be acrobats. I sit in complete admiration of the way these gentlemen are able to pick up the colloquy and discourse on the floor, no matter where it occurs. Of course, this is not made easier by the fact that some Senators speak with the roar of a lion and some of them, to use an old phrase, mumble in their beards.

I express my own great appreciation to Mr. Rhodes. Not only do you put in the RECORD all of the punctuation; not only do you correct all the words that we would have misspelled if we had had to write them ourselves; but on many occasions you correct the many inaccuracies of quotations which occur on the floor.

When I think of the fact that I was only 12 years old when you came to the Senate, I am astounded as I reflect on the length of time involved. The service you have rendered to all those who have served their country in the Senate is a fitting accomplishment which deserves the highest recognition of all of us.

I wish you and Mrs. Rhodes many wonderful years and much time to do the things I know you want to do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a truly remarkable man, a fine, kind-hearted, and generous man, and one of the most loyal and dedicated public servants the U.S. Senate or any other parliamentary body ever has known. I refer to John D. Rhodes, who is present with us today, and who has been with us for many years.

It is a remarkable achievement to serve an institution such as the Senate of the United States for 44 years, particularly when one looks back over those years and realizes the great developments and achievements of our country.

Mr. Rhodes has had the opportunity to record many of these achievements, at least as they were articulated, discussed, and debated in the Senate.

He began his service in the Senate during the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

He had the responsibility of reporting the hearings of the Finance Committee in the first term of the administration of President Wilson. One of the first activities of Congress at that time was the revision of the Tariff Act. Our good friend, Mr. Rhodes, was there to report the lengthy and sometimes tedious hearings of the committee investigating the subject. He was at that time commended for his professional services.

He started out being good and able and talented, and he has continued to be so each year, and he has even improved on that exemplary record.

Mr. Rhodes was commended many times by his professional reporting organization for his excellence and for his remarkable talent as an Official Reporter of Debates and of conferences and conventions, including such organizations as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

John Rhodes could write a book of current American history which, I believe, would excite the entire Nation. He has faithfully recorded the utterances of Senators. For example, he recorded the controversial debate over the ratification of the Versailles Treaty, one of the most important debates in the history of Congress. He has recorded such great and illustrious men as Winston Churchill, the talented and respected Madam Chiang Kai-shek, the great Chancellor of the Federal Republic of West Germany, Konrad Adenauer, and a host of others. What a great record this is.

I know how difficult must be the task of an official reporter of debates of the Senate, particularly when he must report a speaker like myself, who emits a torrent of words, rapidly, and all too often without the punctuation that is required for the kind of reading and understanding the speaker wishes his words to have.

I thank my good friend John Rhodes for the many occasions on which he has made a rather incoherent speech look as if it were readable, digestible, and under-

standable. It is a great pleasure at a moment like this to say publicly that one's life has been enriched by sharing the friendship of a man like John Rhodes.

Dear John, we wish you all of the best and hope you will have many more years of happiness and health and the kind of exciting life that you have lived.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as one of the newer Members of the Senate I wish to join in the tributes that are being paid to John Rhodes. He is always gracious, friendly, considerate, and helpful. He has corrected many errors in grammar, as well as other mistakes. I wish for him and Mrs. Rhodes long life and happiness. I hope that in the course of his retirement he will take the time to write a book, because it would be something that all of us and people throughout the Nation would like to read.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I merely wish to add that I appreciate the fine statements that have been made regarding this truly dedicated public servant, our Official Reporter, John D. Rhodes. I wish to call attention to the fact that he was born in Jackson, Ohio. That is something that should not be overlooked at a time when we are saying a fond goodby to this great public servant, who is leaving us today.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to John D. Rhodes, not on any basis of seniority, but because of the great appreciation I have for his service. I remember that on the day I was sworn in as a Member of the Senate, the 29th day of April 1957, John D. Rhodes stopped me in the cloakroom. I do not know how he had found out what church I belonged to, or whether he had asked me. At any rate, he gave me a list of the churches of my denomination in Washington, with the type of membership, and the kind of preaching in each church, so that I could select the church I wished to join. He gave me advice about banks, in case I wanted to open an account in Washington. He also gave me other advice.

He was not only talking as an Official Reporter of Debates in the Senate, but also as one who was interested in the personal problems of others, especially in the problems of newly arrived Members of the Senate. He gave them invaluable information which was available to them from no other source.

Knowing that, and having become acquainted with him, I remember that he would offer a Senator a little advice or exchange a few quips, such as asking me at times how many horses I had shot out from under the Official Reporters.

In talking to him from time to time, especially in those first years, I found that there were not many people connected with the Senate who had a greater jealousy or higher regard for the reputation of the Senate, or probity of expression, or a higher regard for the English language as it is used on the floor of the Senate, or a greater desire to have the language appear in readable form. John Rhodes has been a good guide and counselor to Senators.

We will miss John Rhodes. I say to you, Mr. Rhodes, that I appreciate the advice and assistance that you gave me, not only in the early days, but also in the intervening years I have been in the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate 19 years ago I found Mr. James Murphy as the Chief Reporter, and I found John D. Rhodes as one of his most loyal assistants. I have enjoyed knowing both of those men. Over the years I have discussed with them subjects dealing with the Revolutionary War, and many other matters dealing with our history.

I shall miss John Rhodes, not only as a good reporter, but as a friend with whom I discussed many subjects that were close to my heart. I was glad to find that they were close to his heart also.

I wish him many years of happiness wherever he may go.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I would not let this opportunity pass without expressing my appreciation for having had the opportunity of serving in the Senate when John Rhodes served as one of its outstanding Official Reporters of Debates.

I know that there have been many times when remarks I had made on the Senate floor certainly should not have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without some changes being made in them so as to make them readable, more understandable, and in keeping with the thoughts I had at the time.

Mr. Rhodes not only understood the language I had used, but he also knew the thoughts I had in mind, and changed the language to express my thoughts and my viewpoint. That is something that I always appreciated and for which I have always been indebted to him.

We all wish him well. It has been a pleasure for me to know him as a personal friend. I wish him many years of a well-earned rest in retirement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in commending the outstanding services of Mr. Rhodes to the Senate and the Nation. I wholeheartedly endorse the statement of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], who referred to the individual help Mr. Rhodes has been to him. I can testify to the same effect, by reason of my experience of almost 17 years in the Senate. Often when I have spoken extemporaneously, Mr. Rhodes, in examining my remarks, has made them appear much better than when I first spoke them. If I misquoted Shakespeare or someone else, the misquotations were always corrected.

It is with deep sincerity that I commend the devoted services of this loyal citizen who is an outstanding Senate reporter. I regret to see him leave the Senate because, frankly, with all due deference to those who will succeed him, I shall have to be a little more cautious about what I say on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to say a few words about the life and service of Mr. John Rhodes.

I have known him, and have profited from his advice and understanding, since I came to the Senate in 1933. John Rhodes' service to the Senate exceeds in length that of any Member presently sitting in this body, including that of our distinguished President pro tempore.

His grasp of Senate history and tradition is profound. His willingness to share his knowledge and judgment has been helpful to many hundreds of Senators, including the Senator from Georgia, for more than four decades.

Men such as James Murphy, his immediate predecessor in the office of Official Reporter, and John Rhodes form indispensable links in the chain of American parliamentary history. Gentlemen and scholars, they fulfill the highest standards of public service.

I commend Mr. Rhodes for his long service to his country. I join my colleagues in wishing him a blessed and happy retirement. We shall miss him, and we honor him for his efforts in the Senate's behalf.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to join in all the fine remarks and tributes that have been paid this morning to our most excellent Chief Reporter, Hon. John D. Rhodes, who is going on a leave of absence for a well-deserved and deeply earned rest after many years of outstanding and most valuable service.

He has been in the Senate much longer than I have. I remember him most fondly and favorably for the fine work he did day and night through the long months. When he became the Chief Reporter he discharged his added duties and responsibilities with great distinction. He earned, and richly deserves, the respect and admiration of the entire membership of the Senate, as well as of his associates, and also the respect of all who know him. Long years hence his fine services will be remembered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to extend my congratulations and best wishes to John Rhodes, who has served us so magnificently, and to wish him a very long and happy life in the enjoyment of his retirement.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is with mixed feelings that all of us here in the Senate learned of the retirement of John Rhodes. John Rhodes has been one of the unsung heroes of the American Government. Over my 11 years in the Senate, I can recall him working assiduously, particularly during late evening sessions and around-the-clock sessions. John Rhodes, along with those who are younger in the corps of Official Reporters, never stopped completing his own official labors, so that Senators, and the country at large, would know what transpired in this Chamber.

On many occasions I have had opportunity to enjoy the reminiscences of John. One of my illustrious predecessors from California was the late Senator Hiram Johnson. Apparently Hiram Johnson would take delight in speaking with great rapidity in the Senate and using words more or less for the purpose of seeing whether or not the Reporters of Debates were sufficiently educated, intelligent, and astute to follow what he was saying. On one of those occasions, Senator Johnson used the word "tintinnabulating." Later he asked John

whether he had been able to transcribe it properly. John said he had. Mr. President, he was able to do so, because he was one of the excellent, outstanding reporters in this country.

A sweet, affable friend of all of us, he will take with him in retirement the love and affection of those of us in the Senate, those who work for the Senate, and Members of the Senate, as he goes into retirement. He will take with him also the fond prayers that he may have many years of happiness and health in his retirement.

We do not in any sense wish to lose his friendship in his retirement. We hope, quite to the contrary, that John will be with us from time to time to renew the friendship which we treasure, and which we know he does.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] I ask unanimous consent that the testimonials delivered to John Rhodes on the Senate floor today be printed as a Senate document, and that other Senators who may wish to insert remarks on the subject may be permitted to do so.

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 653. A bill to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz. and Nev., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 380).

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

S. 27. A bill to provide for establishment of the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 381).

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 1321. A bill to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States (Rept. No. 382).

AUTHORITY TO REPORT INDIVIDUAL AND MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to submit individual and minority views during the adjournment of the Senate on Senate bill 1321, which is known as the Domestic National Service Corps bill.

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

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself and Mr. PROXMIRE):

S. 1968. A bill to prohibit transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1969. A bill for the relief of Carmencita Montalvo; and

S. 1970. A bill for the relief of Adela Helguera Baldor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE OF ARTICLES TO OR FROM THE UNITED STATES ABOARD CERTAIN FOREIGN VESSELS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and request that it be appropriately referred. The bill, if adopted, will prohibit transportation in interstate commerce or foreign commerce to or from the United States aboard vessels of any foreign country which allows vessels sailing under the flag of the country to be used, on or after the date of the enactment of this act, in trade or commerce with Cuba.

The Guantanamo Bay deliveries will not be affected by the bill. In simple words, any foreign vessel that either delivered or carried out of Cuba any type of cargo would be prohibited from carrying into or out of the ports of the United States cargoes of this Nation or any other nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1968) to prohibit transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself and Mr. PROXMIRE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TOWER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1321) to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTE BETWEEN CERTAIN CARRIERS BY RAILWAY AND CERTAIN OF THEIR EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, for myself, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, and ask for its appropriate reference.

This amendment is similar to House Joint Resolution 579, relating to the railroad labor dispute, introduced in the House of Representatives on July 29, 1963, by Congressman STAGGERS, of West Virginia—with two exceptions:

First, Representative STAGGERS' bill has no limit on the time that the Special Joint Emergency Committee shall continue. My bill provides that this special committee shall report not later than 60 days.

Second, my amendment contains a minor addition at the end of the last section which discharges the committee when it has finally reported, unless sooner discharged by the Congress.

As Senators know, the bill introduced in the House, and supported by the railroad brotherhoods and the AFL–CIO, asks for additional time to engage in collective bargaining with the railroad carriers. I am submitting this amendment in the nature of a substitute because I believe it will be impossible for us to resolve the questions involved in this controversy with any reasonable certainty within the time limits that we now have.

The railroad brotherhoods contend that the carriers have never bargained in good faith, that the carriers have constantly relied upon the assumption that this administration would not permit a strike, and that eventually the Congress would have to settle this matter. The carriers assert that they have bargained in good faith. It is very difficult for a congressional committee to determine that question. This amendment will give us a fair shot at it.

The carriers contend that they are in hard shape financially. Mr. Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, contends the opposite, with a few notable exceptions.

The carriers assert that there is featherbedding going on in the railroads of upwards of 32,000 jobs, involving a cost to them of some $600 million a year that could very well be eliminated. The unions contend that, although some jobs could be eliminated, the carriers are trying to cut too deep. We are having difficulty in determining how many men are actually surplus to the needs of the railroads.

We have a basic question referred to in the President's message with respect to whether employees are treated fairly when hit by technological advances. The President suggested a study of this problem, but the problem is with us now. We have it on the railroads. Whatever our committee does will in one way or another set a precedent for what may follow. It seems to me that a closer familiarity given by 60 days of watching the collective bargaining process as provided in my amendment will better qualify the Congress to act intelligently on this problem.

If after 60 days, after having done the best we could, we do not come up with

a solution to this problem—then it will be necessary for us to move to compulsion of one form or another against either the carriers or the unions in order to prevent a strike that would have a disastrous effect on the economy of this country. I hope that this will not be necessary. In any case, after as long as this controversy has gone on, another 30 or 60 days—the carriers have already agreed to 30 days—will, I believe, enable the Congress to act with better information and more intelligently in this matter—if in the interim we cannot get the parties together. It will help, too, if these parties have to look down the barrel of a gun held by a congressional committee while they are actually in the collective bargaining process.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the amendment in the nature of a substitute that I am now submitting. I ask unanimous consent also that it lie on the desk for a period of 2 days for cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Commerce; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, submitted by Mr. ENGLE, is as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That until the expiration of this joint resolution or superseding action by Congress on the subject matter thereof no carrier which served the notices of November 2, 1959, and no labor organization which received such notices or served the labor organization notices of September 7, 1960, shall make any change, except by agreement, in rates of pay, rules, or working conditions encompassed by any of such notices, or engage in any strike or lockout over any dispute arising from any of such notices. Any action heretofore taken which would be prohibited by the foregoing sentence shall be forthwith rescinded and the status existing immediately prior to such action restored.

"SEC. 2. The parties to the disputes arising from the aforesaid notices shall immediately resume collective bargaining with respect thereto and shall exert every reasonable effort to resolve such disputes by agreement. The Secretary of Labor and the National Mediation Board are hereby directed to give all reasonable assistance to the parties and to engage in mediatory action directed promoting such agreement.

"SEC. 3. There is hereby established a Special Joint Emergency Railroad Committee of the Congress to consist of five Members of the House of Representatives to be designated by the Speaker of the House and five Members of the Senate to be designated by the President of the Senate. Within ten days from the enactment of this joint resolution, and thereafter at intervals of not more than ten days, the Secretary of Labor and the National Mediation Board shall report to the Special Joint Emergency Railroad Committee the progress of the negotiations directed by section 2 hereof. If at any time the Special Joint Emergency Railroad Committee finds that the procedures herein provided afford no prospect of resolution of the disputes, it shall so report to the Congress together with recommendations for further action by the Congress, provided, however, that the Special Joint Emergency Railroad Committee shall make a final report to the Congress no more than sixty days from the enactment of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 4. The obligations imposed by this joint resolution shall be enforcible through appropriate orders of the United States district courts upon suit by the Attorney General.

"SEC. 5. This joint resolution shall expire when all disputes covered thereby are disposed of by agreement of the parties thereto, or when the Special Joint Emergency Railroad Committee reports to the Congress as provided in Section 3 hereof."

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 24, 1963, the names of Mr. BAYH, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. FONG, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RIBICOFF, and Mr. SCOTT were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1932) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators) on July 24, 1963.

NOTICE OF ADDITIONAL HEARINGS ON SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to announce additional hearings on S. 298, a bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, in order to receive testimony regarding possible self-dealing by SBIC's.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m., Tuesday, August 6, 1963, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on this matter are requested to notify Mr. Reginald W. Barnes, Assistant Counsel, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

INTERNATIONAL OLYMPICS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted to learn that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has voted to report to the Senate my resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 67, extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States.

The approval of the Foreign Relations Committee and the official Government support that the Department of State has expressed are extremely gratifying. A great deal of work has already been done by the Lake Placid Organizing Committee to prepare their formal application, which is indeed a most impressive document.

There is no doubt that Lake Placid offers unique facilities for winter Olympics, some of them dating back to 1932, when the winter Olympics were held there. Others are new and very modern, and plans are underway now for the construction of an additional jumping hill and another downhill course. I was most impressed by all of the fine facilities, particularly the bobsled run. In fact, I was so enthusiastic that someone later warned me that I might be invited to ride down it one day—an invitation that, I must confess, made me a little nervous, as I do not consider myself Olympic caliber.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will move quickly to give its approval to this joint resolution, for it will undoubtedly add force to the Lake Placid invitation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks an article by Ronald MacKenzie, published in the Bulletin of the International Ski Federation. The article outlines, even more enthusiastically than I can, the merits of Lake Placid.

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

LAKE PLACID, N.Y., U.S.A., 1968 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES

(By Ronald MacKenzie)

In the month of May 1963, Lake Placid's mayor, Robert Peacock, received from the U.S. Olympic Committee an invitation to bid for the 1968 winter Olympic games. The proposal was accepted and the right to bid was won at Chicago in October when this Northeastern winter sports village was selected to represent the United States in bidding for the 10th winter Olympic games.

In 1932 when the third winter Olympic games were held at Lake Placid, the skiing consisted of nordic events only. Alpine events had not yet become part of the program. However, all facilities constructed at that time have been, and are, in constant use in the year-round sports program of the Adirondack Mountain villages. As this is being written the summer ice skating season is in progress in the Olympic Arena. And preparations are being made for the 17th annual summer ski jumping competition. Participants this year will include United States and Canadian Olympic team members.

The 1950 FIS approved cross-country trail system with start and finish elevations of 1,860 feet still exist and are in use during winter. Many improvements are planned for these courses which were laid in deep forested areas. Reserve tracks are planned at 4,000 feet on Whiteface Mountain.

The 70 meter Intervale Olympic jumping hill, also FIS approved is available. It has press and spectator stands to accommodate 10,000 people. These facilities now in constant use will be utilized for the combined skiing events on the Nordic program. This hill is located directly on the main New York to Lake Placid highway, Route 73. Present plans call for the construction of an 85-90 meter jumping hill in the center of the village. This hill will be constructed to meet FIS standards. Mr. Heini Klopfer is expected to inspect the plans for this hill during the fall of 1963, on a visit to Lake Placid.

The Whiteface Mountain ski area is new construction, begun 5 years ago and not yet

complete. During the planning and construction of this development FIS standards were observed. As a result all specifications for the Alpine ski events can be met or exceeded on the present area now in daily winter use, with the exception of the men's downhill course. The addition of one new ski lift to the higher slopes of the mountain will open this area and allow descents of over 3,000 vertical feet. It is from this area of the mountain that the men's downhill course will be prepared. This upper mountain section has a unique feature, a paved motor highway directly to it which can be opened for use in winter. This can be a valuable asset in getting press, TV, and radio people, as well as spectators up the mountain with no interference with competitors. All trails now in use are turf covered, free of stones and stumps. Whiteface is located directly on the main Montreal to Lake Placid highway, Route 86.

The Whiteface Mountain ski area, owned and operated by the Adirondack Mountain Authority, is an agency of the State of New York. President Marc Hodler is expected in Lake Placid in late summer to personally inspect these Alpine ski facilities.

Lake Placid, a community of 3,000 inhabitants, over the years has developed the know-how and the qualified personnel to stage many international events. The area comprising the village of Lake Placid and the town of North Elba is located within the Adirondack Forest Preserve, the largest wilderness area in the United States. Yet the community is readily accessible via two railroads, major motor highways, and jet air service to its own airport. Two hours by car from the Canadian metropolis of Montreal, a junction point for the international airlines.

Playing host to the sports minded vacationer is Lake Placid's only industry. As a result housing facilities are both excellent and numerous. Accommodation for 10,000 can be found in the immediate area and for 25,000 more in communities within a 50-mile radius. Whiteface Mountain is 9 miles from the village of Lake Placid where the Olympic village would be constructed on a 50-acre tract that would be out of bounds for all spectators and unauthorized personnel. In a message to the U.S. Olympic Committee, Nelson Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, said, "Rest assured that if the 1968 Winter Olympic Games are awarded to Lake Placid, the State of New York will do everything possible to assure proper facilities for conducting this great international sporting event."

RONALD MACKENZIE,
Secretary, Provisional Olympic Organizing Committee, 1968 Winter Olympic Games.
JULY 3, 1963.

RECIPROCITY IN UNITED STATES-CANADIAN RELATIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the relationship between the United States and Canada has for years stood out as one of the best examples of good neighborliness in the world. Mutual good will and cooperation are keystones of continental solidarity.

Yet, there are—and always will be—areas of dispute and difference between the two nations, sources of friction that must be weighed and negotiated between the two countries. These differences should be discussed and, if possible, ironed out through friendly negotiations.

It was in this spirit of accommodation that the U.S. Government agreed to exempt Canadian bonds from the proposal for taxation of foreign securities.

Nevertheless, it is still appropriate to ask what concessions have been made to the United States in return. International finance is and should be a two-way street. Concessions to Canada by the United States should certainly be accompanied by Canadian willingness to assist the United States in a comparable way.

There are two particular points which I have in mind and which have long been a source of concern to me. I believe they should be considered as a reasonable Canadian quid pro quo for the U.S. concession with regard to the taxing of securities.

First, the United States admits Canadian bread duty-free into this country.

Canada maintains a duty of 7½ percent ad valorem on U.S. bread. Over the past 5 years, imports of Canadian bread have more than doubled. In the Buffalo area, they have increased nearly tenfold since 1957. Not only does the unilateral Canadian tariff discourage U.S. sales of bread to Canada, it also is causing serious unemployment among bakery workers in the affected areas. Buffalo is not the only area. If the Canadians could be persuaded to eliminate this tariff, it would improve U.S. trade possibilities in this field and add to employment opportunities in the United States.

Second, the Canadian Government in June 1962 lowered the amount of duty-free goods which a Canadian citizen could bring into Canada from the United States from $100 to $25. This was represented as an emergency measure to halt the outflow of Canadian gold. Its effect has been sharply to reduce Canadian purchases in the United States. Surely, in view of the improved Canadian position and the mounting U.S. balance-of-payments problem, a reconsideration of this measure by the Canadian Government would be in order. Yet, in the most recent letter received from the Department of State, I was informed that the Canadian position had not changed.

I am, of course, aware that overall U.S. sales to Canada exceed Canadian sales to the United States by a substantial amount. Nevertheless, in view of the unique dispensation which Canada has been offered by our Government, it would surely not be inappropriate to expect something from Canada in return. I sincerely hope that our Government can be as responsive to the hardships placed on American workers and business by Canadian restrictions as it has been to the difficulties which Canada might have suffered under the security taxation proposal.

With a view toward bringing this issue specifically to the attention of the U.S. officials who negotiated with Canada on the security taxation issue, and encouraging more vigorous and effective representations by the U.S. Government, I have written to Secretary of the Treasury Dillon and Under Secretary of State Ball. I have asked for a report on actions taken to date on these two points and have urged serious consideration of whatever measures may be necessary to bring these issues directly to the attention of top Canadian officials.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, the text of one letter from the Department of State on the question of bread duties and certain relevant statistics, and two letters on the subject of raising the $25 duty-free allowance for Canadian tourists.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 13, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I want to thank you for your letter of June 3, 1963, concerning the importation of bread from Canada.

The Department does not consider that the Canadian export situation is one which warrants changing the present customs treatment for breads under the U.S. tariff. Historically, the Congress provided for the duty-free entry of bread in the Tariff Acts of 1913, 1922, and 1930. The United States bound the duty-free status of bread as a trade agreement concession to Norway in exchange for concessions of importance to U.S. exports. The United States also received benefits of concessions granted by Canada and Norway to the United States. Should action be taken which would restrict imports, the United States would be encouraging other countries to take similar action on other products to the detriment of U.S. exports.

U.S. production of bread in 1962 had an estimated value of approximately $2,500 million. In the same year imports were valued at $1.5 million of which 73 percent came from Canada. According to the trade, the imports from Canada are to a large extent concentrated in certain localities along the United States-Canadian border, although in no metropolitan center does the import trade amount to over 2 percent of the particular area's production.

The Department notes that imports of bread are a part of an exceptionally high level of trade between the United States and Canada. Canada is our largest export market buying vastly more from us than it sells to us. In 1962 out of a bilateral trade with Canada of C$7.9 billion, the United States sold Canada nearly C$700 million more than we purchased. In fact, Canada has had a similarly massive trade deficit with the United States over the last 10 years. In 1962 we had a current account balance with Canada which was C$1,116 million in our favor (this includes travel expenditures, interest and dividends, and freight and shipping).

It is our hope, of course, that trade and other business with Canada will be on a two-way basis. We want Canada to be an expanding market for our American exports and this implies that we should be willing to give Canada an increasing opportunity to sell to us. While not indifferent to the welfare of any individual American enterprise, the Department believes that in the absence of adequate justification it would be unwise to propose restrictive tariff action to deal with highly localized situations which would be prejudicial to other American enterprises and to the American economy as a whole.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

TABLE 1.—*Bread, yeast-leavened, other than hard crisp rye: U.S. imports for consumption by principal sources, 1957–62*

[Foreign value]

Country	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961 [1]	1962 [1]
Canada	$519,807	$590,562	$639,693	$778,215	$837,863	$1,081,064
Italy	30,161	47,778	76,510	61,200	47,762	73,425
Sweden	460			97,090	165,895	48,504
All other	7,306	4,241	2,616	19,700	[2] 55,120	[3] 37,987
Total	557,734	642,581	718,819	956,205	1,106,640	1,240,980

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Includes $21,973 imported from Finland, $14,787 from West Germany, $8,823 from the United Kingdom, and $7,586 from Norway.
[3] Includes $9,241 imported from West Germany and $7,945 from Finland.

NOTE.—The figures in this table understate actual imports as all informal entries of imports valued at not more than $250 each, and formal entries less than $250 each, in 1957, and less than $100 each in 1958–62, have not been fully tabulated in import statistics. The statistical sampling of such importations indicates that the value of such imports may have accounted for as much as 47 percent of the total value of the imports in 1957 of the articles covered by this table. It is estimated that this percentage also applies to imports of these articles since 1957.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

TABLE 2.—*Bread, yeast-leavened, other than hard crisp rye: U.S. imports for consumption from Canada, by customs districts, 1957–62*

Customs districts	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961 [1]	1962 [1]
	Quantity (thousand pounds)					
Michigan	3,131	2,967	2,395	2,334	3,125	5,677
Vermont	2,298	3,208	4,028	4,239	4,248	3,932
Buffalo	160	59	50	688	980	1,274
St. Lawrence	37	48	166	177	153	159
Chicago	22					29
Maine and New Hampshire	6	6	2	6		1
Total	5,654	6,288	6,641	7,444	8,507	11,072
	Foreign value					
Michigan	$280,914	$273,397	$222,762	$202,405	$275,507	$513,147
Vermont	205,740	293,750	363,446	430,709	390,650	369,499
Buffalo	14,732	5,079	4,845	63,563	87,804	112,113
St. Lawrence	15,819	17,436	47,637	80,638	83,902	83,457
Chicago	1,702					2,570
Maine and New Hampshire	900	900	1,003	900		278
Total	519,807	590,562	639,693	778,215	837,863	1,081,064

[1] Preliminary.

NOTE.—The figures in this table understate actual imports as all informal entries of imports valued at not more than $250 each, and formal entries less than $250 each in 1957, and formal entries less than $100 in 1958–62 have not been fully tabulated in import statistics. The statistical sampling of such importations indicates that the value of such imports may have accounted for as much as 47 percent of the total value of the imports in 1957 of the articles covered by this table. It is estimated that this percentage also applies to imports of these articles since 1957.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 22, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I refer to your communication of August 22, 1962, and my interim reply of August 29, concerning a letter from Mr. Walter Van Vranken, retail consultant to the Glens Falls Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Van Vranken expresses concern as to the effects on New York retail business of the Canadian action limiting the duty-free allowance permitted Canadian residents on foreign purchases. It is regretted that this reply has been delayed.

The Canadian Government determined in late June 1962 to limit the duty-free allowance because it believed the cost of the then existing exemption, in terms of foreign exchange, was higher than Canada could afford in the circumstances. The action was one of several temporary measures designed to deal with a Canadian financial and balance-of-payments crisis. While the Government limited the duty-free allowance, a Canadian tourist is still able to spend any amount he desires abroad for merchandise provided he pays the Canadian import duty, if any applies, when the goods are brought into Canada. In June, when the Canadian Government changed the tourist exemption, it was indicated that no controls would be imposed over the amount of money Canadians would be permitted to spend abroad.

The United States has a strong interest in the financial stability of Canada and in the circumstances the Department recognizes the temporary, emergency nature of the Canadian Government's action. The United States, in August 1961, similarly made a substantial reduction in the duty-free allowance accorded to U.S. residents on foreign purchases. The Department anticipates that the Canadian Government will review the status of the tourist exemption once the financial situation in Canada has been fully corrected.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 12, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: Thank you for your letter of April 2, 1963, in which you inquire concerning the present status of the situation with regard to the duty-free allowance accorded by Canada for purchases made abroad by Canadian travelers. You enclosed a letter from Walter Van Vranken, retail consultant, Glens Falls Chamber of Commerce, who is concerned regarding the effect of the reduced Canadian allowance upon retail trade in Glens Falls.

There has been a considerable improvement in the Canadian balance-of-payments situation over the past several months. This has already led the Government to remove the surcharges on imports that were imposed at about the same time that the duty-free allowance was reduced. The latter allowance remains at $25 per person, however.

Should the Canadian balance-of-payments position continue to improve, it is to be hoped that the allowance will be returned to the level that existed prior to June 1962. It may be noted, however, that, regardless of the fact that the U.S. duty-free allowance for travelers is four times greater than the Canadian, total trade between the two countries continues to result in a substantial deficit for Canada.

The letter from Mr. Van Vranken is returned herewith. If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

A "STANDSTILL" CONGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, what I am about to say is bound to be said, because I think it very properly affects every member of the minority. Therefore, I should like to take a few moments to discuss where we stand as tomorrow we begin the eighth month of this session of Congress.

For some time, I have been troubled about the way this session has been going and the way it may affect the country's view of the Congress. I believe what has happened here in the last 7 months has troubled many Americans about the ability of the Congress to hold up its end as the great lawmaking body in our Federal system of checks and balances. I have had this confirmed to me time and again in every part of my own State of New York, and I have little doubt that other Members have run into the same feeling in their States.

I speak today only with the desire to see ourselves, as in a mirror, so that by having a clearer vision of the meaning of what we do or fail to do here, we may assess the responsibility of the majority and minority and do something about it before time literally runs out on us this year.

It seems to me that on the basis of the record to date, we are assigning ourselves a unique niche in history as the biggest and longest running slow-motion show to hit Washington in years. And I believe we are in grave danger of seeing ourselves dubbed the "standstill" Congress, or worse.

We all remember that President Truman, in the heat of the 1948 presidential election, called the Republican 80th Congress the "do-nothing Congress." The present Congress, on the basis of its 7-month record, deserves that description far more than the 80th Congress ever did.

In the first 7 months of the 80th Congress—1947—Congress accomplished the following:

It approved, after extended floor debate, millions in aid to Greece and Turkey, giving congressional support to the first mutual security doctrine.

It approved the first effort after World War II at unification of the Armed Forces.

It approved $350 million in foreign aid.

It approved the Taft-Hartley Labor-Management Act, over the President's veto.

It passed a constitutional amendment limiting the President to two terms of office.

It approved a new procedure for presidential succession.

It approved popular election of the Governor of Puerto Rico.

The Senate ratified peace treaties with Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

In those 7 months, the 80th Congress also approved United Nations site agreements; reincorporation of the Inter-American Institute, American participation in the International Children's Fund, and in the International Refugee Organization; extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation; establishment of a sugar quota system, extension of rent controls and wartime excise taxes; establishment of priorities for critical materials in short supply; extension of the school lunch program, and a freeze on social security taxes.

No matter what one may think of these bills or the many other minor measures passed in the first half of 1947—I was against some of them and for some of them—one must admit that there was plenty of activity on the floor of the House and Senate.

Now let us contrast that record with that of the first 7 months of the present Congress:

This Congress has enacted into law, as of today, only four measures which could conceivably be called major legislation: Extension of corporate and excise taxes; temporarily fixing the national debt limit, the voluntary feed-grains acreage diversion program; and the draft extension.

I think it must be perfectly clear to everyone that if the 80th Congress was called a do nothing Congress, this 88th Congress is on the way toward establishing itself as a "standstill" Congress—for although we are confronted with some of the most crucial domestic and international issues of our times, we have not as yet really come to grips with any of them.

I am not advocating a hasty legislative process. The record of the 80th Congress was not a record of shotgun legislation. Each of the measures I have cited was enacted after full and sometimes extended debate.

If further documentation is necessary, I point out in the 87th Congress—1961—Congress had by this time passed the depressed areas law, minimum wage increase, temporary unemployment benefits, social security extension, aid to dependent children, Sugar Act extension, feed-grains program, reorganization act, Judgeships Act, Highway Financing Act, Water Pollution Act, tax extension, and omnibus housing law, and the Senate had approved the OECD treaty.

While the meager record of this 88th Congress is bad enough, its sad performance is dramatized even more by what has not been passed.

The tax program which the President sent up on January 24 is still in the House committee, after more than 6 months, while the Senate Finance Committee is yet to hold hearings on it.

Education bills are foundering in both Houses; even a higher education bill, which passed both Houses last year, only to fail in conference, has yet to reach the floor of either the House or the Senate.

Health care insurance for the aging has become the year's forgotten issue, with hardly a glimmer of hope for even committee action this session.

Youth employment opportunities, national wilderness, and mass transportation bills have passed the Senate, and are languishing in the other body. The medical school bill has passed the House, and is languishing in the Senate.

The foreign aid authorization bill has not been considered in either House.

There will be those who will alternately point with pride to the urgency now being given civil rights legislation—the most burning domestic issue of our time—or attribute to it our slow pace. But in assessing how the country regards us, let us not forget that although our legislative machinery is reacting with uncommon dispatch to the administration's civil rights package, which was sent to Congress on June 19, those committees could have started hearings on civil rights legislation which had been introduced in both Houses months earlier. Indeed, a group of Senate Republicans as early as March 28 introduced the most comprehensive civil rights legislation in history—at the very time when the signs of Negro unrest were growing more ominous—and sought to get hearings, but in most cases even departmental reports were not received.

Mr. President, we have a crisis in the railroad industry, the result of a failure to anticipate the need for means to deal with national emergency strikes where all settlement efforts have failed; and the failure also to deal with the vital national problem of automation.

We have an international balance-of-payments crisis—which was obvious for months, but for which only recently we received a program; and although the signs of this dollar crisis have been up in neon lights for months, a program took months even to appear.

We have a persistent and burdensome problem of endemic unemployment, which can only grow worse by our failure to act.

Last week the President sent us an immigration message; and although his proposals were similar to reform proposals of President Eisenhower and of President Truman, and have been discussed and debated for years, everyone here wonders whether there is even a prayer that they will get out of committee, let alone reach the Senate floor.

I submit that this is a sorry record. It is a sad spectacle to see the Senate of the United States, in the face of the legislative burdens facing us, and at this time of the year, embarrassed by the real lack of business on the Senate calendar and forced often to hold half-time, every-other-day sessions—and I agree that there is no use in meetings if there is no business on the calendar.

The times cry for action. By seemingly listless behavior here, crisis is being permitted to pile upon crisis. Last year, it was an economic crisis; last month, a civil-rights crisis; last week, a railroad crisis; today, a test ban treaty is before us.

We can do something about it. In the first place, Members of Congress can be aroused to activate themselves to bring some major matters to a conclusion, if for no other reason than a common interest in the prestige and standing of the Congress with the people. The President can be aroused to demand of the majority party, which controls the committees and the Congress, and of which he is the leader, definitive and completed action, with a drumfire of leadership at least equal to the number, fervor, and intensity of his messages. The public can be aroused to demand of legislators the jobs that ought to be done—and done expeditiously.

Our leaders can be aroused. We all know that there are ways in which even incomplete committee action need not stymie us. There is the amendment process on the floor of the Senate, unrestricted by the rule of germaneness; there are calendar Wednesdays, motions to suspend the rule on Mondays, and discharge petitions in the other body. We also know that if rules which tie us up need to be amended—rules such as the prohibition against holding committee meetings while the Senate or House is in session—or if there is a need to ameliorate the rigors of the Rules Committee in the other body, then determined leadership can make changes here, too; and it is high time we heard the voice of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] on that score.

The deliberative process was not meant to be an exercise in continuous futility. But that is precisely what the record of the past 7 months has demonstrated. Congress is in grave danger of seriously jeopardizing its repute with the American people; and with each passing day of legislative inaction, that image is growing worse.

This is a problem for all of us. And I speak today in the hope that my view will be taken up by others and that a new will may seize the Congress, so it will follow the pace demanded by the serious condition of the Nation and its affairs, not the pace of those who think it is of particular interest to slow us up.

Mr. President, I conclude as follows: It is important to point out that the President and his party cannot shun the responsibility for this "standstill" legislative logjam. Everyone knows the Democratic Party has large majorities in both Houses of Congress; they control the committees and the legislative priorities. If that party finds itself so much in conflict with itself that it cannot lead effectively, then the country should know that, too.

But in the final analysis, the responsibility is on all of us to get this body and this Nation off dead center, or time—and history—will be passing us by.

I think I enjoy in this body a reputation for as little partisanship as does almost any other Member; and I make this statement today only in the hope that it will help us and in the hope that others may become conscious of what is happening to the Congress in the eyes of the country. In my opinion, this is the most serious matter of all.

I am not finding fault with anyone; I find no fault with the President, the leaders, or anyone else. As I said when I began, I am only trying to lay before the Senate, as in a mirror, exactly what the country sees, in the expectation that, being wise and patriotic public servants, we shall do something about this situation, as I know we can, and as I hope we will.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from New York very kindly sent to me, in advance, a copy of the speech he has just made, and I had an opportunity to read it briefly prior to the convening of the session today.

What he has said about the 80th Congress is not quite correct, for in my opinion it was not a "do nothing" Congress, as it has been labeled, because it accomplished certain things in the field of foreign affairs, as the Senator from New York has pointed out.

But I find fault with the mirror he has held up—in which I think he sees himself, not the Senate as a whole.

As to the tax program, there is nothing this body can do until the House Ways and Means Committee and the House itself take action on such legislation.

So far as education bills are concerned, I do not notice in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, overwhelming Republican support to report the education bills which are being considered there.

Insofar as health legislation is concerned, I must say in all fairness that in my opinion there is no possibility that a health-care bill will be passed this year; but I hope most sincerely that it will be passed next year—not for political purposes, but because it is long overdue and is a necessity for our elder citizens, who are becoming more numerous and are finding life in retirement more expensive to themselves and more burdensome to their children.

Insofar as the youth opportunities bill, the national wilderness bill, and the mass transportation bill are concerned, as the Senator from New York has indicated, they are, of course, out of the hands of this body, because the Senate has already acted on them and has passed them.

Insofar as the medical-school bill is concerned, it has passed the House; and I understand that in the near future the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare intends to report a bill having to do with aid to medical schools and dental schools.

The foreign aid authorization bill is held up in both Houses; but every year, under both Republican and Democratic administrations that measure is usually sent down a little late; and, because of that, it is always one of the last items to be considered.

Insofar as civil-rights legislation is concerned, at the present time three Senate committees are considering such legislation; and in those three committees we would appreciate Republican help in reporting such measures, so they can be brought to the floor of the Senate for consideration.

The railroad crisis has been mentioned. It was placed in the laps of the Senate and the House a week ago last Tuesday; and in the intervening period the committees have been considering most important legislation in this field.

Insofar as the dollar outflow is concerned, it is something which has plagued both the Eisenhower administration and the Kennedy administration. Both of them, to the best of their ability, tried to curb the outflow of this vital commodity. All of us know what the situation is.

The Senator from New York said:

> We have a persistent and burdensome problem of endemic unemployment, which can only grow worse by our failure to act.

This administration has acted on it, Mr. President, and we are trying to do something about the problem of unemployment. While unemployment is in the vicinity of 5.9 percent of the population, I point out that in our country today approximately 3.3 million people are moonlighting—in other words, they are holding down two jobs—and that situation contributes to the unemployment problem as well.

The Senator said:

> The times cry for action. By seemingly listless behavior here, crisis is being permitted to pile upon crisis. Last year, it was an economic crisis. Last month, a civil rights crisis. Last week, a railroad crisis. Today, a test ban treaty is before us.

So far as Senate committees are concerned, they are living up to their full responsibilities. They are trying, to the best of their ability, to solve the problems before them. Personally I am very proud of their activities and the way they have tackled the problems which confront them.

The Senator said further:

> The President can be aroused to demand of the majority party, which controls the committees and the Congress and of which he is the leader, definitive and completed action with a drumfire of leadership at least equal to the number, fervor and intensity of his messages.

I hope the Senator does not mean that every time a message is sent to the Congress, the President should go on the radio and TV to ask the people to get behind his program, and urge the Senate to do likewise. He does the best he can within the limits of his authority. Despite reports to the contrary, the President of the United States does not have the authority or the power which some people, members of the press, and other media of communication, seem to indicate that he has. He is doing the very best he can to promote programs which will be of benefit to the people as a whole.

Then the Senator talked about reform in the Senate. I believe he knows that attempts have been made to bring about reforms having to do with a dilution of the two-thirds rule down to a three-fifths proposal. He knows that bills have been introduced by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and other Senators to apply the rule of germaneness. He knows that discharge petitions are of little value in this body because of the difficulty in obtaining the required number of signatures. There are other matters. However, I agree with the Senator that there should be a prohibition against one Senator being able, by denying unanimous consent, to hold up meetings of committees while the Senate is in session.

The Senator also referred to the deliberative process as in effect, or at least by implication, an exercise in continuous futility. I do not believe that the deliberative process can be so described. There can be some reforms. But I believe that in due time the Senate, in its wisdom, and deliberately, will see that the necessary reforms are put into operation.

Insofar as the leadership of this body is concerned, I can only say that, by and large, I disagree with much of what the Senator has said. It appears to me to be a political message. I certainly would not agree that the present session could be characterized as a standstill legislative session when, despite the good work of the committees throughout the year, the calendar shows that there is only one bill that can be taken up, and that bill is or will shortly be the pending business.

We do not intend to shun our responsibility.

I agree with the Senator in this statement:

> But in the final analysis, the responsibility is on all of us to get this body and this Nation off dead center, or time—and history—will be passing us by.

I hope that by "all of us," the Senator means Republicans as well as Democrats, and that in the committees the Republicans will do their share to see that proposed legislation is reported. I know that personally the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will, as always, do his share. I wish his party would do as much.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I was deeply concerned about making the speech to which the Senator has referred. I have the greatest respect for the majority leader and for my other colleagues who have leadership positions, and for the Senate itself. I would not say what I have said lightly. But I am quite an independent person; and inasmuch as I had noted this impact around the country, I felt that this was a useful statement to spread upon the record. I am grateful to the Senator for having taken it as seriously as he has and responding to it almost point by point. I hope other Senators will do likewise. I hope other Senators, however they may feel, will address themselves to the issues. There is something about taking an inventory which is in itself a salubrious exercise.

Though I do not now desire to debate with the Senator individual details of what he said or did not say, or the reasons for our past failures to amend rule XXII, the fact is that my statement showed how I deeply feel the country sees the issues. I welcome the Senator's taking inventory. I hope other Senators will do likewise. I assure the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, I will not rest content with merely stirring myself in every respect that I have mentioned, but I shall also do my utmost within my own party to bring support for the ideas and ideals which so many of us share in common.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assure the Senator that I appreciate his words. I know that he means what he has said. I am delighted that we had this little get together. I had anticipated that it would come later in the afternoon, and not during the morning hour. I again express my thanks to the Senate for allowing both the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself to have the debate in which we have engaged.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My view of this subject is probably a little anomalous. There is a great deal of truth in what Edward F. Gibbon wrote in his monumental treatise, "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." Gibbon had a great, scholarly mind. He was a natural historian. He wrote that progress is often made not by what goes on the statute books, but what comes off, or what does not go on the statute books. Sometimes we lament the fact that great quantities of proposed legislation should result in some reaction. I doubt whether I share that view. John Garner once said to President Roosevelt:

> Give the cattle a chance to get a little more fat on them before you start cutting off any more.

I think if we give the country a breather and keep some of the proposed legislation from appearing on the statute books, it will be good for our economy and the tranquillity of our people.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF ROBERT A. TAFT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would not like to have this day go by without at least alluding to the fact that a great American departed this life 10 years ago today. In my office is a portrait—an exquisite work of art. It came from Martha Taft long after she was stricken. She could not talk, but the nurse telephoned me to say that it was her desire and the desire of the Senator that the portrait should hang in my office. Today it is there.

That is the last portrait that was painted of Robert Alphonso Taft. So we think a little about his past. I think of the fortuities of history which in a sense must account for Bob Taft. Certainly they had to account for Abraham Lincoln. There is no other way to explain him than as a divine fortuitant. In due course, when problems were mounting to the skies, and one of the great challenges of the country was monopoly, along came Teddy Roosevelt. Prior to him came a great democratic President, one of the very greatest—Grover Cleveland—and, insofar as I recall, he was the only man who served twice, nonconsecutively, as President. He was a great, courageous President in his own right. But Teddy Roosevelt came to do battle with monopoly.

Then we saw the rise of organized labor, and the power of organized labor. In that period came Bob Taft to do battle.

Some day some giant will come to do battle with giant Government, because it is becoming so big that it is fairly unmanageable.

I allude to Bob Taft this day because he symbolized moderation, restraint, devotion to the Constitution of the United States, and an amazing balance in evaluating the challenges which confronted the country.

So on this, the 10th anniversary of his transition, I merely recollect the fact, and once more pay testimony to a great American who came at the right time, when the challenge appeared.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the executive calendar will be stated.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eugene P. Foley, of Minnesota, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very proud of this man and pleased with his appointment.

Gene Foley has devoted years of service in behalf of the Nation's small businessmen. He has worked on the Hill on the staff of the Select Committee on Small Business and recently has served as Deputy to the Secretary of Commerce. He has done splendid work in a variety of areas. He comes prepared to continue the excellent record compiled by John Horne.

My concern for the small businessmen of this country is well known. I have been a small businessman myself and I speak from years of hard knocks and hard experience. Gene Foley understands the problems that face small business today. He has the courage, intelligence, and determination to meet these problems. I am confident that Gene Foley will provide inspiring and effective leadership of this important Federal agency. I am extremely gratified by his selection as Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a biographical résumé and outline of his professional background.

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

BIOGRAPHICAL RÉSUMÉ OF EUGENE P. FOLEY

OUTLINE OF PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

(1) July 1962 to present—Deputy to the Secretary of Commerce: (a) Review selected policy matters for the Secretary, with appropriate recommendations, (b) clear all Commerce Department memos and correspondence to the White House; (c) assist Secretary with internal management problems.

(2) March 1961–July 1962—Deputy Assistant Secretary, Domestic Affairs: (a) Staff assistant to Assistant Secretary, Domestic Affairs, who had line jurisdiction over: Business and Defense Services Administration, Office of Business Economics, and Census Bureau; (b) cleared all Department opinions on domestic legislation.

(3) November 1961–July 1962, served also as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs during this period—Administrator, Business and Defense Services Administration: (a) Supervised programs and personnel of 21 industry divisions, representing every manufacturing activity in the United States; approximately 600 personnel; (b) represented Commerce Department on following interdepartmental committees: Oil Imports Appeals Board; Executive Stockpile Committee Task Group on Barter; Executive Stockpiling Committee; Petroleum Study Committee; and White House Committee on Small Business.

(4) January 1959-March 1961—legal counsel, U.S. Senate Small Business Committee: (a) Studied financial and antitrust problems of small business; (b) investigated operations of Small Business Administration in five Midwest States; (c) conducted the following committee hearings:

Shopping Centers—1959, April 28, 29, 1959, relating to the difficulties independent retailers have in obtaining locations in shopping centers. Drafted subsequent Senate Report No. 1016, "Impact of Suburban Shopping Centers on Independent Retailers," January 5, 1960.

Dual Distribution in the Automotive Tire Industry—1959, June 17, 18, 19, 1959; relating to the problems independent tire dealers have when the tire manufacturing companies compete with them at retail.

Mergers and Unfair Competition in Food Marketing, July 2, 1959; relating to the inadequate investigation being made by the Federal Trade Commission in their industry-wide study of food marketing.

Mergers and Unfair Competition in Food Marketing, June 22, 1960; relating to the same subject as No. 3.

Small Business Administration, 1960, July 1, 1960; relating to the secret cutback by the Small Business Administration of their loan programs.

(5) July 1955–January 1959—Practice of law, Foley and Foley, Rochester and Wabasha, Minn.: (a) This is a 50-year family law firm; (b) specialized in trial law and legal problems of small corporations.

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

1952–55: University of Minnesota Law School, Minneapolis, Minn., L.L.B.

1952 (6 months): Institute of European Studies, Vienna, Austria, certificate.

1948–52: St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn., B.A., philosophy and political science.

1942–46: St. Felix High School, Wabasha, Minn., high school diploma.

MISCELLANEOUS PERSONAL DATA

Born November 22, 1928, Wabasha, Minn.

Family background: Father, lawyer; three brothers, lawyers; one brother, Air Force colonel (retired); four sisters, housewives; wife, college graduate (St. Catherine's College, St. Paul, Minn., B.A., art), professional sculptress; three children, Anne, 8, Robert, 6, Margaret Mary, 2.

Military, 1946–48: Corporal, U.S. Army Infantry, 24 months (18 months in Korea and Japan).

Foreign travel: (a) 1962, 2 weeks, Paris, OECD meeting, Industry Committee; Geneva, U.N. Lead and Zinc Committee; (b) 1952, 6 months, Vienna, Austria, student; (c) 1946–48, 18 months, Korea and Japan, military duty.

Politics: (a) 1958, Democratic candidate for Congress, First Congressional District of Minnesota; (b) 1960, executive assistant to Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY in Wisconsin and West Virginia presidential primaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term expiring June 30, 1967.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement regarding Mr. Horne. He came to Washington as my administrative assistant in the early part of 1947. He was recognized as one of the most dedicated public servants who ever served on Capitol Hill.

In 1952 and 1953 he served as Administrator of the Small Defense Plants Corporation. When President Kennedy took office in 1961, the President asked him to go to the Small Business Administration.

He has rendered remarkably good service as Administrator of the Small Business Administration. I regret to see him leave that post, but the President of the United States asked that he assume another important position in the Government, the one with respect to which his nomination is pending confirmation.

I know that John Horne will remain the dedicated public servant he has always been and will give to the great savings and loan movement throughout this country, to housing, and to programs under the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the same loyalty and the same tireless effort he has given to the Small Business Administration.

The accomplishments of the Small Business Administration during the time Mr. Horne has been the Administrator will remain as a great compliment to him and to the work he has done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join the distinguished Senator from Alabama in paying my respects to John Horne as a fine public servant, for the remarkable service he has rendered as the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. He extended to those of us in the Congress complete cooperation. His record of aid to independent business will stand as one of his finest accomplishments.

Mr. Horne will now move to an important position on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the duties of which are related directly to much of his experience in housing and to his close association with the Senator from Alabama, who has been a leader in the Congress in connection with the housing program. I wish him well. I join in support of the nomination and in commending Mr. Horne.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks by the Senator from Minnesota.

I feel confident that Mr. Foley, whose nomination has been confirmed, and who will succeed John Horne as Administrator of the Small Business Administration, will render an equally dedicated service. I point with pride to something already mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota, that Mr. Foley served as a member of the staff of the Small Business Committee of the Senate. He has had good training and good contacts in this field. He was a very able member of our staff. As the Senator from Minnesota knows, he was counsel of the staff. I know of no one who could better fill the position, following John Horne, than Gene Foley. I wish him well.

Both these appointments are to fill positions with which I have had considerable contact. My subcommittee on Housing has jurisdiction over legislation which has to do with the savings and loan associations and Federal Home Loan Bank Board matters, with which Mr. Horne will be associated. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee handles legislation relating to small business programs. Also, the Senate Select Committee on Small Business is in constant touch with the Small Business Administration in the handling of its program.

I look forward with a great deal of pleasure to the privilege of serving with Gene Foley as Administrator of the Small Business Administration and with John Horne as a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James I. Loeb, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., U.S. Navy, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Claude G. Ross, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Central African Republic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard Rex Cottam, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Kuwait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Burundi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Michael Blumenthal, of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dr. Walter Adams, of Michigan, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for a term of 3 years expiring May 11, 1966, and until a successor is appointed and has qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dr. Mabel M. Smythe, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for a term of 3 years expiring May 11, 1966, and until a successor is appointed and has qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations placed on the Secretary's desk, in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

TRIBUTE TO HENRY CABOT LODGE, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today the Senate has confirmed the nomination of a most remarkable group of nominees for important assignments in the service of the Federal Government. I select only one, on which to speak a word.

I am extremely grateful that the distinguished former Ambassador to the United Nations and former U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge, has accepted the assignment to be our

Ambassador to Vietnam. It is indeed a difficult assignment, one which calls for great skill in the diplomatic field, and requires personal sacrifice. I said all of this at the hearing when Ambassador Lodge appeared before the committee, and I wish to repeat it for the record. He has the esteem and respect of Members of the Senate for his great service to our country.

There are others on the list about whom we could make similar complimentary remarks. The Senate has confirmed the nominations of an unusual group today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senate confirmed the nomination of my friend and former colleague from Massachusetts, and the former Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, to be the United States Ambassador to Vietnam. He will devote his great talents there to the securing of peace and the solving of the complex problems that involve us in the Far East.

Ambassador Lodge is an able French scholar and thus will be able to converse fluently with the people of South Vietnam. Having served for 8 years as the representative of the United States to the United Nations, he understands the problems of diplomacy and how to work with the leaders of the countries of the world.

As our Ambassador to South Vietnam, he will be a real asset to our country. He will put his outstanding ability to work in that country as a public service for the benefit of the people of the United States and, I am sure, the people of the world. I congratulate him upon his willingness to assume this arduous work.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, today the Senate confirmed the nomination of a number of extremely able appointees to various departments within the Government. I should like at this time to confine my remarks to two of those individuals.

One of them is Adm. George W. Anderson, who becomes our Ambassador to Portugal. He has had a distinguished naval career, and has comported himself with dignity and honor to the service, which he so ably represents, and to the country, which he has honored by his service in the Navy through the years.

The United States is extremely fortunate to have a man of the character and integrity of Adm. George W. Anderson become our Ambassador to Portugal, a country which confronts difficult problems at present. It is also significant that this man of the Navy is being designated Ambassador Extraordinary to a country from which at the present time, and for some years past, we have leased naval facilities in the mid-Atlantic.

I know he will represent our Nation well. The appointment is outstanding. I wish him the best of luck in the years ahead.

The other nominee whose appointment was confirmed today, and about whom I should like to say a few words, is Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, a former colleague of ours in this body, a former Ambassador to the United Nations under the previous administration, a combat soldier during the late war, and a man of great ability and devotion to his country.

His assignment is an extraordinary one, because he goes to the Republic of South Vietnam; and he will not lack for difficulties or problems or questions in that new assignment. It is an area which is of great and significant importance to the United States, as well as to southeast Asia and the Asian Continent.

Ambassador Lodge is a man of strong character. He has had much political and diplomatic experience. He has an extremely difficult task confronting him in Saigon.

I take this means to wish him well and to express the hope that he will perform as capably there as he did as a Member of this body, as an officer in the Army of the United States, and as Ambassador to the United Nations. He is a good man, and a strong man; and I know he will represent our country with credit in this most difficult assignment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration of the bill (S. 1703) the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be allowed to be present in the Senate chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the nuclear test-ban treaty will be before the Senate soon.

Before I give my approval to so important a treaty, I will want full information on the impact, if any, that compliance with the provisions of the proposed treaty will have on our national security.

I will want the analysis and advice not only of the experts in the State Department and the Disarmament Agency, but also of each of the Chiefs of Staff and of appropriate scientists of our Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and such non-Government persons who by past training, are capable of dealing with the subject matter.

In September of 1961 Red Russia, in violation of its agreement with the United States, did testing in the air with bombs having a capacity of 60 megatons. It is claimed by some that out of those tests Red Russia obtained information that has assisted it in developing an antimissile missile, and methods of rendering ineffective the electronic equipment used in radar and in our weapons guidance systems.

This aspect of the problem is grave and, therefore, must be explored.

Our Government has kept honorably its promises and commitments. Red Russia is noted for its indifference and calloused attitude toward the duty of fulfilling agreements. If this treaty is finally signed and approved, our country contemplates keeping it. If we are to judge the conduct of Red Russia for the future on the basis of its conduct in the past, we would have to declare now that when advantages derived by Red Russia demand it, the treaty will be broken.

If after getting this full information and analysis, I conclude that the security of our country will not be impaired by the approval of the treaty, I will vote for it. If my judgment in the end is to the contrary, I will unhesitatingly vote against it.

In speaking of nongovernmental witnesses, there are many who can be called. I mention the following:

Prof. Henry Kissinger, Centre for International Studies, Harvard University, noted author.

Prof. Edward Teller, who needs no further identification.

Prof. Stefan T. Passony, director, International Studies Program, Hoover Institution on War, Peace, and Revolution, Stanford University; author; formerly professor at Georgetown University; and special consultant to the Air Force.

Robert Murphy, former Under Secretary of State.

Brig. Gen. Frank Howley, retired; vice chancellor of New York University; former commandant of the American Zone in Berlin.

Earl Voss, reporter for the Washington Star; author of the new book "The Nuclear Trap."

Col. William R. Kintner, retired, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania; well-known author.

Adm. Arleigh Burke, retired.

Gen. Lauris Norstad, retired.

Adm. Arthur Radford, retired.

There are others who could also be called.

The security of our country is involved. This treaty should not be hurried through the Senate solely for the purpose of having it ratified. Full and complete hearings should be held, so that Senators may be able to act intelligently upon the issue, and also so the American public may be fully informed concerning the significance of the treaty and the facts which support or oppose its adoption.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to say to the Senator from Ohio that I believe the outline of the witnesses he has just presented to us is essential for our hearings. Since the Senator from Ohio is a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and it is my privilege also to serve there, I shall do all I can to see that we have the broadest possible

testimony and the most searching testimony possible with reference to the treaty, because it is my view that consideration of this matter will involve one of the most important debates and discussions in the Senate for many a year.

I assure the Senator of my wholehearted cooperation. I do not believe we should attempt to have a onesided presentation. We want to hear from those in Government and outside Government, those who have been associated with Government in the past, and people from every walk of life. The Senator can be assured of that cooperation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I appreciate very much the concurrence in judgment that has just been expressed by the Senator from Minnesota. I am quite certain that within the solitude of our citizens' homes throughout the country there is deep meditation dealing with what our ultimate security will be. It seems to me that on an issue so vital it is essential not only that Senators be fully apprised of the facts, but also that the public should know what is being done, not only with respect to the desired banning of nuclear tests but also the assurance that what we are doing will make certain for our descendants a stable, secure, and living United States.

POLICE CHIEFS SUPPORT YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention the growing support across the Nation among chiefs of police for the youth employment bill which has passed the Senate and is now awaiting action in the House.

During the past month I have received letters of support from police chiefs from Alaska to Maine; from Minnesota to Texas; and from California to South Carolina.

I have in my office a folder of letters from all over the United States and a great number of newspaper clippings dealing with people, representing their communities in important public positions, who support the act.

The response from law-enforcement officers throughout the Nation has been gratifying because these are the men who understand the problems now facing our youth and the tremendous cost delinquency and youth unemployment exacts from their communities.

In addition to the support of hundreds of police chiefs, I am happy to note that the International Association of Chiefs of Police—IACP—has indicated its interest in the youth employment program and its wholehearted support for the underlying aim to give idle hands something constructive to do.

Mr. Quinn Tamm, executive director of IACP, said the police, more so than most groups, are well aware of the mischief—up to and including serious crimes—that idle hands and minds can get into.

Every constructive blow that can be struck at the problem of reorienting aimless and poorly prepared youths toward a productive future deserves the support of all. Mr. Tamm said he is gratified that so many of his police colleagues throughout the country have gotten behind this very promising program.

Following are a few of the numerous excerpts from letters received at my office:

Chief Daniel Joseph of New Kensington, Pa., said:

> It has always been my firm belief that a youth bill of this type is a sound investment.

From Albany, Calif., Chief Ralph Jensen wrote:

> Be assured that I wholeheartedly support your proposed bill. I can well remember how the old CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps) helped the young men who came to "California, the State of Golden Opportunity," from the dust bowls to only find there was no employment.

Chief Lewis Hollaway of Fairbury, Nebr., wrote:

> I have worked 28 years in law enforcement here. * * * I am sure that giving these young people honest work with good supervision is one of the best cures for delinquency that can be had. We are hoping this bill passes because I am sure it will not cost any more than the cost of crime.

From Ann Arbor, Mich., Chief R. J. Gainsley wrote:

> It is my belief, through our national programs as well as State and local programs, much more can be done to keep our youth in school and employed, whereby if they are kept busy we can certainly cut down on our crime rate.

Chief Oliver Felt, of Starbuck, Minn., notes that:

> We have a lot of youngsters growing up in this town besides all other towns around. They come into town looking for something to do and can't find a thing to keep busy. So they try to find some mischief to do. If they can't find anything to do here they go to other towns. I'm behind you 100 percent on this bill and I hope it passes the House.

Chief Charles W. Freeman, of Seymour, Ind., noted:

> We believe the juvenile delinquent is everyone's concern, not just the President's and the U.S. Senators' and judges and law enforcement officers. I feel that the President will get full support from all on this bill.

From Rome, N.Y., Chief James C. Dunn wrote:

> I sincerely believe that this is a very beneficial piece of legislation that merits full congressional concern. I am a police officer of 35 years experience and have during my tenure, been in a position to fully evaluate the dangers of that group of young men between the ages of 16 to 21, who are without employment, and benefit of any trade or skills. They are decidedly a problem group that must be recognized as such, and assisted.

Chief Dunn went on to note the old Civilian Conservation Corps in the thirties had provided lifelong benefits to the beauty of the area in which he lives. Chief Dunn observed:

> A drive through that area today, will evidence the value of that program. Large stands of reforestation provide marvelous soil bank protection for the area. Still in evidence and in use, are numerous firefighting ponds built by the corps. Roads constructed by the corps, and small bridges in that area are still in use. Such a program today would serve a valuable twofold purpose: in the training of these youths, and the material benefit that would be realized in a given area through the program.

Chief John P. Howard of Wauwatosa, Wis., sums up the vital necessity of passage of the youth employment bill in the House this year when he wrote:

> It should be evident to anyone who studies current events that a vast pool of idle, untrained, undereducated and dissatisfied youth in any country provides a fertile field for not only crime and delinquency, but also for demagogs and extremists who use riots, violence and terrorism as tools of their trade. Street mobs from Saigon to Caracas, are made of such material.

Chief Howard concluded:

> The question of cost should not be a deciding factor in the considering of this program. We are going to have to pay for this group of idle young people in some way as long as they are around. Is it not better to spend the money on training and constructive work than on expanded prisons, juvenile detention centers and direct relief?

Mr. President, I would like to stress the fact that the youth employment bill is gaining support from all parts of the country and from Democrats and Republicans alike who are concerned about the future of our youth.

Recent opinion polls conducted by Congressmen and Senators of both parties point out the fact that a majority of Americans favor this type of action in helping our youth. For example, a poll recently conducted by Representative WILLARD S. CURTIN of Pennsylvania, who represents an area that usually expresses deep reservations about Federal programs, disclosed that 67 percent of the respondents favored the youth employment bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a partial list of police chiefs who have given their support to the passage of the youth employment bill.

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

POLICE CHIEFS

Martin Almester, Rossford, Ohio.
James Anderson, Frazee, Minn.
Edward Aucone, Beverly, Mass.
Clyde Barden, Carmen, Okla.
Chelcia Barga, New Port Richey, Fla.
Jack Barlow, Boulder City, Nev.
Ed Beck, Shelley, Idaho.
Selmer Bentley, Twin Valley, Minn.
Delmar L. Berger, Centralia, Ill.
Sardner T. Bink, Columbia, Pa.
Paul Bollig, Maple Lake, Minn.
Norman Bowers, Fall River, Mass.
John J. Bornhorn, Covington, Ky.
James H. Brid, Clifton, Tex.
Frank H. Brewster, Rantoul.
John Bussanih, Hampton Bays, N.Y.
Arthur Cadorette, Warrenburg, Mo.
Roy Cannedy, Greenfield, Ill.
Frederick H. Carwile, Crisfield, Md.
Anthony J. Casamassima, Seneca Falls, N.Y.
Woodrow Casey, Chisholm, Minn.
Anthony Casuccio, Ellwood City, Pa.
W. L. Casey, Chisholm, Minn.
Andrew J. Celmer, Amsterdam, N.Y.
Noal Choate, Wagoner, Okla.
Albert E. Clauser, Port Alleghany, Pa.
Glen Clay, Ashville, Ohio.
Marvin A. Clemens, Hemet, Calif.
John T. Costello, Auburn, N.Y.
F. Cubbernuss, Colon, Mich.
C. C. Cunningham, St. Marys, W. Va.
H. L. Dailey, St. Paul, Va.

Joseph P. Darcy, Fitchburg, Mass.
Lloyd E. Detienne, Jr., Zion, Ill.
Arthur C. Diehl, Jr., Bath, Pa.
C. E. Ditmer, Velva, N. Dak.
Edward Donahue, Patton, Pa.
Harold R. Dowd, Maplewood, N.J.
Stanley A. DuCharme, Schenectady, N.Y.
James C. Dunn, Rome, N.Y.
Joe Eason, Whitefish, Mont.
Peter Elar, Freeport, N.Y.
Harry S. Farrar, Luray, Va.
Oliver C. Felt, Starbuck, Minn.
William F. Fitzpatrick, Milford, Mass.
John C. Flanigan, Anchorage, Alaska.
John F. Foley, Gary, Ind.
Leonard G. Foos, Manitou Springs, Colo.
T. E. Foust, Missoula, Mont.
Reuben Freeland, Frederick, Okla.
Charles W. Freeman, Seymour, Ind.
Henry M. Bunk, Independence, Iowa.
R. J. Gainsley, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Boyd Garner, Linden, Tenn.
William H. Garner, North Adams, Mass.
Colin A. W. Gillis, Revere, Mass.
Jim Graham, Sand Springs, Okla.
Clyde Gray, Genesee, Idaho.
James H. Griffin, Edenton, N.C.
Patrick F. Grimaldi, North Tonawanda, N.Y.
Joseph H. Guilfoile, Waterbury, Conn.
Walter Hanson, Belgrade, Minn.
Frank E. Harbach, Franklin, Ohio.
Arthur Harris, Milford, Conn.
William T. Hartley, Jr., Marshall, Mo.
George Hausmann, Pitman, N.J.
Emerson George, Hebron, Ohio.
William Henninge, Greene, N.Y.
Earl Hensley, Oxford, Ind.
Kay Hensley, Liberty, Ind.
Oscar H. Hill, Thornton, Colo.
Ernest Hina, Sturgis, Ky.
Albert L. Hinckley, Hyannis, Mass.
Emil Hlavka, Gregory, S. Dak.
L. Hollaway, Fairbury, Nebr.
Marvin O. Horcher, Wheeling, Ill.
John P. Howard, Wauwatosa, Wis.
O. B. Howard, Port Lavaca, Tex.
Anthony W. Howes, Annapolis, Md.
John E. Hutchison, Rimersburg, Pa.
Harry P. Jenkins, Elk Grove Village, Ill.
Ralph M. Jensen, Albany, Calif.
A. E. Jewell, Oxnard, Calif.
Gene Johnson, Oxford, N.Y.
Daniel W. Joseph, New Kensington, Pa.
Lyman J. Kane, Bar Harbor, Maine.
Justin D. Kaney, Nyack, N.Y.
Vernal Keller, Boise, Idaho.
Albert L. Kendrick, Azusa, Calif.
Roy D. Kerr, Farmington, N. Mex.
Emil Keszler, Lodi, Calif.
Robert L. Ketcham, South St. Paul, Minn.
Ernest King, Hamlet, N.C.
Brice G. Kinnamon, Cambridge, Md.
James R. Klinkhamer, Carpentersville, Ill.
Louis M. Kulpa, Wheeling, W. Va.
Clare W. Kyler, Mansfield, Ohio.
Ralph J. LaRock, Iron River, Mich.
Nels J. Lauritzen, Woodbridge, N.J.
W. F. Law, Tavares, Fla.
John E. Lawver, Coshocton, Ohio.
Leo P. LeBeau, Ogdensburg, N.Y.
Joel P. LeBel, Brunswick, Maine.
John Levitt, Fruita, Colo.
John Lloyd, Foley, Minn.
William A. Long, St. Albans, W. Va.
Mel Lubbers, Circle Pines, Minn.
William McCarley, Washougal, Wash.
Howard G. McPeek, Irvington, N.J.
Elmer Madden, Newburgh, Ind.
Henry J. Maguder, Meriden, Conn.
Noah Marchal, Mount Carmel, Ill.
Charles R. Marshall, Batavia, Ill.
J. W. Massey, Munday, Tex.
Enoch Matthews, McDonald, Pa.
Andrew Mattingly, Hodgenville, Ky.
Allen Miglio, Harper Woods, Mich.
Raymond Miller, Marshall, Ill.
Kenneth A. Minahan, Fox Lake, Ill.
R. A. Miles, Austin, Tex.
Pat Morrell, Swayzee, Ind.
R. A. Morriss, Sabina, Ohio.
Clement J. Mueller, Hartford, Wis.
James F. Mulcahy, Newport, Vt.
P. K. Nail, Conway Springs, Kans.
H. L. Nickle, Newport, Pa.
Jacob J. Novak, North Chicago, Ill.
M. Orlins, Norwalk, Conn.
Bob Oslund, Osceola, Wis.
James Osnato, Scotch Plains, N.J.
Nicholas Pavelko, Jr., Youngstown, Ohio.
W. F. Peach, Newport News, Va.
Paul V. Peiffer, Lebanon, Pa.
Herbert Phillips, Miami, Ariz.
William C. Poole, Lakewood, N.J.
Elmer V. Poss, Sibley, Iowa.
Dan Provenzano, Northlake, Ill.
H. Richardson, Orange, Calif.
Robert E. Richardson, Madison Heights, Mich.
Frank Riddle, Terre Haute, Ind.
I. A. Robinson, Downey, Calif.
Philip M. Rose, Willimantic, Conn.
Ambrose A. Ryan, Hoboken, N.J.
W. E. Schiefenstine, Camden, N.Y.
Clarence Schroeder, Millington, Mich.
Eral Shepard, West Union, Ohio.
M. J. Sheredy, Barnesboro, Pa.
Konstantin Shirkoff, Conneautville, Pa.
Jack D. Skelton, Clemson, S.C.
C. Sloan, Waldport, Oreg.
L. M. Smeltz, Attica, Ohio.
Joseph E. Stavor, Duquesne, Pa.
C. M. Stevens, Hurlock, Md.
Wallace Stouffer, Iron River, Wis.
Arthur Strauch, Gibbon, Minn.
E. A. Susterka, Ypsilanti, Mich.
Charles I. Tarbutton, Centreville, Md.
Estill Tharp, Beattyville, Ky.
Ray M. Thorpe, Detroit Lakes, Minn.
Dominic L. Valesano, Wakefield, Mich.
Francis R. Veltri, Beeville, Tex.
Emiddio Vinciguerra, Berwick, Pa.
Philip Wagenti, Lodi, N.J.
Mearl B. Waldsmith, Mazomanie, Wis.
J. Merritt Wenzel, Wakefield, Mass.
Bernard A. Westemeier, Dyersville, Iowa.
H. G. Whitmire, La Marque, Tex.
Eldon E. Whitworth, Poplar Bluff, Mo.
Bill Wilkinson, Abernathy, Tex.
Richard Wilson, O'Fallon, Mo.
Donald Woodruff, Bellefontaine, Ohio.
Jerry Wright, Colby, Kans.
Al Zeeb, Wilton, N. Dak.
Frank Zentkowski, Moose Lake, Minn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. From time to time I shall place other names in the RECORD, because I believe eventually we shall have the names of more than 5,000 chiefs of police throughout the Nation who will actively support the legislation to which I referred.

PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY—A WASHINGTON PERSPECTIVE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on "Problems of our Democracy: A Washington Perspective" by my good friend and associate, Dr. Max M. Kampelman, at a convocation at the Claremont Colleges, Claremont, Calif. Dr. Kampelman is known to many of us as my former legislative counsel in the Senate, now actively practicing law here in the District of Columbia. His constructive community role as chairman of the executive committee of the District of Columbia National Bank was recently commented on favorably on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. This summer Dr. Kampelman temporarily returned to his early profession of college teaching, accepting an appointment as the distinguished visiting professor of political science at Claremont College. I commend his address to this body as a vital commentary on the values of the practical politician to our democracy, a message that requires repetition and understanding in our society.

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

PROBLEMS OF OUR DEMOCRACY: A WASHINGTON PERSPECTIVE

(Convocation address to the Claremont Colleges by Max M. Kampelman, July 2, 1963)

This is the first convocation of the Claremont summer session for 1963 and I am both immensely pleased and highly honored to have been invited to address it. This is our first visit to your lovely community and we look forward to a most stimulating and pleasant summer with you. It may seem strange to you that we would have been invited to make a more than 2,000-mile trip across the country to be with you this summer, and yet it is appropriate for an educational forum on a political science subject to have a point of view from our Nation's Capital. Not that Washington can claim any monopoly on clarity. In fact, some of us in Washington frequently feel like Senator Green, of Rhode Island, who was still Washington's social butterfly in his late eighties. At one cocktail party he was found fumbling through a handful of invitations. A guest inquired: "Are you trying to figure out where you're going next, Senator?" "No," he replied, "I'm trying to figure out where I'm at now."

In any event, this business of faculties inviting their colleagues in for special lectures from time to time is an old device. An older colleague once said it was so they can be reminded again of the superiority of their own methods.

In typing a theme for a class report on a visit to the Nation's Capital, a young student began with the following typographical error: "Washington, D.C. is hounded on all sides by the United States of America." In point of fact, however, Washington, D.C., is not only hounded and bounded by the United States of America, but also by the world—a world which cannot decide whether to eat its heart out or shoot its brains out.

It is now 15 years since I left the campus, taking what was to be a short leave from Bennington College in Vermont to spend a brief but intensive period examining the actual workings of our National Government. I had been intimately involved with city and State government while studying and teaching at the University of Minnesota. I had written a doctoral dissertation on a vital national problem of democracy; taught and thought a good deal about the operations of our National Government, and was prepared to substantiate my acquired prejudices with actual social scientific observations. In a large measure, I was somewhat like the fellow who said: "I know it's true because I've said it before."

My purpose is not to convey the impression that I was all wrong then or that I am all right now. The change was furthermore not that drastic. It is rather to emphasize the word "perspective" in the title selected for my subject this morning. In fact, what you will be hearing is not only a "Washington perspective," but also a "Kampelman perspective." The importance of recognizing this can best be illustrated, though exaggerated, when you consider placing two painters side by side before the same landscape, and return an hour or so later to see what each has on his canvas. You may find two pictures so different that it will seem impossible that they were drawn from the same model.

A lesson to be derived from this illustration is in the question: "Would you say that either one of the artists has betrayed the truth?"

This is not to say that there is no truth—either in art or in politics. It is rather to say that there is truth in more than one perspective—though not in all perspectives or points of view.

This is a particularly vital comment for an understanding of democracy, which is the main thrust of the subject under review this morning. One of the most noteworthy essays on the meaning of truth in a democracy was written by that famous jurist and American philosopher, Oliver Wendell Holmes, in his opinion of 1919 in the case of *Abrams* v. *U.S.*, when he wrote:

"But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundation of their own conduct, that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market."

We are prepared to demonstrate the truth of our democratic creed in the competition of the marketplace and in the appeal to the hearts and minds of men. Our prior concern, however, is that there may not be the time in which to use the tools and strength of freedom to persevere in the struggle against totalitarianism because humanity itself faces a threat to its survival. It is important that we hold aloft the democratic banner which says that all men are created equal, but we cannot avoid realizing that we are also in danger of being cremated equal. Yet, they are interrelated.

While in India a year ago, I clipped a story from a New Delhi newspaper quoting a Hindu leader as follows: "We can fly in the air like birds; we can swim under the sea like fish; but how to live on earth like men, we know not."

Civilization—that race between enlightenment and catastrophe—is besieged on all sides. We here in the United States have no way of avoiding the consequences of that race, nor can we avoid the responsibilities of participating in it. Young as we are as a nation, ours is the oldest example of a democratic society dedicated to the principles of liberty and equality and committed to adjust those principles to one another and to the realities and complexities of modern life. We know now that whether we have a message that is relevant to the world may determine how well we survive the power struggle in which we are involved. We also know now that our superiority or survival is no longer assured. For a long time we acted as if our democracy were something that perpetuated itself automatically—as if our ancestors had succeeded in setting up a machine that had solved the problem of perpetual motion in politics. The phenomenon of two world wars, the rise of fascism and nazism, the emergence of new nations in Africa and Asia with their own tentative solutions to meet their deep needs, the growing factor of color in the world and in our own country—all of these have placed stresses upon our theories and on our system which have shattered our complacency and self-assuredness. No longer have we a right to say that the growing rationality of man assures the inevitability of democratic victory—or the more we have learned about man, the more we have learned the importance of the irrational in him; and the more we have seen of history, the more can we doubt the inevitability of any development. The task of preserving democracy requires our inventive effort and our creative ability. It also requires a sophisticated understanding that it is not a Utopia we seek, not a pathway to the stars, but only the articles of war if you will, the rules of the game, by which the human race can fight an endless battle with itself as it seeks to climb the evolutionary ladder.

Some definitions are now in order. When we describe democracy as relating to rules of the game we refer to the means by which men and societies govern themselves rather than to the substance of the decisions themselves. Whether steel production or medical care or the water system should be socialized or kept in private hands are important and vital questions to any society and its people, but neither solution is a democratic one per se. Thus, it is nonsense to claim that "economic democracy," whatever that means, requires socialization of the economy or that state ownership is "undemocratic" and only private enterprise compatible with democracy. England is no less democratic than we because of its socialized medicine and we no less than England because of our preference for maximizing private enterprise. The key democratic ingredient is that the decisions are made through the governmental machinery of majority consensus and may be changed in the same way.

This semantic confusion about the meaning of the word "democracy" is far too prevalent. It is a recent development. Until the First World War, its meaning for nearly 2,500 years from the fifth century B.C. when the word first began to appear in the works of the Greek writers on politics was a relatively constant one, meaning either "rule by the people" or "authority in the people." This was modified through the ages by a number of tributary ideas which joined the general stream of democratic thought, such as the stoic idea of human equality, the Roman and Anglo-Saxon concepts of representation, religious freedom, and then the modern conceptions of Locke, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Paine and Jefferson—but it remained constant as a form of self-government. In this form, it also remained highly controversial, with critics of democracy from Plato through 20th century anti-democrats characterizing it as a form of irrational and indefensible mob rule.

It is only with the First World War that "democracy" became a "God-word," like "truth," "justice." We're all for it because it is good. That means we tend to define it to suit our conception of the good: the Communist world describes its one-party elite regimes as "people's democracies"; Mussolini called his corporate state "the realization of true democracy"; the Nazis called their Third Reich "the most ennobled form of a modern democratic state."

Hence my emphasis on isolating and defining the true ingredients of the term, for with the absence of definition and the lack of direction, the idea of democracy and with it the idea of liberty may become confused and eventually subverted in men's minds. For us, the basic quality must not be whether we agree or disagree with the decision or its objective, but whether in fact the institutions of decisionmaking provide that the ultimate power resides in the people governed, with decisions made by officers responsible to the people governed.

And it is here that we reach the essence of what would be my sermon this morning were we meeting on the first rather than the third day of the week. Key to the functioning of democracy is the political process—and the key to the operation of this process is the much maligned and frequently disrespected politician.

I meet many audiences during the course of a year and have been introduced with various degrees of compliments as a professor, lawyer, or public servant; but seldom as a politician. The reason is a tribute to the good manners of the chairman. Yet, I am as much a politician as I am any of the more flattering identifications. To many, a politician is identified with one of the least noteworthy of occupations. But the politician plays a role as vital to the realization of the highest aspirations of man as the teacher or the minister. For upon him depends the feasibility and practicality of democracy being able to function.

Why the disrespect for politics and the politician?

First, there is the feeling that politics attracts those too lazy or too unable to make their mark in the more respectable professions. This should be a familiar criticism to teachers—and I here take note of my audience—as I note the old refrain "He who can, does. He who can't, teaches."

This is further complicated for the politician by the realization that many people who run for or hold public office have their motivations interwoven with personal ambition and the gratification of self. This has led to the cynical observation that political issues and parties exist not because there are two sides to every question but two sides to every office—an inside and an outside.

To grant this, however, is not to forfeit the claim for respectability. We have learned enough about man and his psyche to know that the ego plays an important part for all of us even in our selections of vocations and avocations and that motivations are not simple. Furthermore, a strong case can be made for the proposition that the instinct for survival and the desire to stay in office for the politician may well be the ingredient in a democracy which provides the safety line, the tie between the elected and the elector, those who represent and those to be represented in a democracy. This knowledge that the next election is inevitable and imminent makes it unlikely that the politician will lightly disregard his responsibilities to his constituents.

Then there is the argument that politics requires a compromise with principle; that an adjustment to the realities of power demands various forms of corruption from outright bribery in some cases to a sacrifice of integrity of beliefs in others—and that men of honesty and conviction don't belong in the profession.

This dangerous concept must be laid to rest decisively. We can make short shrift of the outright corruption phase of the position. The most authoritative study of the question of ethics in Government was made about 10 years ago by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS who demonstrated once and for all that for every public official bribed, and there are relatively few, there was a greater criminal, the citizen who attempted to bribe him; and that the incidence of crime among public servants was far less than the incidence of criminality of the lack of integrity in many of the more honorable professions.

The more vital point, however, relates to the broader conception of corruption and integrity. It does not help us, in examining democracy and its problems, to think of public policy positions as fixed and immovable ones. To view politics in such a way is to view it as an instrument of fanatics. The distinguished democratic philosopher, T. V. Smith, once said that "politics is the art of compromising an issue without compromising yourself." To "compromise" is not to repudiate or abdicate principle; it might in fact be a furtherance and strengthening of principle. If we as a group should desire to advance the role of education in American life by raising minimum teachers' salaries from $5,000 to $7,000 annually and find that we don't have the votes, the friends, or the ability to persuade the society to go any higher than $6,000, our acceptance of the $6,000 figure and compromising the $7,000 figure downward shouldn't blind us to the advance that we have made and our accomplishment in advancing toward our goal.

The peculiar strength of democratic government is the opportunity that it affords for just this kind of compromise and harmonizing of views, as our society—a large and intensely varied one—strives to arrive at a consensus and make decisions necessary to its progress. There are some who disparage

this role—at which the politician is so expert and so necessary—and prefer to hold their banners high without accommodating themselves to differing views in society. They tend to hurl the epithet "opportunist" at the politician, who indeed makes the system work. This is, of course, their privilege, these people of conscience on the right and on the left who insist that their conscience be your guide. I suspect, however, that whatever their motivations in luxuriating in a feeling of a greater purity and spirituality than their fellows, they run the risk of separating themselves from genuine thought about problems, especially the new problems that do not yield to old formuli and incantations, and they will probably never have the responsibility of power in our democracy.

The political role I champion this morning is that of the seeker for votes, the partisan politician whose loyalty to his party is second to his loyalty to his country, but is nevertheless real because he recognizes that it is through our political party framework that the American electorate can best express itself and keep its reins on decisionmaking. It is the give and take of the political campaign and the competition for votes that provides the forum for the discussion of issues, the criticism of government that is so essential, the airing that is so vital for the open society. I warmly recall the refreshing story of the indignant citizen who told the office seeker: "I wouldn't vote for you if you were the Angel Gabriel." And the suave politician's reply: "If I were the Angel Gabriel you wouldn't be in my precinct."

The politician I commend to you is the one who instinctively recognizes the limitations of government and his own decisionmaking powers. Here I think of the Congressman who defined his role in the House Ways and Means Committee as follows: "The art of taxation consists in so plucking the goose as to obtain the largest amount of feathers with the least possible amount of hissing."

This political role has many problems associated with it. It produces mistakes on occasion. Witness the experiment with prohibition. An English writer returned after a visit to the United States during prohibition and, being asked how it was working, replied: "Well, it's a darn sight better than no liquor at all."

This politics also brings with it the campaign speech with its exaggerations. The Harry Golden story of the southern politician running for public office illustrates this shortcoming. His standard political speech went something like this:

"Remember the symbol of the Republican Party. It is an elephant; the giant that stumps through the jungle, clumping little animals underfoot and swinging its weight around. But the symbol of the Democrat is the little mule, the same blessed animal our Savior rode in Jerusalem 2,000 years ago."

Our Government has become bigger and more complicated to meet the new problems of industrialization, automation, the atomic revolution and the awesome international threat we face. The problems of government are more difficult to solve. I sense that this is establishing a humility on the part of the American people. It appears to me that the American people are of late less likely to criticize and more likely to sympathize with the President in his responsibility for decisionmaking. Increasing numbers of Americans feel grateful for the fact that they don't have the responsibility. No longer do parents automatically wish for their children to grow up to be President. What is the significance of this?

I suggest that one of the dangers growing out of this recognition of the complexity of government is the danger of disassociation—the danger of the American people abandoning their responsibility because of the difficulty of making any intelligent sense out of their problems. This gets to be more serious because I am convinced that as the international crisis deepens—and it will—as the struggle for survival increasingly permeates the consciousness of the American people—as it must—there will be increased tensions and strains within the American society. Our democratic institutions will be put to the test of whether they can prevail in the face of these crises. This will require the utilization of all material and human resources with the full, intelligent participation of our citizenry.

Our country needs not less politics, but more politics; not fewer politicians, but more of them, more good ones, more active and dedicated partisans who understand their role to include that of educating the electorate. The politician is indeed the teacher and his student body is the American electorate. We reach toward this objective as we enlarge the dimension and understanding of politics and direct and encourage larger numbers of young people into active political life.

Winston Churchill said that democracy was the worst form of government—next to every other. Justice Jackson once wrote that our system of government "is not a luxury to be enjoyed or a theory to be defended. It is a weapon to be used." Americans are proud of their heritage—and justly so. Prime Minister Gladstone referred to our democratic system as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." We're proud of that tribute and many of us accept this judgment as a typically British understatement.

The profound theologian Reinhold Niebuhr wrote: "Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary." We know how vital democracy is to the realization of our aspirations. We have demonstrated that we are willing to fight for our principles. But a wise man once said that it is easier to fight for our principles than to live up to them. The real challenge we face is our willingness and ability to live up to them. The tools of politics are among those available to us.

I said earlier that I was tempted to deliver a sermon to you and in fact I did so. Concluding on that ecclesiastical theme I remind myself of the advice given by the elder of a church to the new minister about to deliver his first sermon: "We don't have time limits on our sermons, but we feel that very few souls are saved after the first half hour." I fear that I have missed the message but I end with appreciation for your courtesy and attention.

PASSAMAQUODDY TIDAL POWER PROJECT

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in my continuing efforts to create bipartisan support for the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, I have written a joint letter to the chairmen of the State committees of the two major political parties in Maine. I ask unanimous consent that my letter be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1963.

Hon. DAVID A. NICHOLS,
Chairman, Republican State Committee, Lincolnville, Maine.

Hon. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,
Chairman, Democratic State Committee, Lewiston, Maine.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NICHOLS AND CHAIRMAN HATHAWAY: In connection with the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, some persons have expressed the feeling that one of the major tasks was to educate the people of Maine on it in order to create support for it from the people of Maine. I am not convinced that this is actually the case.

I do not believe that it is necessary to conduct an educational campaign throughout the State of Maine because I believe the people of Maine are well educated on Quoddy after having heard its potentials discussed for nearly 40 years. And in that education, I believe that the people of Maine are overwhelmingly in favor of the proposed Quoddy project because of the economic benefits that it will bring to Maine.

Consequently, in the spirit of bipartisanship, I would like to propose a joint effort and project by the State committees of the two major political parties in Maine. That project would be the sponsorship and financing by the Democratic State committee and the Republican State committee of a Statewide poll by a recognized national polling concern known for objectivity to determine whether the people of Maine are in favor of the proposed Quoddy project.

I know of no better way to insulate the proposed Quoddy project from political partisanship than to have such a bipartisan project jointly sponsored by your committees. If the poll shows that the people of Maine are overwhelmingly in favor of Quoddy, then there is no need for an educational campaign and this would be the most effective way to keep Quoddy out of politics and future campaigns. If the poll shows that people are dubious about Quoddy, then it will be all the more important to any educational campaign that is conducted because the poll should show not only the reasons they are dubious but as well those sections, regions, and segments of the population that as yet do not favor Quoddy. Then a much better and more effective educational campaign could be conducted.

In short, I think a poll under your joint sponsorship would either eliminate the necessity for an educational campaign or would determine how and where such an educational campaign should be concentrated.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senator.

HE MIGHT HAVE BEEN PRESIDENT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there appeared in last Sunday's newspapers throughout the Nation a profile of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia, RICHARD B. RUSSELL. The article was written by the Associated Press writer, Jack Bell, who points out that DICK RUSSELL might have become President of the United States if he had not been from the State of Georgia.

Mr. President, many of us here in the Senate and many citizens of this country believe this to be true, and feel that DICK RUSSELL would be an outstanding Chief Executive and render meritorious service to his Nation. It is unfortunate indeed that sectionalism could stand in the way of such a great statesman as Senator RUSSELL.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Associated Press article be printed in the RECORD.

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

PROFILE: RICHARD B. RUSSELL—HE MIGHT HAVE BEEN PRESIDENT

(By Jack Bell)

WASHINGTON, July 27.—In the opinion of many colleagues, the man who will bark the

signals in the civil rights filibuster might have become President if he hadn't been from Georgia.

Because he is from Georgia, Senator RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL instead will command the corporal's guard of about 18 lusty-lunged southern Senators who will try to talk to death President Kennedy's civil rights program.

The tall, balding Senator with the George Washington nose will be pitting canny strategy and an unequaled knowledge of the Senate's rules against an emotional surge generated by Negro demonstrations and police-dog reaction.

It remains problematical whether RUSSELL's opponents can collect the necessary two-thirds approval of those voting and apply the cloture rule to end debate, thus killing off the filibuster.

Before that happens the cots may go up in the cloakrooms for around-the-clock sessions to test the stamina of RUSSELL's troops.

Whatever the outcome, DICK RUSSELL seems likely to retain his position as the most powerful single individual in the Senate.

At 65, with 30 years of Senate service behind him, RUSSELL remains the quiet, courtly gentleman who reflects his heritage as the bachelor son of a struggling country lawyer who rose to be chief justice of his State.

RUSSELL can turn tiger on the Senate floor when he detects what he believes are unfair assaults on States rights. But his colleagues continue to respect him even as he shows his claws.

As a representative of moderate conservatism, RUSSELL has had two shots at his party's presidential nomination and was defeated in each largely because he was branded as "too sectional."

In the 1946 convention which nominated President Harry S. Truman, southerners piled up 263 protest votes for RUSSELL who wasn't even on hand. When many of his southern brethren bolted, RUSSELL stayed silent, but regular.

In 1952, the Georgia Senator went after the nomination. The fact that he got only 292 out of about 1,200 votes demonstrated again that a man whose record and personality probably would have been acceptable had he hailed from the North, West, or East could not surmount the political disadvantages of his ties to the South.

Philosophical about this, RUSSELL maintains his party regularity despite his strong opposition to parts of his President's program.

"While I am always for those who are running on the Democratic ticket," he said, "I must confess that I have had varying degrees of enthusiasm for various candidates on the ticket."

RUSSELL helped campaign for the Kennedy-Johnson ticket in 1960. But even the persuasive powers of his longtime friend and close associate, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, may not be enough to get him into the 1964 campaign after the President's civil rights stand.

The Georgia Senator didn't mince words in denouncing the Kennedy legislative program, with emphasis on the section which would enforce desegregation on privately owned businesses which serve the public. Nor did he pull punches in criticism of the President.

"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," he said.

And on the accommodations section:

"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."

But outside the field of civil rights, RUSSELL is a man to be reckoned with on major national issues.

When he speaks the Senate listens.

When it votes, the stand he takes is influential—if not always decisive—among his colleagues.

RUSSELL looks upon the Senate as the greatest stabilizing force in preserving our Constitution. He cherishes the Senate's traditions as the last world body of free debate.

Moreover, he is a charter member of the inner circle. "Check it with Dick" is a frequently used phrase when controversial legislation is at hand.

From his vantage point as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and high-ranking membership on the Appropriations and Space Committees, as well as the Senate-House Atomic Energy group, the Georgia Senator has a finger on almost every Government activity.

He speaks frankly in White House conferences. He thought Kennedy's quarantine solution to the Cuban missile problem last fall was short of the action needed.

RUSSELL's advice: "Go in there and wipe them out."

When he first came to the Senate, RUSSELL had supported Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal. He voted for social security, the NRA and TVA. He was the author of an amendment out of which the farm parity payment system grew.

But over the years, he has become conservative on fiscal matters. He told his colleagues recently:

"I have voted against increases in the foreign aid program and I have also voted against a number of other big-spend programs, and if a majority of the Members of the Senate had voted as I did, the budget would have been in balance every year since the Korean war."

In the field of national defense, RUSSELL is recognized as pretty much the voice of the Senate. He summed up his position with this observation:

"To me the most important conclusion to be drawn from today's state of world affairs is that we must be militarily strong."

RUSSELL demonstrated his power in the Senate last April when his Armed Services Committee rebelled against him and by a 9 to 8 vote added $196 million to begin the purchase of component parts for the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile.

The Georgia Senator told his colleagues this system would cost $20 billion and in the words of Gen. Curtis E. Lemay, Air Force Chief, would provide a defense for 26 cities "and they would not be defended very well."

Advocates of the Nike-Zeus forced an unusual closed session of the Senate to discuss the matter. When the doors were opened, RUSSELL's amendment to cut out the additional fund was approved by a lopsided 58 to 16 vote.

In that case, RUSSELL backed the judgment of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. He and McNamara parted company, however, on the issue of building the RS-70, long-range reconnaissance bomber. Russell thinks it would be better to go on with bomber production longer than McNamara wants to do so, but he concedes he hasn't been able to change the Secretary's mind.

But RUSSELL takes defeat as philosophically as he does victory. His theory is that a man does what he thinks is best in his country's interests.

Having done that, he lives well with his own conscience.

FLYWAY MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the Federal Government's attempts to manage the Nation's waterfowl seasons has been a matter of much consternation in Wyoming, as evidenced by a letter sent recently to the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.

The writer, Wyoming's Game and Fish Commission Director, S. J. Jiacoletti, noted that attempts were made in 1957 to set up a truly workable flyway management plan. He observed, however:

> It was thought that the States would be embraced in a cooperative spirit of joint responsibility for the management of our Nation's waterfowl. That this was not done is evident.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this illuminating letter outlining a problem which is common to most of our waterfowl States be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATE OF WYOMING,
GAME AND FISH COMMISSION,
Cheyenne, Wyo., July 23, 1963.

Hon. T. A. THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Your letter of June 17, asking for views on the past performance of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in setting waterfowl seasons, is appreciated.

Ever since 1953, when flyway councils were conceived, it has been a mandate of the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission that a representative from our department be present at the council and technical committee meetings, which were organized for better management of the wildfowl resource.

The early years of the council's approach to waterfowl management were rough ones and in 1957, with the adoption of a flyway management plan, it was thought that the States would be embraced in a cooperative spirit of joint responsibility for the management of our Nation's waterfowl. That this was not done is evident.

For 13 years the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission has been spending funds on the waterfowl resource, through the development of new habitat, creation of new flocks, participation in Canadian banding operations, and research into waterfowl problems within our own State. Other States have done as much and yet the experience of the personnel responsible for waterfowl within the States goes unrecognized by many within the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

During years of high waterfowl abundance the States in the central flyway, as well as other flyways, were thrown an occasional bone by being permitted a relaxation of bag limits and seasons, but at no time were the considered evaluations of experienced wildlife people accepted, but rather the Bureau continued to fall back on the recommendations of pressure groups and insiders seeking personal gain. What a waste of the resource. And, then came the lean years of the sixties; when habitat began to shrivel and waterfowl numbers began to dwindle, and, there is no denying that numbers did dwindle, but these facts, too, were recognized and taken into account by trained personnel responsible for making recommendations to the councils and, subsequently, to the Bureau. Again, no recognition was made of the total years of experience in management represented by the States, and the Bureau saw fit to curtail seasons and harvests beyond those suggested. Again a tremendous waste of the resource.

It appears to us that if the spirit of a formalized management plan is to be adhered to, then greater regards to recommendations from the flyway councils should be granted. Are the States to be partners in the management of the waterfowl resource only during periods of abundance or is it that the Bureau feels we are incapable of intelligent decisions during periods with declining populations?

We certainly agree that the problems of managing waterfowl, which are international in their movements, is a complex one. However, we also feel that the States in each flyway are contributing enough knowledge, through trained personnel, so that reasonable recommendations can be made for waterfowl seasons and bag limits. No State wildlife agency will ever be guilty of recommending waterfowl into oblivion, but neither are they going to be guilty of wasting a natural resource when there is a surplus to be cropped.

All that we ask is that the Bureau adhere more closely to the recommendations of the flyway council or else give up this sham of cooperation which they now practice.

Again, let me say that I appreciate this opportunity to express the feelings of the commission about the present waterfowl management program and I only regret that I will be unable to appear before your committee to testify.

Please call upon me if I can be of further assistance.

Yours very truly,

S. J. JIACOLETTI,
State Game and Fish Commissioner.

SATURDAY EVENING POST NARRATES HARDSHIP OF MILITARY SERVICE IN COLD WAR

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the arguments which is often presented in opposition to the cold war GI bill is that this is peacetime and not wartime.

Those who advance this argument seem to believe that our servicemen spend their days eating ice cream in between movies at the base theater. The inadequacy of the argument that we should draw a distinction between veterans who served during a hot war and the veterans of the cold war as a basis for awarding veterans' readjustment benefits is demonstrated by the fate of the *Thresher*, the ever-growing casualty list in South Vietnam and the recent Communist ambush of an American patrol in South Korea which resulted in the deaths of Pfc. William L. Foster III, of Drexel Hill, Pa.; Pvt. David A. Seiler, of Theresa, Wis.; and the wounding of William L. Foster, of Baltimore. A subsequent clash the following day occurred 6 miles south of the demilitarized zone and resulted in the death of a third American soldier, Cpl. George F. Larion, of Davidson, Mich.

The type of duty which our servicemen must face during the cold war is illustrated by Rafael Steinberg's article "The Lonely Line of Armistice," which appears in the July 27–August 3, 1963, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Steinberg's article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I would like to read the following quote from Mr. Steinberg's article:

Aside from the dangers, Korean duty is still one of the least attractive assignments in the world. Yet 450,000 Americans have had to serve there since the war ended, and about 50,000 are there today, and will probably be there next year, and the next, for "the longest armistice in history" shows no sign of breaking out into real peace or war.

When the armistice was formally signed 10 years ago, on July 27, 1953, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, then the 8th Army commander in Korea, reminded his troops that "the armistice is just a suspension of hostilities—an interruption of the shooting * * * in itself, it does not end the war. It is simply an agreement * * * to stop all hostile acts while attempting through political discussions to reach a peaceful solution.

"There must be no thought of going home until permanent peace and stability have been restored to Korea." Taylor said, "We are faced with the same enemy, only a short distance away, and must be ready for any move he makes."

Mr. Steinberg's article together with the dangers inherent in such situations as the Marine landings in Lebanon and Thailand, the tinderboxes of Laos and Berlin, and the conflict in South Vietnam reveal the falsity of the argument that we should deny the veterans of the cold war the benefits of the GI bill on the basis that they have served during peacetime.

Everyday, hundreds of thousands of American servicemen defend the interests of this country from Berlin to Guantanamo to Korea and from Greenland to the Antarctic. It is only equitable that we should pass the cold war GI bill to assist these men in readjusting to civilian life when new men replace them along the Korean armistice line, at Checkpoint Charlie, along the radar lines in Alaska, Canada, and Greenland, and the hundreds of bases where U.S. servicemen serve throughout the world.

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

THE LONELY LINE OF ARMISTICE

(Ten years after the shooting stopped, American forces still patrol the battlefields of Korea. A closeup anniversary report on the men who stand guard, risking their lives as they wait for the peace that never comes.)

In an 8- by 10-foot wooden shack on a lonely, bare Korean hill a young American soldier picks up the handset of a field radio, presses the button, and speaks in a flat voice. "Encourage 6. This is Encourage 817, with an all-secure report. Over."

At the same time, a few hills away, an American sergeant quietly briefs his men. "Now, when I halt this man, if he wiggles one little finger, Sergeant Massey's going to shoot him. You just can't take any chance with these people. Remember the password. We have agents up here like anyone else. We don't want to shoot any of ours. Remember, I'll halt him, Sergeant Massey will shoot him." Quietly, keeping 10 yards apart, the men file up a hill to lie in a 4-hour stakeout, awaiting North Korean agents in the demilitarized zone (DMZ).

The code names change monthly. The individual soldiers rotate back to the States every 13 months. But 10 weary years after the shooting stopped, American soldiers remain on guard in Korea, weapons loaded, drilled for battle, skirmishing every so often with Communist agents and troops. In all seasons, and around the clock, they pass the basic message that the armistice is still secure. And by being there, they help guarantee that it will remain so.

Four Americans were killed in Korea's demilitarized zone during the past year, and two have fallen into enemy hands. Two more defected across the line. Aside from the dangers, Korean duty is still one of the least attractive assignments in the world. Yet 450,000 Americans have had to serve there since the war ended, and about 50,000 are there today, and will probably be there next year, and the next, for "the longest armistice in history" shows no sign of breaking out into real peace or war.

When the Korean armistice was formally signed 10 years ago, on July 27, 1953, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, then the 8th Army commander in Korea, reminded his troops that "the armistice is just a suspension of hostilities—an interruption of the shooting * * * in itself, it does not end the war. It is simply an agreement * * * to stop all hostile acts while attempting through political discussions to reach a peaceful solution.

"There must be no thought of going home until permanent peace and stability have been restored to Korea," Taylor said. "We are faced with the same enemy, only a short distance away, and must be ready for any move he makes."

The political conference never amounted to anything; no satisfactory way of peacefully unifying Korea has ever been devised. The war that was not legally a war has become the peace that is not technically peace.

Most of the 16 nations who sent troops to Korea have withdrawn their forces; only the Turks and the Thais maintain small combat units in Korea. It is the South Koreans and the Americans who still face the same enemy. The ROK Army stands guard along most of the 151-mile front, including the rugged mountains of the east; north of Seoul, defending the low-lying so-called classic invasion routes, are two U.S. divisions, the 1st Cavalry and the 7th Infantry.

North of the Imjin River lives the 1st Reconnaissance Squadron of the 9th Cavalry Regiment. Essentially an armored outfit, it has a double mission. Its 600 men must patrol and guard the DMZ, and, if an attack comes, they must delay it until the main body of troops can get south of the river.

"I don't reckon that more than 2 percent of us would ever get across the river," says one platoon lieutenant. "You might say we are expendable."

Meanwhile, the men of the 9th live in heated barracks, have flush toilets and showers, sleep between sheets. There are movie theaters, a hobby shop, and a PX snack bar, serving malteds, cheeseburgers, popcorn, steaks, and other stateside goodies, at less than stateside prices. Some officers' quarters have elaborate stereo record players, and the officers' mess goes formal once a week; instead of uniforms, the officers wear canary-yellow cavalry blazers and little black bow ties. The enlisted men must always be in uniform, but they have Korean houseboys to do their laundry, and to take care of KP chores.

Despite the natural improvements in GI living standards, time seems to have stood still in Korea. Joseph Stalin is dead, but the enemy is still called "Joe," the name he acquired right after the armistice when the command started discouraging the use of "gook" and "gooney." Army food—except for the snack bar where the GI must pay—has not improved much. (Food at the officers' mess is quite good, however, and each officer has his own napkin ring, with his name on it.)

The GI in Korea still uses slang transplanted by the first American troops who rushed over from Japan when the North Koreans struck across the 38th parallel in 1950. A girl is still a "moose," (from the Japanese musume, girl) and a house or barrack is still called "hooch" (from the Japanese word for house, uchi). Not one GI in 10 knows the origin. More leisure and better educational opportunities have failed

to increase the tiny store of Korean words in the GI's vocabulary; bahli-bahli (hurry), idi-wa (come here) are about all he can manage.

And the soldier's dreams are still of home. There is probably not one man in Korea who cannot tell you exactly how many more months or days he has to serve there. Everything from the VD rate (high) and the court-martial rate (low) to the amount of duty a GI is expected to pull, hinges on whether he is a long-timer (with his Korean future before him) or a short-timer (soon to leave). The KPCOD, the cut-off date after which a short-timer—or at least the married short-timer—will forgo the companionship of the moose in the villages, is usually calculated at about 6 weeks before departure.

Some men don't depart alive. On a cold, windy night last November, Sp4c. James C. Johnson took over Outpost Susan, in the Able troop sector. With him was another man from Able troop, Pfc. Efran Olivo-Baez, and a TDY (temporary duty) private from a rear-echelon unit, sent up to reinforce the thin ranks of the men in the 9th Cavalry. The Cuban crisis was still alive, and the men of the 9th had been on a death count alert for weeks, their jeeps and armored personnel carriers standing gassed and ready to move into battle on a 30-minute notice. Each troop was manning five outposts around the clock, instead of the normal three, and the men were tired.

On this forgotten, forsaken outpost, a decade after the conflict, 6,000 miles from his Kentucky home, Specialist Johnson got careless. There was one factor that Johnson was not aware of: in the shadowy two-way espionage war which goes on constantly in the DMZ, South Korean or American agents had recently scored a success in the Susan area. The Communists discovered it and apparently felt they had to retaliate. Outpost Susan was the handiest target for their revenge.

As the event was pieced together later by Capt. James R. Brokenshire, from Reading, Pa., who was then the A troop commanding officer, three or more North Koreans crept up to Susan soon after dark. The wind covered any sound. Bushes and darkness hid them from sight. Quietly they waited.

At night, only one man of the outpost detail was supposed to be inside the hut at any time. But shortly after 8:30 p.m. Johnson allowed Olivo-Baez to duck in to get warm at the tiny gasoline stove. A moment later, the TDY private opened the door to enter, too, leaving no one outside on guard.

That was the moment the North Koreans were waiting for. Suddenly they stood and lobbed five hand grenades almost simultaneously at the flimsy, unprotected outpost shack. At least one grenade crashed through the plate-glass observation window and exploded inside, killing Johnson instantly, sending a chunk of metal into Pfc. Olivo-Baez's leg. The TDY private, uninjured, ran back out the door in panic and fled down the slope to the rear.

A jeep on the way to the outpost with another radio met the wounded Olivo-Baez at the foot of the hill. The alert squad and Captain Brokenshire rushed to Susan. "I found the third man as I was coming back down from the OP," the captain recalls. "He was lying by the side of the road. He yelled at the vehicle when I went by. He was pretty shaky then, but when we started talking to him, he became a hero. His story changed every time someone talked to him."

The attack on Susan shocked 1st Cavalry Division and gave it the second recent cause for soul searching. The other occurred in May and August last year. Two young Americans had defected across the truce line—and that had not happened since the armistice.

The first GI to go across was Pvt. Larry A. Abshier, 18, an "8-ball" soldier who had just been busted from private, first class for getting too drunk to stand guard. After his conviction, he had been transferred, as a sort of punishment, to the 9th Cavalry for zone duty. On May 28, a few minutes after he arrived on outpost, he took off down a road to North Korea and disappeared over the demarcation line. A few weeks later, men on outposts heard his voice on loudspeakers, telling them about the "happy life of the North Korean people." Shortly after that, balloons wafted down with booklets showing a grinning Abshier surrounded by pretty North Korean girls.

Whether Pfc. James Joseph Dresnok saw one of these pamphlets or not, the Army says it does not know. An orphan from Glenallen, Va., 20-year-old Dresnok was married but estranged from his wife back home when he met "Shirley" Kim, a hostess at the New Star Club in a village near the Imjin River. Dresnok forged a pass to visit her one night, and for that he faced a summary court-martial on August 16. And perhaps he had tired of Shirley. So, on the 15th, Dresnok walked north. When the men on Outpost Susan spotted him and called out, he just turned and waved. He was already too close to the line to be caught.

After that, the Army started screening men assigned north of the Imjin. Instead of considering zone duty a punishment, the Army specifically kept soldiers with court-martial records south of the river, and no one without some high school education was considered fit for the zone. (Dresnok had gone only as far as the eighth grade.) And in the units of the 9th Cavalry, only one man in six is now a draftee, while the overall proportion in Korea is one in three.

Then came the attack on Susan. "I believe that ——— who went across from A troop led that patrol back in there," says 1st Sgt. Kenneth Lovett. The command didn't think so, but it knew that something had to be done. While the protests were made at Panmunjom, the outposts themselves—"they used to look like hot-dog stands," says one officer—were completely rebuilt. The new shacks, now called guard posts instead of outposts, have thicker walls capable of stopping small-arms fire, and plate-glass windows have been replaced with shatterproof safety glass. Around each outpost, men of the 9th Cavalry laid a double fence of barbed wire, with trip flares to illuminate intruders and tin cans tied on to jangle when disturbed. Col. Stanley Kennedy, Commanding Officer of the 9th, increased the size of the outpost detail, decreed that every outpost building must be just like every other, with everything located in the same place. So precise and detailed were his instructions that they even specified where a man should place his gloves if he had to take them off while on duty. "There's so much chicken," says one enlisted man, "that some guys are more afraid of who's coming out behind them than who's coming out in front. You can get chewed out good if the colonel comes out and finds your gloves on the map board."

Late one afternoon recently, some 20 men of the 9th Cavalry gathered in the operations room of C troop, ready for 6 hours on guard-post duty. Most were men of the troop, and it was old stuff to them. But some were TDY personnel, nervous, silent, fingering their M-14 rifles, staring at the sign on the wall behind the lieutenant: "Halt, or I fire. Chong-gi Chong Sonda."

Second Lt. Thomas Gamble, a 22-year-old from Buffalo, N.Y., stood at the counter and briefed the men in flat, staccato bursts.

"Your mission" he told them, "is to observe the demilitarized zone in visible areas of North Korea, to report all activity in this area, to report all violations, friendly or enemy, of the armistice agreement, to give early warning in case of hostilities, to adjust artillery fire in case of hostilities, and to apprehend all unauthorized persons.

"Let the persons who are to be apprehended get as close as possible. 'Halt, or I fire. Chong-gi Chong Sonda.' Fire a warning shot, fire to wound.

"Apprehended personnel are referred to as 'packages.' Unauthorized persons spotted but not yet apprehended will be referred to as 'crackers.'

"Stay out of minefields. If there's any doubt about an area being mined, stay out of it. Ahh, on December 24, Christmas Eve, we lost a man over in Bravo troop. He walked in where he shouldn't have." Pause. "He got his head blown off. He was dead." Longer pause. "It was a merry Christmas." The men shifted, and looked at each other.

"Now, pyrotechnics. Red (flare) means enemy attack. Green, you need assistance, you can't continue your mission. Your communications are out, you need assistance, send up a green flare. Yellow, is a warning to aircraft, friendly or enemy, that they are over the DMZ.

"The challenge is Pat, P-A-T. The password is Tab, T-A-B. Pat, Tab." Lieutenant Gamble swept his eyes around the room, scanning the white name labels each man wore on his field jacket, watching the men write the password on the backs of their hands. Many wrote "Path" instead of "Pat."

"Jordan, what's the red flare mean?"

Jordan, a big Negro, stammered nervously. "That's the—er—the enemy in trouble on account of the enemy——"

"No, red means an enemy attack. We're the ones who are in trouble."

The men filed out, on their way to a night on guard posts Pansy, Barbara, Laura, Dot, all named after officers' wives. During the war, outposts and hills were named for women that any man would like to spend the night with: Marilyn, Hedy, Ava, Jane Russell.

In the back of the truck on the way to guard post Laura, Pfc. Robert J. Evangelista, a TDY "augmentation" from 12th Cavalry, chatted with two men from C troop. Evangelista, a tall, thin youth with a toothy smile, was a short timer, nearing the end of his Korea tour, and he had been up to the DMZ on guard post and patrol duty before. But to the other men, Pfc. Donald E. Hyndman and Pfc. Irwin Carroll, Evangelista was clearly an outsider, a neophyte.

After hashing it around a bit, the three men agreed on one thing: This DMZ duty was better than being in an infantry battle group to the rear. Evangelista had a simple explanation: "The work is easier here." The other men looked at him but said nothing. He would learn.

Guard post Laura sits on the brow of a sandy hill, overlooking the green valleys of the DMZ and North Korea. It is well within the DMZ itself, just about 250 yards south of the military demarcation line that runs through the center of the zone. Sp4c. Harry Oliver, of Colton, Calif., guard post leader, had been riding up in the cab with the driver of the truck. Now he took over. He was a short timer, and he knew the area well. "About two ridges out in front, there's a North Korean OP. That's Taedok-san, that big hill to our front, and you can see all kinds of bunkers and emplacements, trenches down there."

It was late afternoon and the sun was sinking. Oliver and the other men scanned the valleys in front of them, for it would be dark soon and they would then have to depend on their ears. Far down to the right, in a deserted rice paddy, two deer grazed. "This used to be a pretty jumpy place, people always hearing a lot of noises. Generally they were caused by animals," said Oliver. "Sometimes you'd get people throwing rocks. Probably they were North Koreans, sometimes it might have been imagination. It gets windy up here, and these big leaves of

these bushes make a lot of noise, sounds like something's coming up."

Private, first class Hyndman, 18, has been married 8 months and has spent 5 of those months in Korea, but he likes the Army, and has "no serious gripe." Now he was staring out at Route 4 with the binoculars. "I got a GAZ (a Russian jeep) goin' west, Ollie." Oliver picked up his phone again. "Dayton? This is Laura. I've got a GAZ-51 going west on Route 4 at 1859."

Private First Class Carroll, 19, a driver of one of C troop's seven M-41 tanks, was standing behind the shack, looking north. "You lose a lot of sleep on this guard post duty," he complained, rubbing the stubble on his boxer's face. "One day you're on at 12, and the next day at 6. I am glad when I can get back to my tank."

In a foxhole a few yards away from the shack, TDY man Evangelista watched the sun go down. Unlike most of the men of the 9th, he doesn't like the Army, although he enlisted and is RA—a Regular. "I was young and didn't know any better," says short-timer Evangelista. "We believed too much of what we seen in the movies. It wouldn't be so bad if you weren't a private, let's put it that way. If you're lower than a sergeant, you're treated like dirt. But I guess what makes it so hard over here is being away from home."

ALLIES BUT NOT FRIENDS

Inside, after dark, Oliver talked of the Katusa's, the Korean Augmentation to the U.S. Army. Ten percent of the U.S. ranks in Korea are filled out by ROK Army personnel. The Katusa's eat and live with the troops, stand GP duty, and join the GI's on the stakeouts and patrols.

"We get along pretty well," says Oliver. "It is pretty hard to communicate, but it works out pretty good. Most of them work hard, and we get along. It is better to learn about Korea from them than to go out to the village and learn it from the prostitutes and Mama-sans and all. Actually, there is really not a close association between the GI and the Katusa. They don't go on pass together. I am not sure there is any regulation against it, you just do not see it. Mainly, it is the language."

Suddenly there came a shout—the challenge—and the thunk of an M-14 rifle shot. Oliver grabbed his rifle and hurtled out the back door. Two more shots. Crouching low, he zigzagged down the slope. Quiet. He called softly. Evangelista's voice, then Hyndman's. "Something moved down there. A light. We fired." Then two more shots. "I saw it," said Carroll.

Oliver crashed back into the shack. "Before they fire, they are supposed to tell me." He cranked the field phone. "Would you get Lieutenant Gamble out here right away. I think we have got a cracker. We fired a few shots at it." Then he was out again, circling out behind the outpost. Clearly, on the night air came a whistle, a human whistle. Minutes went by while the four men searched the darkness. Then, from the foxhole to the left of the outpost shack, Hyndman noticed something: "There, do you see that faint light? Moving a little. And another one. Looks like lightning bugs." On the other side Oliver was coming to the same conclusion. There was no other sight or sound of movement.

Oliver stumped in, picked up the phone again. Apologetically he said, "Disregard that other thing. The boys got a little excited. We jumped the gun, I guess. I think it was probably lightning bugs."

Then he muttered, "Ever since Susan, some of these TDY boys are a little trigger happy."

Evangelista was the man who fired first. "I feel kinda foolish, shooting at lightning bugs. But I sure thought I saw something move."

Nobody ribbed Evangelista. All three men had fired, and they seemed to feel that it made them safe, even though the target was fireflies. But at the next night's briefing, something new was added. "If you shoot," Sfc. Donald R. Smith drawled at the men of the first platoon, "make sure you know what you're shootin' at. Don't start blasting away at any lightnin' bugs like happened t'other night at Laura." Some of the men started to laugh. "Don't laugh, that's what happened. Make sure it's a human being."

On the morning after that there was gunfire again at Laura, and this time the target was human. In the dawn fog, Sp4c. Henry R. Buyny, a 22-year-old from New Castle, Pa., spotted "a Korean man sneaking through the woods right in front of us. I yelled at him to halt but he turned and ran down a draw. I fired twice and thought I hit him but he kept on going."

Summoned by radio, 2d Lt. Robert E. Rintz, a new West Point shavetail, dashed out to the guard post and found the intruder hiding in a clump of bushes. "We searched him and found only personal effects (but) with him was about a month's supply of food, plus some water. We brought him back to the jeep, tied his hands and feet with our belts, and took him to the S-2 (Intelligence) at squadron headquarters. He was a small guy with a heavy beard, long hair and was really dirty, but when I first saw him all huddled up and pointed my pistol at him, I was scared. It's a good thing for him that he didn't try to run because I probably would have pumped every round into him."

To the veterans, Regular Army sergeants on their third or fourth tour of duty in Korea, "Joe" is a personal enemy. First Sgt. Kenneth C. Lovett, 30, and Sgt. Glen Mizer, 31, are two such veterans now leading the kids of Charley troop. One night recently they sat together in the mess hall, reminiscing. Mizer's boots and uniform were splattered with mud. He had just come off a stakeout—with five other men he had lain for 4 hours in the rain near the demarcation line in an unsuccessful attempt to ambush a North Korean agent. A taciturn man with blue eyes and thinning, sandy hair, who thinks a lot about his 14 head of Black Angus cattle back in Cumming, Ga., he listened to talkative Ken Lovett, a shrewd, impish West Virginian.

"When I came back this time," recalled Lovett, "the first time I went on observation post I wanted to shoot that North Korean patrol down there. But I got a wife and kids back home (in Bartley, W. Va.), and so I held my fire."

Lovett was a paratrooper with the 187th Airborne when they jumped into Munsan-ni in March 1951. "I got hit soon after that, and I went back, and I said then, 'I'll never see this place again.'" But now he is stationed just about 6 miles from the drop zone of 12 years ago, in low but precipitous hills that "remind me of West Virginia—and Kentucky."

"They don't remind me of north Georgia," Sergeant Mizer muttered.

"No, I'm just talking about the landscape, the mountains," said Lovett, as the other men laughed.

"During the war," Lovett continued, "I didn't have to carry a damn pass to look at 'em either. Now I gotta sign for a pass, let Joe spit in my eye, damn near, can't do a damn thing about it. Just sit there and take it. At least then, damn it, we could fight back. Now we can't do nothing but sit there and take it. Kid got killed up there. What can we do? Not a damn thing. Joe says, 'They have been punished, we don't know nothin' about it.' Yeah, they been punished. Probably got a damn medal."

Mizer, also a paratroop man, saved his words for when they were needed. A couple of days later he led a four-man patrol along Charley troop's section of the military demarcation line, a 6-foot-wide barbed-wire corridor that cuts across the Korean Peninsula. Two of his men were oldtimers who had worked with him often; but there was a new man along, Pfc. Herman Holt, a 19-year-old from Los Angeles, out on his first patrol in the demilitarized zone. A jeep took them into the zone and left them a few hundred yards south of the line. The sun beat down on deserted, overgrown rice paddies, and low scrub pine hills. An old farmers' road, now a byway for patrols by day and line-crossers by night, stretched ahead of the soldiers up a long valley to the north.

Mizer gathered his men around him. "We'll go out here 'till we hit the MDL (military demarcation line), and we'll turn left till we get to Virginia. Now, remember, if we make contact with one of Joe's patrols, we'll move to the south side. We'll stand there and let him pass. And I regret to say that if he spits on you, or anything like that, don't hit him, don't do nothing, let him go right on by. This is somethin' we gotta face, so we don't cause a—a riot here. If he tries to give you candy, propaganda booklets, don't let him do it. Keep your hands at your side."

In single file, they set off, Mizer in the lead. Behind him came Holt, Pfc. Steve Sutton, 21, a shy, stammering Negro from North Carolina, and Katusa Sgt. Yung-Ok Suh, 24. Mizer mispronounced the Korean's name. "Shoo's been with me for a long time. He's a good man." Sergeant Suh smiled; if he resented doing a privates job, he didn't show it.

"Joe can see us comin' right now, from that hill way up there," Mizer said. The men plodded on. In daylight, an invisible Joe held no terrors. Old, rusted barbed wire, shell cases, empty C-ration tins, cartridges, bits of wire—the miscellaneous debris of war—lay scattered along the path. But not in great amounts: scavengers, risking minefields and the bullets of patrols, have cleaned out most of it during 10 years of night prowling.

The Charley 3 patrol sloshed through a tiny brook, climbed along the side of a shale knoll, pushed through some willow branches.

A hundred yards before the MDL, Mizer halted. "You come up here at night, and if you've never been here before, you see that sign, you'll swear to God there's a man standing up there."

The sign that looks like a man was one of the 1,292 yellow markers along the 151-mile military demarcation line dividing North from South Korea, the line that starts at the Han River in the west, goes lengthwise through the center of the green baize-covered table of the Military Armistice Commission meeting room at Panmunjom, and then threads through the hills and valleys of Korea, northeast to the Sea of Japan. It represents the final line of contact when the guns stopped shooting, and it cuts a nation in two. No one knows how many men died within sight of it, how many shells exploded within sound of it, or how long the yellow signs will stay. The line is a frozen summary of a million defeats and victories. Each crimp in it, each loop, each corner, was drawn in blood. Yet there is no one who remembers the significance of each turning, and there are no monuments but the thickening underbrush, the wild deer and the mute yellow signs.

Across a narrow green valley, the men see a round, sandy hill, about 400 yards away, beetling down on them—Bunker Hill. Here occurred one of the heaviest sustained two-way artillery barrages of the Korean war: 32,000 rounds of American artillery on the Chinese attackers; 15,000 Chinese shells on U.S. marine positions along the ridge, all in one night. Hundreds of Chinese got through the barrage and breached the American lines twice. The Chinese attack continued all night, but the hill held, and hundreds of dead Chinese were visible on the forward slope at sunrise. Bunker Hill is

quiet now, deserted. It lies just north of the demarcation line. Sergeant Mizer's patrol leaves it behind. There is some sagging barbed wire to straighten, a fence post to hammer into the ground with a rock, long stretches of knee-deep water to wade. Up a steep gully, guard post Laura comes into view.

Mizer calls a 5-minute halt, lets his men smoke.

Here, too, there are old bunkers, with rotting sandbags, and foxholes, half-filled in by earth and sand, more debris; cans, wire, frayed canvas. But the lush growth hides most of it. The path between the double barbed wire runs in and out of gullies, climbing up the south side of another rice-paddy valley.

LEISURE IN TEAHOUSES

Although the great majority of patrols and guard-post watches turn up nothing more serious than a scavenger or a few telltale footprints, the men and their commanders take them seriously—for that one-in-a-hundred chance. Only 35 percent of the men of the 9th Calvary are permitted to be away from their unit areas at any given time; only 15 percent can be out of the division area, that is, go as far as Seoul. Consequently, when the men do have leisure, they either go through the "moose gate" to the local village "teahouses" (registered with and inspected by division headquarters) or make their way to one of the recreation centers provided by the Army in all troop areas. There, they have bowling alleys, sports, libraries. There's a division baseball league (the 9th Cavalry is currently in last place with a one-and-nine record), and a weekly division newspaper keeps the men informed of the standings.

Since the Army decreed in 1961 that the traditional R. & R. leaves to Japan would be counted against a man's furlough time, the flow of GI's to Tokyo has dropped steadily. Only a couple of hundred go a month, most preferring to save their leaves for their return home. Consequently, the Korean Government hopes that its $5 million Walker Hill resort near Seoul will eventually pick up a large part of the annual $84 million the Army pays to its troops in Korea.

Originally planned to include a gambling casino and a more-or-less sanitary brothel, Walker Hill ran into trouble when U.S. 8th Army generals started having nightmares about congressional investigating committees. Under threat of being posted "off limits," the Walker Hill management quickly changed its plans, opened for business last spring with a very respectable—and quite scenic—establishment. There is no gambling, except for slot machines; no girls, not even cabaret dance partners, except for the women the customers bring in themselves. As a result, there are not many GI customers either for Walker Hill's five hotels (named Matthew, James, Douglas, Lyman, and Maxwell, for 5 of the U.S. generals who served in Korea), 12 private villas, swimming pool, restaurants, and bars overlooking the Han River. Nor for the gorgeous nightclub, which displays such modern conveniences as a ceiling gondola, in which a luscious showgirl rides, occasionally dropping balloons on the heads of American fighting men below.

Where time stands the stillest in Korea is at Panmunjom. Through 170 meetings of the full-dress military armistice commission, and thousands of lower level conferences of duty officers and secretaries, the two sides have almost never reached agreement on anything, except when to recess and when to meet next. The atmosphere was established when the signers of the armistice declined to shake hands with one another 10 years ago, and a cordial word has not been uttered across the table yet.

Of the 2,274 armistice violations charged against them by the United Nations command, the North Korean-Chinese side has admitted only two, both in 1953. As of the 170th meeting on May 27, the Communists had accused the U.N. command of 5,648 violations, of which the U.N. confessed 76. Latest U.N. "violation": an 8th Army helicopter that strayed into the north side of the DMZ on May 17, while checking zone markers, and was apparently shot down by North Korean gunners.

Urgent, repeated demands by the U.N. command failed to obtain the release of the two pilots aboard the chopper, although Marine Maj. Gen. George H. Cloud admitted an "honest mistake," and expressed regrets. Not until the end of June did the Communists acknowledge that the fliers were alive and in captivity. The Communists claimed the pilots were engaged in espionage (though they carried no arms, no camera). Since the pilots were "criminals," the Communists argued, the U.N. command had no right to demand their return. A trial seemed imminent. The names of Capt. Ben Stutts and Capt. Charleton Voltz may have to be added to the list of U.S. casualties in Korea.

In the operations room of Charley troop, the men for the midnight-to-dawn guard post shift come in to sign for their DMZ cards. A gin rummy game is in progress behind the counter. Sergeant Lovett is on duty; his badge of office, hanging from his belt, is the set of keys that will unlock the ammo supply room if necessary. "You know what I miss most?" he asks. "My 6-month-old daughter that I haven't seen yet. I was in Korea when my oldest was born too."

The radio in the corner hisses and crackles its familiar message: "This is Encourage 576 with an all-secure report. Over."

THE HERITAGE OF POPE JOHN

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, all of us in this body have been deeply moved, I know, by the passage of recent events within the Roman Catholic Church—by the death of Pope John XXIII, by the mounting evidence of the tremendous impact which his brief reign had on the church and on the whole world, and now by the succession to the throne of St. Peter of Pope Paul VI, who, we are told, is determined to continue in the tradition of his beloved predecessor.

The world is already coming to realize how deep and strong the heritage of Pope John runs. Indeed, in this time of flux and change in world affairs, we already may be witnessing a harvest of some of the fruits of his labor. Because his impact was so universal, it is not surprising that Pope John's magnificent contributions have been memorialized in the temporal as well as in the spiritual realm and by men of all faiths. I am particularly happy to call the attention of the Senate to one such memorial by one of our own colleagues, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]. As a veteran of 7 years' service in the diplomatic corps, some of it behind the Iron Curtain, Senator PELL is well qualified to comment on the legacy of Pope John as a diplomat and peacemaker. As the Senator states, it was Pope John, more than anyone else, who restored the pursuit of peace to respectability and dignity.

It is entirely fitting—and again a tribute to Pope John's universality, that the comments of Senator PELL, an Episcopalian, should be published in America, the Catholic weekly review published by a group of Jesuit Fathers. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Heritage of Pope John," by Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, which appeared in the July 13, 1963, issue of America be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

THE HERITAGE OF POPE JOHN

(By Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island)

Pope John XXIII died on the evening following Pentecost Sunday. It is a day of high significance and joy in the Roman Catholic Church, and it was one of the Pope's favorites; for it commemorates the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles—an act which gave deep spiritual expression to the church in its beginnings.

This year the Pope suffered through the Feast of Pentecost in agony. Yet he was able to rally from the threshold of death and give his special blessing to mankind. In doing so, he imparted his own spiritual meaning and the intensity of his dedication to the world at large.

The prayerful supplications of the thousands gathered to kneel in St. Peter's Square, the prayers of the millions outside of Rome, made him wish, not for his own life, but that copious favors would be granted to the work he had undertaken. He has left us a truly remarkable heritage, certainly the most remarkable of our particular times.

He understood them, the longing and need they imply. He could be politically sagacious to the point of shrewdness; but he was never dogmatic, and always the wisdom was tempered with humility and often with humor directed against himself. He could be almost worldly in demeanor, his eyes full of ebullient inner mirth: an old man enjoying a private jest with an old friend; but those same eyes could express all the authority and dignity of his eminent office. They could betoken an infinity of compassion, sadness, and pain; and when he knelt at the altar and his head, always a trifle bowed, bent lower, he seemed to personify the universal quest for religious truth which men and women of all faiths share—the ultimate, unbroken, serene, and profound communion between man and God.

His extraordinary versatility helped create a beloved image. Perhaps we ourselves laughed inwardly and with delight at the concept of a Pope, in his flowing robes and vestments, blessing a helicopter just landed in the Vatican courtyard, or gaily riding in a police launch while Patriarch of Venice, since a gondola was too oldfashioned a means of conveyance. Possibly we smiled at the picture of the white skull cap perched between the two monumentally grand ears, and the eyes seemed to return our amusement. "Oh Lord," said Pope John once, regarding his reflection, "this man will be a disaster on television." But then we remember the gnarled, short fingers touching the cross, the long vigil below the Vatican bedroom window, and the files of mourners paying their final homage under St. Peter's soaring dome. We feel the impact of immense loss.

Already broadcast to the world are the details of his life—from the humble birth of Angelo Roncalli on the farm in northern Italy through the procession of increasing responsibilities which he assumed. To one, such as myself, engaged in public life, the execution of these responsibilities—merely from a political standpoint—affords a source for stimulating study and inspiration. It is fascinating, for instance, to follow the germination of his ideals for a unified Catholic Church and their practical implementation, as he advanced from the office of Apostolic Visitor to Bulgaria, to Apostolic Delegate to Turkey and Greece and Administrator of the

Latin Vicariate of Constantinople. He tried ceaselessly in those years to establish improving accord between the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Churches. Gradually, through his unique blend of gentleness and firmness, and through the labyrinth of conflicting viewpoints and beliefs, his ideals took shape.

They reached fruition on a much broader scale when he summoned to Rome the first Ecumenical Council to be held in 92 years—not this time to deal with problems of doctrinal heresy or political enemies, as in the case of the only 20 previous councils to be convened over a period of nearly 20 centuries—but to examine boldly a new approach to religious harmony. He exhorted the 2,500 assembled bishops to conduct their discussions and debates in the name of holy liberty. Many opposed his ideals as overly liberal; many traditionalists will continue to oppose the sweeping changes he espoused. Nevertheless, in the Pope's own phrase, "a great echo" of approbation has been evoked. Its reverberations are worldwide.

Fascinating, too, is a study of his work as Papal Nuncio to Paris in the difficult days which brought World War II to its conclusion. With enormous tact he helped resolve the differences and the mutual antagonisms existing between the protagonists of Marshal Pétain and the liberating forces of General de Gaulle. Even that most controversial French leader could not but give his swift endorsement to Monsignor Roncalli, and when, in 1958, the future Pope was elevated to the College of Cardinals, he received his red biretta from Vincent Auriol, then President of the French Republic, in keeping with a custom which allows certain heads of state such privilege upon request.

The ceremony, I think, significantly demonstrates Pope John's talents as politician-diplomat-statesman, together with the respect and affection he engendered. He was able to succor hundreds of German prisoners of war in France without upsetting the delicate balance of his office; and he brought these same talents to his discussions with the Soviet Union and to his efforts to improve conditions behind the Iron Curtain. He has shown us that negotiation with the Communist world is not impossible, that it can lead, by a slow process of painstaking labor, to constructive results. Restrictions on the freedom of prelates in Hungary and Poland are being removed. Herein Pope John showed himself to be an astute realist. "False philosophic teachings," he said, "historically must submit to changes, even of a profound nature." He had the keenest appreciation of historic processes; he approached them as a scholar.

His emissaries, quite apparently, were conducting further explorations. We have caught glimpses of this through such reported Vatican contacts as those with Cardinal Wyszynski, Primate of Poland and undisputed courageous patriot; by the visits of Cardinal Koenig, Archbishop of Vienna, to Poland and Hungary; by indications that Cardinal Mindszenty, Primate of Hungary, may be allowed to leave his sanctuary in the U.S. Legation in Budapest; by the admission to the Pope's death chamber, at his own request, of Archbishop Slipyi, Primate of the Ukraine.

We can only speculate on these various deliberations and special missions; but they connote a sense of urgency and purpose. Undoubtedly they must be strenuously pursued if they are to succeed. They reveal, however, that Pope John was constantly probing for a means of easing tensions between East and West; and when the history of his reign is at last fully recorded, this aspect of it may well be seen as one of his major contributions.

"I have tried to preserve my calm and balance while investigating and evaluating things and persons about me, concerned more with what unites than with what divides." These eloquently direct words were the motivating force behind the Pope's every undertaking. They are at the root of his encyclicals: Mater et Magistra, in which he communicated the need for assistance to the impoverished, the distressed and underprivileged of all races and creeds; and Pacem in Terris, in which he addressed himself to the monumental task of creating a strong foundation for universal peace and enhanced international cooperation.

Most significant from the viewpoint of the basic survival of our civilization, is the extraordinary metamorphosis of the word peace during the period of Pope John's reign. He gave both eminent respectability and immense renewed dignity to a word which, upon his election, was being exploited by the Communists, by the Picasso dove, by the facsimiles his followers produced, and by such as Lord Russell.

Fifty-six months later, at the Pope's death, the pursuit of peace had become imbued with the deepest possible meaning and purpose. Bound as we were like lemmings upon paths of headlong destruction, all of us have now the inspiration to resume our search for the goals which he so held aloft.

The two encyclicals are without question among the Pope's most important legacies. They will be examined and reexamined by future generations, and especially by our own. They stand steadfast, true and beyond challenge. We cannot maintain, however, that the Pope alone has given us guidance toward these goals. Many others, during mankind's evolution, have shared in this continuing dialog to express our aspirations.

"Justice, then, right reason and humanity urgently demand that the arms race should cease." What lifts this language far beyond the ordinary is not the actual content—nor just the fact that it stems from a celebrated religious leader, nor that the source is surrounded by the pomp of traditional solemnity and the magnificence of architectural achievement. St. Peter's Square in Rome, with its wide-curving colonnade, the towering interior of the basilica, these are the arenas where the human voice is given opportunity for added consequence. But to me, the Pope's words possess their transcendent value when we view them in a less ornate framework. It was not a lofty, stone-carved balcony which projected Pope John's message and meaning to the world. It was the quietly spoken phrase, and the simple gesture of his hand.

"I am your brother," he said, "I am your parish priest." "I will be called John," he told the Sacred College of Cardinals on the October day in 1958 when he was elected and accepted the papal designation. "The name John is dear to me because it is the name of my father." (Wonderfully moving words, I think, almost heartbreaking in retrospect.) "It is dear to me because it is the title of the humble parish church where we received baptism," he explained. "It is the name which, in the long series of Roman pontiffs, has been most used. * * * We have preferred to shield the smallness of our own name behind this magnificent succession."

In our supposed modern sophistication, we have become wary of humility. Blow your horn, we are frequently and all too glibly instructed: you (or your product) will be accepted at face value; and all around us we are aware of aggressive individuals seeking to overtop other individuals, and aggressive nations striving to dominate and control. What a vast contrast when we confront the genuine and the real.

Pope John was an innovator. He elevated to cardinal the first Negro, the first Filipino, the first Japanese. He decentralized the authority of the Church by expanding the Sacred College to 82 members, with a non-Italian majority of 55. He created the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity as an official organ in Rome. He held many affectionate audiences with Jewish leaders, and the meeting between the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury was the first such encounter in more than five centuries. In turn, the standard of the archbishop was lowered to half-staff on Pope John's death—the first time an Anglican primate's flag had so been flown in tribute to the head of another church.

He was a gregarious man; he altered the custom that the Pope should eat alone, and dined with the administrative members of his household. He broke with tradition in making unscheduled visits outside the Vatican to orphanages and hospitals and jails, "You couldn't come to me," he once told a group of prisoners, "so I come to you." It was Christmastime.

Less than a month before he died he was presented with the renowned Balzan peace prize—worth $230,000, which he has set aside for a "perpetual fund in favor of peace." It was the first time ever that a Pope had received a peace award.

Each attribute of his personality has left us a legacy and a heritage. The politician-diplomat-statesman—working with care, with knowledge, with patience and fundamental assurance—has given us a new example, a renewed vision to follow. The scholarly cleric has opened new avenues for church reform, and, above all, church unity. The innovator, with his omnipresent humor and flair for the unpredictable, has taught us that these new avenues can be found, even in old age, even at death's door. The sufferer has shown us once again that "atrocious pain" can be made the springboard to human dignity.

We can surmise that the Pope's work was incomplete in his own eyes. Referring to the reconvening of the Ecumenical Council which had been planned for this coming September 8, and speaking directly to God in his private papers, the Pope wrote: "Will He concede me to finish it? Will He not concede this to me?" It remains for Pope John's successor to carry on his tasks. But what an enormous amount he accomplished during the apex of his life, and in less than a 5-year span.

These accomplishments would have been of lesser stature, of course, had the man responsible for them been austere or remote. We would not have remembered them as easily or with the same outgoing spirit of gratitude. Once overhearing a remark that he possessed the hands of a peasant, he took no offense. "Mine are the hands of a peasant," he is reported to have said later on. "It was such a nice compliment." Sotto il Monte—that was the town of his birth, in the shadow of the Alps. The words in Italian mean "under the mountain"—below it. The mind immediately conceives a symbol in refutation—yet the Pope loved his birthplace and in his earlier years returned often to it, as if the daily hard toil of the farmer refreshed him.

The gift of simplicity is, then, perhaps the greatest of all his legacies. Simplicity and greatness are rarely combined. Spiritual intent is the catalyst; and this, too, is rare enough, especially in 1963. Inescapably, no matter what our personal beliefs and religious preferences happen to be, we feel that Pope John was in close communication with his God. That is only part of the synthesis, however. To me the Pope's crowning attribute is that he was also in close communication with mankind—and that he carried the afflictions of mankind, all the divisive and discordant elements, not as a burden, not as a subject for attack and excoriation, but as a banner of hope.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on July 23, President Kennedy sent to the Congress a historic message recommending the

removal from our basic immigration law of the national origins quota system. I was privileged to introduce a bill (S. 1932) to carry out the recommendations of the President, and Senators from both sides of the aisle have joined in cosponsoring this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's message be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S IMMIGRATION MESSAGE TO THE CONGRESS, JULY 23, 1963

I am transmitting herewith for the consideration of the Congress, legislation revising and modernizing our immigration laws. More than a decade has elapsed since the last substantial amendment to these laws. I believe there exists a compelling need for the Congress to reexamine and make certain changes in these laws.

The most urgent and fundamental reform I am recommending relates to the national origins system of selecting immigrants. Since 1924 it has been used to determine the number of quota immigrants permitted to enter the United States each year. Accordingly, although the legislation I am transmitting deals with many problems which require remedial action, it concentrates attention primarily upon revision of our quota immigration system. The enactment of this legislation will not resolve all of our important problems in the field of immigration law. It will, however, provide a sound basis upon which we can build in developing an immigration law that serves the national interest and reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribes.

ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION BASED ON NATIONAL ORIGINS

Present legislation establishes a system of annual quotas to govern immigration from each country. Under this system, 156,700 quota immigrants are permitted to enter the United States each year. The system is based upon the national origins of the population of the United States in 1920. The use of the year 1920 is arbitrary. It rests upon the fact that this system was introduced in 1924 and the last prior census was in 1920. The use of a national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose. In an age of interdependence among nations, such a system is an anachronism, for it discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth.

Because of the composition of our population in 1920, the system is heavily weighted in favor of immigration from northern Europe and severely limits immigration from southern and eastern Europe and from other parts of the world. An American citizen with a Greek father or mother must wait at least 18 months to bring his parents here to join him. A citizen whose married son or daughter, or brother or sister, is Italian cannot obtain a quota number for an even longer time. Meanwhile, many thousands of quota numbers are wasted because they are not wanted or needed by nationals of the countries to which they are assigned.

I recommend that there be substituted for the national origins system a formula governing immigration to the United States which takes into account (1) the skills of the immigrant and their relationships to our needs, (2) the family relationship between immigrants and persons already here, so that the reuniting of families is encouraged, and (3) the priority of registration. Present law grants a preference to immigrants with special skills, education or training. It also grants a preference to various relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens. But it does so only within a national origins quota. It should be modified so that those with the greatest ability to add to the national welfare, no matter where they are born, are granted the highest priority. The next priority should go to those who seek to be reunited with their relatives. As between applicants with equal claims the earliest registrant should be the first admitted.

Many problems of fairness and foreign policy are involved in replacing a system so long entrenched. The national origins system has produced large backlogs of applications in some countries, and too rapid a change might, in a system of limited immigration, so drastically curtail immigration in some countries the only effect might be to shift the unfairness from one group of nations to another. A reasonable time to adjust to any new system must be provided if individual hardships upon persons who were relying on the present system are to be avoided. In addition, any new system must have sufficient flexibility to allow adjustments to be made when it appears that immigrants from nations closely allied to the United States will be unduly restricted in their freedom to furnish the new seed population that has so long been a source of strength to our Nation.

PROPOSAL IN DETAIL

Accordingly, I recommend:

First, that existing quotas be reduced gradually, at the rate of 20 percent a year. The quota numbers released each year would be placed in a quota reserve pool, to be distributed on the new basis.

Second, that native of no one country receive over 10 percent of the total quota numbers authorized in any 1 year. This will insure that the pattern of immigration is not distorted by excessive demand from any one country.

Third, that the President be authorized, after receiving recommendations from a seven-man immigration board, to reserve up to 50 percent of the unallocated quota numbers for issuance to persons disadvantaged by the change in the quota system, and up to 20 percent to refugees whose sudden dislocation requires special treatment. The immigration board will be composed of two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two members appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and three members appointed by the President. In addition to its responsibility for formulating recommendations regarding the use of the quota reserve pool, the board will make a continuous study of our immigration policy.

ALL QUOTA NUMBERS USED

But it is not alone the initial assignment of quota numbers which is arbitrary and unjust; additional inequity results from the failure of the law to permit full utilization of the authorized quota numbers. While American citizens wait for years for their relatives to receive a quota, approximately 60,000 quota numbers are wasted each year because the countries to which they are assigned have far more numbers allocated to them than they have emigrants seeking to move to the United States. There is no way at present in which these numbers can be reassigned to nations where immense backlogs of applicants for admission to the United States have accumulated. I recommend that this deficiency in the law be corrected.

ASIA-PACIFIC TRIANGLE

A special discriminatory formula is now used to regulate the immigration of persons who are attributable by their ancestry to an area called the Asia-Pacific triangle. This area embraces all countries from Pakistan to Japan and the Pacific islands north of Australia and New Zealand. Usually, the quota under which a prospective immigrant must enter is determined by his place of birth. However, if as much as one-half of an immigrant's ancestors came from nations in the Asia-Pacific triangle, he must rely upon the small quota assigned to the country of his ancestry, regardless of where he was born. This provision of the law should be repealed.

OTHER PROVISIONS

In order to remove other existing barriers to the reuniting of families, I recommend two additional improvements in the law.

First, parents of American citizens, who now have a preferred quota status, should be accorded nonquota status.

Second, parents of aliens resident in the United States, who now have no preference, should be accorded a preference, after skilled specialists and other relatives of citizens and alien residents.

These changes will have little effect on the number of immigrants admitted. They will have a major effect upon the individual hardships many of our citizens and residents now face in being separated from their parents.

In addition, I recommend the following changes in the law in order to correct certain deficiencies and improve its general application.

1. Changes in the preference structure. At present, the procedure under which specially skilled or trained workers are permitted to enter this country too often prevents talented people from applying for visas to enter the United States. It often deprives us of immigrants who would be helpful to our economy and our culture. This procedure should be liberalized so that highly trained or skilled persons may obtain a preference without requiring that they secure employment here before emigrating. In addition, I recommend that a special preference be accorded workers with lesser skills who can fill specific needs in short supply in this country.

2. Nonquota status for natives of Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago should be granted. Under existing law, no numerical limitation is imposed upon the number of immigrants coming from Canada, Mexico, Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Canal Zone, or any independent country in Central or South America. But the language of the statute restricts this privilege to persons born in countries in the Caribbean area which gained their independence prior to the date of the last major amendment to the immigration and nationality statutes, in 1952. This accidental discrimination against the newly independent nations of the Western Hemisphere should be corrected.

3. Persons afflicted with mental health problems should be admitted provided certain standards are met. Today, any person afflicted with a mental disease or mental defect, psychotic personality, or epilepsy, and any person who has suffered an attack of mental illness, can enter this country only if a private bill is enacted for his benefit. Families which are able and willing to care for a mentally ill child or parent are often forced to choose between living in the United States and leaving heir loved ones behind and not living in the United States but being able to see and care of their loved ones. Mental illness is not incurable. It should be treated like other illnesses. I recommend that the Attorney General, at his discretion, and under proper safeguards, be authorized to waive those provisions of the law which prohibit the admission to the United States of persons with mental problems when they are close relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens.

4. The Secretary of State should be authorized, in his discretion, to require reregistration of certain quota immigrant visa applicants and to regulate the time of payment of

visa fees. This authority brings registration lists up to date, terminates the priority of applicants who have refused to accept a visa, and ends the problem of "insurance" registrations by persons who have no present intention to emigrate. Registration figures for oversubscribed quota areas are now inaccurate because there exists no way of determining whether registrants have died, have emigrated to other countries, or for some other reason no longer want to emigrate to the United States. These problems are particularly acute in heavily oversubscribed areas.

CONCLUSION

As I have already indicated the measures I have outlined will not solve all the problems of immigration. Many of them will require additional legislation; some cannot be solved by any one country. But the legislation I am submitting will insure that progress will continue to be made toward our ideals and toward the realization of humanitarian objectives. The measures I have recommended will help eliminate discrimination between peoples and nations on a basis that is unrelated to any contribution that immigrants can have and is inconsistent with our traditions of welcome. Our investment in new citizens has always been a valuable source of our strength.

NEW YORK TIMES DESCRIBES BEAUTY OF SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as each day passes, more and more people are visiting the Sleeping Bear Dunes area in Michigan and are recognizing that it has a unique beauty which deserves preservation.

The New York Times of July 28 has a most interesting story, "New Role Looms for the Sleeping Bear Dunes." I commend it to those who may not yet be familiar with this unequaled Great Lakes area, where the senior Senator from Michigan and I are urging the establishment of a national lakeshore.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article be inserted 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:

NEW ROLE LOOMS FOR THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

(By Damon Stetson)

GLEN HAVEN, MICH.—Gordon Plowman, a tall, lean man wearing a soft, slouch hat, told us to hop into his balloon tire dunesmobile convertible. Then he headed westward along the shore of Good Harbor Bay and toward the massive Sleeping Bear Dunes.

We leaned back, tilted our faces skyward and breathed deeply of the cool, fresh air blowing off Lake Michigan. Mr. Plowman gunned the engine slightly as we zoomed onto the sand of the giant dune area, which towers 460 feet above the lake and extends 7 miles southward and 2½ miles inland. Riding the winding, twisting, dipping duneways was like a safari into an African desert without the heat.

Occasionally, we passed jagged skeletons of old cedars. Here and there, courageous and persistent poplars and cottonwoods pushed upward from the shifting sands, but mostly there were just acres of rolling dunes.

The dunesmobile swooped down into a valley and then swirled around a curve and into a sharp climb to an overlook point. As Mr. Plowman brought the vehicle to a quick stop, we suddenly found ourselves looking out over the bright blue lake and toward South Manitou Island.

BEACH BELOW

Mr. Plowman said we were 1,100 feet above sea level. The beach lay almost straight down—more than 665 feet below us.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes derive their name from an old Indian legend. Ottawa and Chippewa Indians, according to the tale, said that a black bear and her cubs once attempted to swim across Lake Michigan from the Wisconsin side.

As the bears drew close to the Michigan beach, the cubs grew tired and fell behind. The mother bear, however, continued to the beach and climbed to the top of a bluff to await her offspring. But they never made it.

Nowadays, a solitary dune covered with dark-colored vegetation is identified as the mother bear. Her ill-fated cubs, the legend says, were transformed into the forest-covered Manitou Islands (north and south), which lie a few miles offshore.

Our dunesmobile now headed inland, swooping and almost diving over sharp crests of whirling sands created by the winds from the lake. Suddenly, lying before us to the east, we saw the shimmering expanse of Glen Lake, nested in a forest of green. Then we turned northward, winding among junipers and birches that somehow had found life and sustenance amid the sands.

Pyramid Point was ahead, but we veered to the northeast through a narrow roadway cut out of thick, forested inland vegetation. A few minutes later, still tingling from the thrills of the exciting ride, we were back in Glen Haven and were thanking Mr. Plowman for showing us one of Michigan's most spectacular natural phenomena.

NATURAL LAKESHORE

The Sleeping Bear Dunes, long a tourist attraction, have assumed new significance as the result of two congressional proposals to create a national lakeshore in the area. The bill of Senators PHILIP A. HART and PAT MCNAMARA, both Democrats of Michigan, would establish a 77,000-acre national park development in the region. The park would extend from Crystal Lake, on the south, to a point north of Little Traverse Lake, on Good Harbor Bay.

Another bill, by Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Republican, of Michigan, would provide a smaller lakeshore area taking in about 37,000 acres.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes region is one of 12 remaining portions of the Nation's shorelines that the National Park Service has designated as being "deserving of preservation by the Federal Government."

The Park Service cited a host of factors that make the sector one of the outstanding recreation and natural areas of the Great Lakes region. Among the factors it listed were the Sleeping Bear Dunes themselves, with the forest-covered Empire Dunes to the south, the miles of excellent sand beaches, the pine and oak forests of the Platte Plains, the giant cedars, dunes, and gull colony of South Manitou Island, the bogs, marshes, lakes and streams of the area, and the wide variety of plants, trees, birds, and wildlife.

BAYS, BLUFFS, BEACHES

The Sleeping Bear area lies almost due west of Traverse City, on the northwest coast of Michigan's lower peninsula. From Point Betsie to the south to Good Harbor Bay to the north, the proposed national lakeshore extends for about 37 miles along bays, bluffs, beaches, and dunes and across inland forests.

The National Park Service describes the area as both remote and accessible—remote in that its natural features are as yet untrammeled and accessible in that it lies within a day's drive of 20 million people in the populous Chicago-Detroit complex. It is 239 miles from Detroit, 294 from Chicago and 400 from Cleveland.

An unusual combination of scenic, scientific, and recreational features enhances the potential of the region of a national park, according to the Park Service.

The towering dunes themselves provide vantage points for viewing the bays and broad blue expanse of Lake Michigan, the green forests to the east and the attractive inland lakes. The beaches along Lake Michigan and the warmer ones inland, such as Platte and Glen Lakes, provides opportunities for boating, fishing, swimming, and water skiing.

The Platte and Crystal Rivers carry enough water for float trips by rowboat or canoe. The forest sections offer many areas suitable for the development of new campgrounds.

On the dunes themselves, erosion is continuing, so that the processes of headland dune formation can be studied firsthand. Geologists say that, at some stage in the distant past, a system of high perched dunes developed along the western face of the Sleeping Bear moraine.

SOLITARY SURVIVOR

The Sleeping Bear Dune itself is now the solitary survivor of this development.

As the moraine diminished to landward, however, the dunes were rejuvenated and blown over the lee, or northeast, slope of the moraine. That is where they lie today.

Although the region has rich possibilities as a national lakeshore open to all, the proposal has run into strong opposition from many local residents and owners of summer cottages. They are worried about visitors roaming indiscriminately on private properties in the region and about losses in tax revenues if the Park Service takes over.

Senator HART emphasizes, however, that permanent private ownership of existing homes and resort property would be assured in the lakeshore region. Public use areas, he said, would be developed so as to insure privacy for home and cottage owners.

PRICE DISPUTE

In any dispute over the price of any property sold to the Government, Senator Hart explained, a fair market value would be determined, with full judicial protection. He estimates at about $4 million the cost of acquiring undeveloped land needed for public development within the boundaries of the proposed park.

The development proposal for the region would include a system of scenic drives around the high bluffs overlooking the inland lakes. Public use areas and campgrounds would be selected, Senator Hart said, so as to provide buffers to insure the privacy of existing cottages.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, there has come to my attention an editorial from the Pontiac (Mich.) Press of July 22 which expresses eloquently the reasons for the continuing widespread support in Michigan and throughout the Midwest for the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore development.

Efforts to preserve our national resources and to provide adequate recreational areas, not only for our generation but for those to come, always are controversial. But it is this very obligation we have to future generations that demands we seek equitable and fair solutions to these controversies.

S. 792, which Senator MCNAMARA and I have introduced, contains many innovations by which both public and permanent private residential and commercial development in the Sleeping

Bear Dunes area can proceed together in the decades ahead.

One of these innovations is a provision for technical assistance to local counties and townships in obtaining the best land use and zoning assistance available in our country.

Special residential development areas, where new residential construction could go forward under provisions of local zoning ordinances, are provided for in this bill.

When I testified before the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee in March of this year, I indicated my support for a provision which would insure that local school districts which have bonding obligations would also be adequately protected in terms of any undue loss of school revenue.

These features, among others, for the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore which have been developed through private consultation and public meetings represent innovations by which there can be mixed public and private use of areas of special national significance.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Pontiac Press of July 22 be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

CONGRESSMAN PUTS NEW LIGHT ON CONTROVERSIAL DUNE TOPIC

The subject of our Sleeping Bear Dunes is so controversial, we'd like to reprint a quotation for the consideration of those who are opposed.

This comes from "Planning and Civic Comment," a quarterly publication, which is the official organ of "American Planning and Civic Association on State Parks."

The statement originated with JOHN F. SHELLEY, Congressman from California, and we seize this brief excerpt from his bill "to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people of our Nation." That in itself, is a powerful and suggestive statement.

A student in 2063 is asking a history professor about the people in the United States a hundred years before—in our day. The undergraduate inquires whether these "courageous, farsighted people ever stopped their continuous building of schools, highways, homes and playgrounds."

The professor replies:

"No, they never stopped. They were bold, ambitious, enterprising people—these energetic citizens of the sixties. They went right on building their schools, homes, highways, and playgrounds.

"But they were not so consumed with their own destiny—their own needs and ambitions—that they forgot about ours.

"They left us their spirit—they left us their natural resources—they even left us some of their wilderness as a reminder of our past and our heritage. This they inherited from those who went before them. This they preserved for us. This we must preserve, too."

The Press believes these people of a century hence—2063—deserve the fruits of current thought, consideration, and planning. They should expect a part of our heritage intact. The good of the masses is paramount. Future airports, highways, schools and parks must be planned and started now. And always—always they must inevitably occupy land that belongs to someone.

Can it be otherwise?

But picture the added cost, dislocation and hardships, if these steps were postponed a century.

And the State doesn't confiscate.

It pays its way—which is some mitigation.

We can't block progress.

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION ADOPTED BY UNITED HIAS SERVICE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, for many years United HIAS Service has been in the forefront of efforts to put a just and reasonable immigration law on our statute books. They have done great things in helping to alert public opinion to the need for immigration reform, and share a major responsibility in generating the broadly based support for an immigration reform bill. I pay tribute to the fine record of United HIAS.

At their annual meeting this year, United HIAS adopted a timely and appropriate resolution on immigration. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this resolution be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION ADOPTED AT ANNUAL MEETING, UNITED HIAS SERVICE

Whereas for many years the members of United HIAS Service have been urging revision of the basic U.S. immigration and nationality law; and

Whereas there has been recognition by the U.S. Congress of continuing refugee needs by the passage of Public Law 87-510, for which we commend the Congress; and

Whereas this new legislation does provide for the permanent admission of certain categories of refugees outside of quota restrictions and, therefore, is an important forward step in our immigration policy, nevertheless, there has been no action on many of the issues which have been of continuing concern to our members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national origins quota system with its implications that some nations and races are superior to others, be abolished and instead, a method of reflecting American democratic concepts concerning the dignity and worth of the individual be incorporated into a new quota allocations system, including provisions for use of unused numbers each year;

That in such system due consideration should be given to family reunion, persons with outstanding skills urgently required by the United States; asylum for refugees, persecutees, and escapees, and finally, to immigrants who have no special ties in the United States, except their ardent desire to live in this free land; be it further

Resolved, That in carrying out our concept of the importance of close family ties, parents, grandparents of American citizens and legal resident aliens and spouses and minor children of legal resident aliens shall be granted nonquota status.

We are gratified by the introduction in the Senate, under broad sponsorship, of a bill designed to accomplish these objectives; be it further

Resolved, That provisions for deportation of aliens be revised so as to eliminate what is basically a double punishment for transgressions; be it further

Resolved, That except for cases of fraud, there shall be no distinction between naturalized and native-born citizens.

We therefore urge upon the membership of United HIAS Service that representations be made to their Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to take such appropriate action which would in no way jeopardize our national interest, yet would infuse our immigration and nationality laws with the cherished humanitarian and democratic principles of our Nation, and set an example of leadership in the free world.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF YESTERDAY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, recently Frederick D. Mott, M.D., executive director of Detroit's Community Health Association was a speaker at the meeting of the Third National Congress on Voluntary Health Insurance and Prepayment in Chicago on February 15, 1963. His observations, I believe, will be of interest to the Congress. For this reason I ask that they be made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Community Health Association is a medical care plan which has been functioning in the Detroit area for more than 2 years. It is providing thoroughly satisfactory service to a membership which now exceeds 50,000 people. It is growing steadily and has been recognized as a plan available to Federal employees in Detroit. Additionally, Dr. Mott is also president of the Group Health Association of America which represents the medical plans, cooperatives, unions, and others interested in progress in this field.

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

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF YESTERDAY—INDEPENDENT PROGRAMS

(By Frederick D. Mott, M.D., president, Group Health Association of America, Inc.)

Rather than confusing you with a mass of detail about the whole heterogeneous grouping of so-called independent programs, all of those not comprising the Blue plans or insurance company plans, I wish to confine my remarks at this opening session to the direct service, group practice-prepayment plans. As of 1961, upward of 4 million persons were served by these plans of some 10 million in the whole independent plan category.

Direct service plans have their roots far back in our history. George Washington engaged a physician to take care of the people on his estate for £15 a year. The 19th century saw the development of many plans to bring medical care to isolated miners and lumbermen. The employees and management of the Southern Pacific Railway established a program in 1869 that became the forerunner of numerous railway medical and hospital care programs. The Union Health Center set up by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union in 1913 paved the way for today's 65 or more union health centers. The Ross-Loos medical group in Los Angeles broke new prepayment ground in 1929 as a physician-sponsored plan. The first consumer-cooperative prepayment plan was also started in 1929, in Elk City, Okla.

Though the roots of the group-health movement are deep, its major growth has come since the late thirties and particularly since World War II. This growth in recent times is a direct reflection of some of today's major trends in medical care. Among these trends are the remarkable, continuing advances in medical science; the seemingly endless increase in specialization; rising medical care costs; an aging population and increase in chronic illness that are changing the role of medicine; and the increasing demand for broader health insurance coverage in the face of a declining supply of physicians.

These trends point up the need to broaden the availability of all new services, to provide for coordination of services and for continuity of responsibility in the care of the patient, and to conserve our limited medical resources.

Such challenges call for bold new approaches. Today we have a growing group of direct service plans that are making the fruits of medical science more fully available without money barriers, that are bringing order out of the chaotic burgeoning of medical specialization, that are facilitating the long-term medical management of the aging or chronically ill person by his personal physician backed up by an organized medical team that shares his responsibility, and that are achieving the economies and efficiencies of group medical practice at a time when doctors and other health workers are in increasingly short supply.

These group practice-prepayment plans have widely varying sponsorship and differing patterns of facilities and services. They are quite similar, however, in their basic approach. They provide positive health programs, not simply insurance against some of the costs of illness. They offer comprehensive services in the office, home, and hospital. Their philosophy is to promote health, to prevent illness, to detect disease early, to give definitive treatment, and to minimize the effects of inevitable illness or disability. These plans place a great deal of emphasis on quality of care and look to group practice as one of the most consistent ways of assuring high-quality service. Finally, these plans are oriented to the consumer while protecting the role of the physician, and many believe that overall policies should be primarily under consumer or community control.

Let me touch briefly on the programs we are discussing. The two largest, of course, are the Kaiser-Permanente plans on the west coast and Hawaii, and the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York.

The Kaiser Foundation Health Plans with their associated Permanente Medical Groups and their unique network of hospitals and clinics now serve close to 1 million people. Flexibility of approach is maintained, with contract benefits varying from comprehensive to somewhat limited, and with the principle of dual or multiple choice being emphasized. The rate of growth of this program seems to be limited only by the deliberate rate at which new facilities are added—facilities, by the way, that are paid for almost entirely out of the prepayment mechanism. The popularity of the program has been reaffirmed in recent years by the way Federal employees have joined in large numbers.

Health Insurance Plan, directed by a community board which includes a number of distinguished physicians, presents a quite different picture. Here some 650,000 people are served by family doctors and specialists in 32 medical groups. The medical services provided are very broad in scope and are rendered with practically no extra charges. Subscribers carry separate hospital care insurance, usually Blue Cross, and hospitalization is in various New York area hospitals where group physicians can obtain privileges. Noteworthy in Health Insurance Plan are the interest in medical care research and the searching explorations of quality of care that have been undertaken. As an indication of trends, Health Insurance Plan participates in the multiple choice program for State as well as Federal employees.

Other group practice-prepayment plans are scattered around the country—among them are the San Diego Health Association, the Ross-Loos Medical Group in Los Angeles, Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound with its own hospital in Seattle, Group Health Plan in St. Paul, a considerable number of railway employee hospitals and clinics, the Elk City, Oklahoma Community Hospital-Clinic, the Labor Health Institute in St. Louis, the Union Health Service in Chicago, the Community Health Association in Detroit, the hospitals for Spanish-American associations in Tampa, the Miners Memorial Hospitals and a number of clinics serving primarily coal miners, Group Health Association in Washington, the Endicott-Johnson program in Binghamton, N.Y., and a large number of labor health centers that concentrate particularly on preventive, diagnostic, and other ambulatory services.

A forerunner of things to come, with still another form of sponsorship to add to the widely varying sponsorship of the list of plans just given, is seen in the new prepaid group practice plan entered into jointly by New York Medical College-Flower Fifth Avenue Hospitals and the hotel industry and employees in New York City. I believe nine other group centers are projected and that one or more other medical schools may cooperate in this significant program, assuring the sort of built-in quality controls informed consumers are seeking. A number of our medical schools across the Nation, concerned about their teaching resources, are showing interest in the potentialities of a steady clientele of patients linked to the university medical centers through prepayment.

While relatively new as a major force, the growing group practice-prepayment movement is achieving results that deserve serious study by all those looking for solutions to today's perplexing problems of medical care. I wish to deal briefly with certain of these results.

Through these programs several million people have easy access to all of the essential services provided by personal physicians and specialists, not just in the hospital but in the office and home as well, services that typically comprise preventive, diagnostic, therapeutic, and rehabilitative services. As a rule, the obtaining of personal preventive services is positively stimulated. Some restriction in psychiatric services is one of the few limitations often encountered in these plans. Extra charges, if any, are designed to supplement revenues rather than to act as deterrents to needed care.

The thorough study issued by the United Steelworkers in 1960 explored the value of various medical care contracts in meeting costs. They estimated that under the Kaiser plan the costs of 93 percent of physicians' services were being met as compared with 52 percent for Blue Shield and from 46 to 50 percent for commercial insurance. They estimated further that under group practice plans some 80 percent of currently insurable costs are covered as compared with some 60 percent for standard United Steelworker plans. An earlier study, by the Health Information Foundation, showed that HIP was paying 80 percent of the gross costs of physicians' services as compared with 59 percent for Group Health Insurance, New York City's free choice, comprehensive care plan. Another measure of broad coverage is found in the recent Columbia University study, "Family Medical Care Under Three Types of Health Insurance." Families in the Kaiser plan had out-of-pocket family care expenses amounting to almost $50 less than families in the New Jersey Blues and $35 less than in the General Electric comprehensive-major medical plan.

In addition to providing broader coverage at competitive rates, these direct service plans have built-in governors that resist rising costs. These are found partly in the group practice framework with its economies, its budgetable expense for the services of doctors on salary or sharing partnership income, and its system of incentives that differ from those of the solo practitioner on fee for service. Within this framework and that of a broad ambulatory service, there is evidence of some sort of governor holding down increasingly expensive hospital utilization and surgical care.

In 1961 Blue Cross plans nationally had to pay for an average of 1,103 days of care per 1,000 persons. That same year the enrollees in the Kaiser plan in northern California used 614 days, members of Group Health Association in Washington, D.C., used 625 days, and members of Group Health Cooperative in Seattle used 569 days per 1,000.

Since almost all Health Insurance Plan subscribers have Blue Cross coverage for hospital care, special studies are required to learn their hospital utilization experience. One study showed Health Insurance Plan families using 20 percent less hospital care than Blue Shield subscribers in New York City. A second study showed Health Insurance Plan experience at 410 days in contrast to 870 days per 1,000 for Group Health Insurance. A third study, involving ILGWU members, revealed an adjusted rate of 744 days per 1,000 for Health Insurance Plan and 955 for Group Health Insurance. The United Steelworkers' experience was 570 days for Kaiser subscribers, 1,032 days for the Blues, and 1,167 days for commercial insurance. Our new CHA program in Detroit is operating at a utilization rate some 25 percent below that of Michigan Blue Cross.

These numerous factual studies are not invalidated by the recent Columbia study showing approximately the same amount of hospital care being used by samples of Kaiser, New Jersey Blue Plans, and G.E. major medical subscribers. In the preface, Dr. Trussell states that the study "indicated that the more comprehensive the coverage, the greater the use of physicians; yet such accessibility did not push the in-hospital utilization by the Kaiser plan subscribers above that of the other plans." In this study total family outlays for medical and hospital care, both premiums and out-of-pocket expenses, adjusted for area price differences, were lowest for the Kaiser sample. Dr. Trussell writes "* * * the present study has strengthened the 'cost containment' data supporting the trend toward hospital-based group practice * * *."

Having mentioned surgical care as an element of cost control, let me simply say briefly that studies by the Health Information Foundation, the Steelworkers, and the United Mine Workers Welfare Fund have shown sharply reduced surgical rates in the prepaid group practice settings in Health Insurance Plan, Kaiser, and the mine workers program.

This brings me to the subject of quality of care. Those of you who have tried know how hard it is to measure. We proponents of group practice-prepayment are convinced that our programs lead to improved quality of care, a conviction that admittedly must be subjected to new and better methods of analysis in the coming years. In the meantime there are good reasons for our conviction—careful selection of group physicians, performance of specialized services by those trained in such skills, medical staff organization for ambulatory as well as institutional practice, the ever-present judgment of one's peers, easy consultation without economic hindrance, opportunities for teaching and research, adequate and accessible diagnostic facilities, provision for leisure time and vacations, and review of performance by outside authorities. There have been studies—and more are needed—dealing with the percentage of subscribers having a personal doctor, the percentage of youngsters under regular pediatric care, and the percentage seeing a doctor during the year. Of perhaps more compelling significance would be more studies aimed at measuring health improvement, such as the perinatal mortality studies in New York City that showed Health Insurance Plan in such a favorable light.

These group practice plans are achieving results and they will grow and spread because they are in tune with the times. The

very technology of medicine, in rapid evolution and with no pause in sight, is forcing the accelerating development of group medical practice. The growing shortage of physicians will further speed this trend. Interest is growing among the private group clinics, as well as the medical schools, in a mutually helpful rapprochement with labor and other consumer groups seeking to obtain broader health benefits at a supportable, reasonably controllable cost. Consumer-oriented group practice-prepayment recognizes the legitimate interests of those who use and pay for the services, and of those professional persons who provide the services. These plans are in line with current trends in medical care, they are in tune with the 1960's, and they are on the move.

CONGRESS NEEDS REFORM

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on August 2, 1946, the 79th Congress passed a Legislative Reorganization Act which, in title I, part 3, section 132, provided:

> Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day (Sundays excepted) in the month of July in each year, unless otherwise provided by the Congress.

This year Congress will once again stay in session far beyond this date July 31. We have acted on only a small, relatively unimportant part of the business before us. Important bills have received little attention. One reason for this is dilatory tactics made possible by our anachronistic rules of procedure.

Even as so little business has been done on the Senate floor, so many of our committees have proceeded at a more than leisurely pace. We are all aware of the inaction of some committees on key bills.

Other ills have plagued this body for a number of years. Working against efficiency and decisive action, they have reduced the Senate to its present state.

Our increasing ineffectiveness has not gone unnoticed. Many newsmen and news commentators have pointed this out to the public. Indeed, this session of Congress has unfortunately provided many commentators with a great deal of material.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several recent articles on this unfortunate situation.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 10, 1963]

TIME FOR REFORM—CONGRESS MUST SEIZE THE INITIATIVE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

A veteran of the House of Representatives who is retiring undefeated from one of the largest States remarked in private conversation the other day: "In all my 15 years in Congress I have never been able to devote more than one-tenth of my time to doing what I was primarily elected to do—help shape the laws of the land."

The able and respected chairman of one of the Senate's many investigating committees raised his arms in despair the other evening and exclaimed: "The executive has become so big that we [the Congress] have simply lost control. We can't review it adequately; we can't check it adequately; we just don't know what it is doing."

And this: Congress never gives one look at the massive and mounting Federal budget as a whole. It looks at it piecemeal but never in toto. It appropriates piecemeal without ever putting the parts together to know what it is doing, then it abandons responsibility for continuous, overall review—despite the fact that its own rules call for such review.

What do these facts (and others like them) really mean? They mean that the congressional minutiae so gobble up the time of individual Members of Congress that they can't do their primary work; that even the best congressional investigating committees are no longer able to oversee how the executive is carrying out the congressional will; that as the Federal budget grows, Congress is steadily losing control, even losing sight, of what is going on.

The need for congressional reorganization to modernize its creaking, Model-T machinery is no longer seriously questioned. The need is to enable the Congress to lay hold of the means and procedures to transact the public business efficiently and responsibility and to capture its eroded authority.

Fortunately, the prospects for such reorganization are looking up. One step is the bipartisan resolution introduced by Senator CLIFFORD CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, and Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, to create a Commission on Congressional Reorganization to study and propose needed reforms.

Public hearings will be held shortly by a Senate Rules Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, aided by a specially appointed staff counsel, former Representative Hugh Alexander, of North Carolina.

Reflecting the almost unanimous endorsement of those in private life who know most about the Congress, the volume of correspondence which Senator CASE has had from political scientists is particularly revealing.

Senator CASE has received 195 letters from specialists in government. Of these, 160 strongly approve the move for congressional reform, none is opposed, 35 are noncommittal. Eighty-two percent of the letters consider the proposed study very timely and necessary, and hope it will succeed. Some of the specific comments and suggestions are these:

The Commission should focus on this central question: How can Congress remain an independent, productive, efficient, and creative branch of Government?

Many contend that Congress is not measuring up to its potential and to public expectations.

The statement that "congressional reform is long overdue" repeatedly occurs in the letters.

"Congress is in for rough sledding in the coming months and years," one of the political scientists writes. "Unless Congress moves to reform itself, that criticism will grow. Now is the time to begin study of reform so as to bring Congress up to date before even more power passes to the executive branch and before the image of Congress drops further in the minds of our people."

Wouldn't it be well if Congress paused in trying to reform everybody else and took a clear look at its own shortcomings—and did something about them?

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Press Intelligence, July 1, 1963]

SENATE REFORM

A frequent criticism voiced by visitors to the gallery of the U.S. Senate is that the Senate appears to be doing nothing. It is a valid judgment. The fact is that for most of the time, the Senate is in session urgent public business is sidetracked by speeches that have no relation to the subject at hand and more often than not only a handful of Senators is available to maintain the myth that the Senate is the greatest deliberative body in the world.

The move to impose a rule of germaneness under which at least 4 hours a day would be reserved for Senate debate which sticks to the subject at hand deserves far more support than prior attempts have attracted. Senator CASE of New Jersey, long an advocate of reform in congressional rules, has persisted in seeking to make some of them effective. The recent resolution by 31 Senators calling for the rule of germaneness should encourage Senator CASE to carry on his efforts.

The most frequent impression reported by high school students after their first visit to see Government in action deals with the discovery that seats in the Senate are vacant with one or two Members droning along for the purpose of entering into the RECORD views and opinions for home consumption. Recently Senator DOUGLAS had to wait 2 hours to speak on President Kennedy's area redevelopment proposal because of interruptions completely foreign to the pending business.

The rule of germaneness is needed if only to save the Senate from its declining reputation as a legislative body. Enough Senators should appear on the floor and stick to the issue until the rule is accepted.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, July 17, 1963]

CONGRESS NEEDS REFORM

Congress is facing a record legislative logjam, and it may be a poor time to suggest consideration of measures not already high on its priority list. Yet it would be a serious mistake to ignore a warning given a few days ago by a bipartisan group of legislators. The gist of this is that Congress should move now for a comprehensive overhaul of its machinery or risk total eclipse in national affairs.

It is painfully evident that Congress is wallowing in a slough of impotency. It has moved at snail's pace in the last 6 months. Major portions of President Kennedy's program have not reached the floor of either chamber. Committee work on tax cut and foreign aid bills, to mention only two measures, is behind schedule, and a rocky road is ahead for civil rights proposals. The customary adjournment target, Labor Day, has been virtually abandoned; most Members think they will be lucky if they get home by Thanksgiving, and it could be much later.

Against this background Senator CASE, of New Jersey, told a rules subcommittee that Congress is so bogged down in cumbersome procedures that "the executive and judicial branches have had to take over primary responsibility for conducting the Nation's business." Senator KEATING of New York, backed him up, and added: "This is not simply the result, as some contend, of a desire on the part of strong Chief Executives and Chief Justices to assume great power; in major respects Congress itself must bear the blame for its declining role."

It is significant that a prominent place among the critics was taken by Senator MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, coauthor of the La Follette-Monroney Act of 1946. This was the last major reorganization of Congress, and it must be said that the effects have to a considerable extent worn off. Mr. MONRONEY favors a vast overhaul, to be brought about after a study by a special joint Senate-House Committee. Senators CASE and CLARK, of Pennsylvania, have suggested this course.

Senator CASE also has proposed a commission of three Senators, three Representatives and six outside experts appointed by the President, but, as Mr. MONRONEY notes, this is open to the criticism that the Executive would be invading the field of congressional prerogative. The 1946 act was drafted by a Senate-House committee with a staff of experts. While it brought about many needed reforms, it could not get at several evils that still plague Congress—the

filibuster, the seniority system and the inordinate power of the House Rules Committee to block legislation.

Whatever the body chosen to make the study, it could well give thought to a recent proposal by Columnist Walter Lippmann. Mr. Lippmann suggested that "the most important and most needed reform would be a rule that measures proposed by the President must, if he labels them urgent, be reported out of committees within a certain time and brought to a vote within a certain time." This gets to the heart of the matter. There is no logical reason why the Nation cannot get prompt action—either yes or no—on an administration proposal. A mere handful of legislators, often responding to sectional pressures, now can cause interminable delays.

The country can no longer afford the luxury of a Congress like the current one is showing itself to be at this session. It is true that the President represents the country as a whole and Congress, in a manner of speaking, its separate parts. Yet Congress has been able to form a national consensus in times of clearly defined peril. What levers can be used to bring about a similar consensus in times of relative peace? The progress of civil rights legislation may well show the scope of the problem; Congress had better start looking into it at once.

[From the Washington Post, July 2, 1963]

BALL-AND-CHAIN CONGRESS

Congress took a fleeting look at its creaking and outmoded machinery last week and then went on another vacation. There was no direct connection between the 1-day hearing on organization problems conducted by a Senate Rules subcommittee and the suspension of all major business for an extended Fourth of July holiday. But the coincidence once more highlights the disturbing incapacity of Congress to meet its obligations and the great reluctance of the leaders to do anything about it.

Senator KEATING told his colleagues that "in major respects Congress itself must bear the blame for its declining role." Instead of being a responsive instrument of the national will, Congress too frequently serves as a ball-and-chain on the leg of national progress. To our way of thinking, Senators CLARK, MONRONEY, CASE, BARTLETT, and KEATING made a powerful case for the appointment of a study group that would seek out the causes of congressional ineffectiveness, as did the La Follette-Monroney committee during the 1940's. But Chairman HAYDEN, of the Rules Committee, adjourned the hearing without fixing a date for its resumption, and fear is being expressed in the cloakrooms that nothing will be done. Congressional apathy is nowhere more profound than in the sphere of injecting new life and more efficiency into Congress itself.

Meanwhile the outlook for the current session becomes increasingly discouraging. Many of the important bills which the administration has recommended to Congress are apparently to be quietly discarded without so much as a committee report or a vote on them. Several high-priority bills are stalled in the House Rules Committee despite the reform that was supposed to have been imposed on that mortuary squad last January.

In 6 months of much talk and legislative meandering Congress has passed only a few minor bills. Most of the topflight measures in the administration's program are still moving sluggishly, or not at all, within the committee structure. As Senator MONRONEY noted, the all-important task of legislation occupies only a minor portion of Congressmen's time. The two Houses are toying with a thousand things without the wit or the discipline to focus their efforts upon major tasks or to pursue a systematic agenda.

No Member of Congress can safely be indifferent to this state of affairs. The legislative branch is bringing disrepute upon itself by slavishly clinging to a stale traditionalism in the atomic age. If this condition is allowed to worsen, the first question to be asked a Congressman returning to his home district may well be, "What have you done to relieve Congress of its ball-and-chain?"

[From the Daily News, June 18, 1963]

CAPITOL STUFF

(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, June 17.—As might have been expected, congressional reaction to the Supreme Court's anti-Lord's Prayer decision today was most bitter. It appeared from the comment that Congress was in a fighting mood, determined to curb the Court's powers one way or another.

This is a laugh. This Congress is incapable of anything but negative obstructionism. It is not only dull but inept, and is operating sluggishly under the most mediocre politicians gathered under one tent in decades. For these reasons all the present talk about a constitutional amendment to nullify the school prayer edict is just talk. It will never be anything more.

In contrast to the low state the legislative branch of Government has fallen into, let's give the Supreme Court devil his due. However much many Americans detest certain controversial decisions of the Warren Court, the Court has two attributes which Congress lacks: It has been exciting, not stodgy and it has the guts to take a stand, no matter how unpopular one of its verdicts may be.

What Congress knows is that its own failure to function, while the judiciary branch functions positively and with derring-do, is at the heart of most of the slurs now being aimed at the High Court.

In this exercise in frustration came such spewings-forth today as the damning by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, of the "eight silly old men" who decided the school prayer case. And, of course, in this same category belongs the proposal by Representative ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Republican, of Wisconsin, that Congress name a board of psychiatrists to give the Court mental tests.

Now that the Court has closed up shop for the summer, leaving the flames of controversy over its behavior higher than ever, it is pertinent to take a good close look at the remarkable switch in governmental processes that has developed in recent years.

When the Constitution was written, the first three articles provided that the legislative powers be vested in Congress, the executive power in the President, and the judicial powers "in one Supreme Court."

If one of these three coequal branches appeared most certain through the years to be more dull, dignified and of less consequence than any other, it was clearly the judiciary. And, by and large, this was true until the Warren Court arrived 10 years ago and tackled dramatically the civil rights issue.

URGE ACTION BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE

Almost coincidentally came the decline in the legislative branch, which has now reached the point where the experts are suggesting that Congress needs to be retooled before it is too late.

There is no dispute right now that the Court has the power to act or the President the power to carry out his constitutional authority or that they do so with a certain efficiency and positiveness. On the other hand, Congress has gradually begun to lose its ability to originate and enact according to its legislative powers and has moved toward a negative stance, capable only of vetoing or compromising what the administration proposes.

How Congress got that way is a long and involved story, but the present situation, concerning President Kennedys' forthcoming civil rights legislative program, points up the heart of the problem.

Because of antiquated rules, committees controlled by aged and often doddering southerners can box up legislation. One-third of the Senate can filibuster a bill to death. But as Kennedy said the other day, "An administration must bill, can well have the support of a majority of the Members of either House but, because of parliamentary procedure, may never be voted on."

NEITHER PARTY HAS VIGOROUS LEADERS

Besides this stubborn adherence to a seniority system which should have gone out with McKinley, this Congress is virtually leaderless—in both parties. Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK and Senate Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD lack the drive to keep Members in line. Similarly, House GOP Leader CHARLES HALLECK and Senate Republican Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN can control their party membership only part of the time. Generally, on a big issue they can speak only for themselves.

So here we have a Congress which for 5 months has fiddled around with a tax reduction bill and still has not got it out of the House Ways and Means Committee, where such legislation must originate. And Congress has yet to act on the foreign aid issue or on any other key measures which must establish its record of accomplishment.

Yet these same legislators find it easy to tee off at the Supreme Court, while it is actually high time they set their own house in order.

Congressmen such as ELLENDER and O'KONSKI could better have said it would be most proper at this time for a board of psychiatrists to give mental tests to the "silly old men" responsible for the decrepit functioning of House and Senate.

EACH HOUSE HANDCUFFED BY PROCEDURE

They know, obviously, that what political scientists such as Prof. Edgar W. Waugh, of Michigan, say about Congress is true. "Each House," say Waugh, "has become, so to speak, a prisoner of procedures which are patently out of step with the swift tempo of the nuclear space age. This needs to be corrected and quickly."

Senator CLIFFORD CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, recently polled more than 200 political scientists on what is the matter with Congress. The generalized response was that Congress has begun to lose its standing in the public mind as an effective arm of the Government.

And Congress, as usual, is doing nothing about recovering its lost status. But, as usual, it takes violent exception to acts of the judiciary and executive branches, even though it knows it is powerless to curb them because it cannot even run itself properly.

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS

(By American Broadcasting Co.)

A fellow has to wonder now and then what it really would take to get Congress moving. An earthquake? War? A Profumo-type scandal in the Cabinet? The country is crawling with crises but Capitol Hill is not the place to measure them.

With more dawdling than deliberate speed, the Senate and House are sidling up to the fresh packet of civil rights bills as if they half-suspected the whole issue were a false alarm. Key officials of the executive branch were staggered in an emergency meeting with the Democratic congressional leadership on Wednesday on the railway crisis to discover that virtually nobody had given serious thought to what kind of special legislation might be required, what the precedent of compulsory arbitration—the most widely mentioned procedure—really meant and

what the political and economic impact of such action might be. Unless something far more hopeful emerges from the fact-finding labors of the emergency four-man panel than appeared likely today, Congress will be confronted with the added crushing burden by July 29 of legislative action to break the labor-management deadlock on the railroads over work rules and expendable jobs.

But it already has a massive backlog of unfinished business. In a careful survey on congressional inactivity over a veritable armada of becalmed bills, the Wall Street Journal reported Tuesday that "no Congress since World War II * * * has talked so much while translating so few Presidential proposals into victories or defeats. As a result nearly all the President's bills are dangling in limbo."

The lawmakers have even faltered in one of their favorite pastimes—congressional inquiries. The Wall Street Journal pointed out that Tennessee Senator KEFAUVER's Antitrust Subcommittee has not yet issued its findings on the investigation of price-fixing by electrical manufacturers which it made 2 years ago. Nor has Senator MCCLELLAN's investigating subcommittee come up with a report on its probe of the Billie Sol Estes scandal, to say nothing of any summation of last year's hearings on alleged profit-pyramiding in the aircraft and missile industry.

Recipes for congressional reform are a dime a dozen. Many responsible speeches have been made and scores of bills drafted to quicken the sluggish legislative pulse. But Congress—to change the figure of speech—is not likely to scrape the barnacles off its august bottom just for the exercise. In fact the amount of self-serving cargo that legislators manage to load upon it is sometimes appalling.

Once, not so long ago that it is ancient history, a Congressman appeared before the House Rules Committee on behalf of a certain bill. "I want you gentlemen to know," he told his colleagues on that key body, "that I support this legislation because I have a personal financial interest in it." This particular public servant was later caught up in the toils of the law—not because of his candor as a witness but because of the deviousness in which he used his elective office for personal gain in promotion schemes. He is not, of course, typical of congressional standards of behavior and yet it cannot be denied that those standards are shockingly low—so low that some observers have questioned Congress capability to function on grounds of public morality—or immorality—alone.

Capitol Hill may not be all that demoralized and as Time Correspondent Neil MacNeil points out in his recent book, "The Forge of Democracy," a study of the House, Congress over its many decades—lest we forget—has reflected "the whole people, their weaknesses as well as their strengths, their foolishness as well as their wisdom, their prejudices as well as their tolerances, their fears as well as their courage."

That being undeniably the case, it behooves the public then, assuming hopefully that it is at least a little dissatisfied with its own image as Congress reflects it, to demand some changes. Public pressure for reform is one of the vital ingredients lacking. A handful of public-spirited Members of Congress—notably including Republican Senator CLIFFORD CASE of New Jersey and Democratic Senator JOSEPH CLARK of Pennsylvania—have tried to build up a head of steam for action but the response of their colleagues has been less than breathtaking. On June 28, Senator CARL HAYDEN of Arizona, chairman of a Subcommittee on Senate rules, held a 1-day—repeat, 1-day—hearing on the subject.

The canny octogenarian who is also the seniority—and prestige—conscious chairman of the vastly important Senate appropriations committee, first tried to bury his 1-day exercise on reforms even deeper by scheduling it right after the Memorial Day weekend when virtually no Member would be present. Under pressure he made it later and then conceded that more time should be given to such an important issue as congressional reform. But to eager questions of "when?" and "how much time?", HAYDEN has only hemmed and hawed an answer. If the country in righteous anger would demand one, he and other key committee chairmen with a vested interest in the congressional status quo might be obliged to listen and respond.

PROPOSED TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently Mr. Walter Lippmann contended in one of his columns that "test ban foes are short of solid arguments." At this point I do not classify myself as either a friend or a foe of this treaty, but I do have some very serious reservations about it, and I can assure Mr. Lippmann that there are plenty of solid arguments against it. Mr. Stefan Possony, director of the international political studies program of the Hoover Institution, is one of the most knowledgeable men in the United States in this whole field, and he has presented in a very brief paper some rather solid arguments against the treaty. I ask unanimous consent that this paper be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

And, further, Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN, yesterday issued a press release that points out two possible consequences of some rather loose language contained in sections 1, 2, 4, and 5 of article III of the proposed treaty. I am not trying by the mention of this release to indicate any position on the part of the minority leader, but I think he has acted in his extremely wise manner and in his customary way of carefully scrutinizing the language of this proposed treaty.

I would suggest that all of my colleagues read both Mr. Possony's arguments and the consequences Senator DIRKSEN referred to in his press release, and I ask that Senator DIRKSEN's release be made a part of my remarks.

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

STATEMENT ON WALTER LIPPMANN'S ARTICLE "TEST BAN FOES SHORT OF SOLID ARGUMENTS"

(By Stefan T. Possony)

Mr. Walter Lippmann's assertion that test ban foes are "short of solid arguments" is based on inadequate information. The opposition to the test ban, inter alia, was based on the fact that underground cheating is feasible. At long last, this point is now generally conceded and the draft treaty does not prohibit underground tests.

Mr. Lippmann writes that "theoretically, it is possible to shoot a nuclear device a million miles into outer space * * * and then to explode it without its being detected." But "no proposal has ever been made, or could have been made, to insure that a violation in outer space would be detected." This just is not so: One of the technical Geneva agreements dealt with this problem, and proposed to establish a system of earth and sun satellites to police a test ban in space. The fact is that cheating in space is practical, and at far shorter distances than 1 million miles. Whether such shots are necessary depends largely on the manner in which space will be used for military purposes.

Mr. Lippmann alleges that the real purposes of the test ban opponents is to keep on testing until "we shall invent the absolute weapon." No person versed in military matters ever advanced such a childish proposition. Absolute weapons cannot exist in periods of rapid technological change. But just as the nuclear weapon superseded "conventional armaments," so new weapons continually render existing arsenals obsolete. A strategy of planned obsolescence cannot but lead to disaster.

Opposition to the test ban is based on five basic propositions:

1. Reduction or elimination of fallout can be achieved by a fallout and clean test convention and does not require a ban on testing.

2. A ban on atmospheric, space, and under water tests now is harmful to U.S. security. We still need such tests to determine, for example, the vulnerability of missile sites and Polaris submarines, to develop antimissile weapons, and to match the firepower of existing Soviet superyield weapons—in brief to enhance, at a moment when the power of the offensive is reaching its apogee, our capability of executing a second strike strategy.

3. The draft treaty precludes the effective defense of Europe against nuclear blackmail and ground-air attack. It also sets up the United States and U.S.S.R. as a worldwide military duopoly and therefore tends to transform all other states into mere satellites. Thus, the test ban treaty ultimately will destroy NATO, or else prove an ephemeral gambit in the warfare of deception and self-deception.

4. The draft treaty seems to exclude Plowshare shots, and thus by flat tries to destroy one of the potentially most productive resources of mankind.

5. Technology advances like an impersonal force. Certainly, it would be useful to bring order into the dynamism of technology, but the present draft treaty, even if it were to preclude subterfuge or cheating, seeks to stop technology—a futile undertaking. King Herod "sent and slew all the boys in Bethlehem." In Oscar Wilde's version, Herod also said: "Hear then: I forbid that by Him the dead should be awakened. It would be terrible if to life the dead came again."

The test ban may or may not help the Soviets to "reach and overtake" the United States militarily, but the fantastic illusion that history can be stopped or turned back, precludes the elaboration of genuinely constructive national and international security policies.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

Further examination of the treaty draft for a partial nuclear test ban reveals that, in addition to the clause giving the original signatories, including the Soviet Union, a veto over amendments, there is another provision of considerable consequence.

This provision can only be discovered by careful reading of sections 1, 2, 4, and 5 of article III.

Section 1 provides that "any state which does not sign this treaty before its entry into force * * * may accede to it at any time."

Section 2 designates the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union as "despositary governments" and provides that "instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited" with the depositary governments.

Section 4 provides that "for states whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force

of this treaty, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession."

Section 5 provides that "the depositary governments"—meaning the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union—"shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding states of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification of and accession to this treaty."

Thus, any nation can become a party to the treaty automatically simply by notifying the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union that it accedes to or has ratified the treaty.

There is a need to examine two possible consequences under this provision:

1. Since the Soviet Union in 1949 imposed on East Germany its puppet government known as the German Democratic Republic, the United States and the United Kingdom have refused, despite repeated Soviet urging, to acknowledge East Germany as a state because its boundary claims violates the Potsdam agreement.

Under the treaty draft for a partial test ban, East Germany, by the simple and, at present, meaningless act of depositing with the United States and the United Kingdom instruments of accession to the treaty would compel them under section 5 to notify all other signatories that this "state," which neither the United States nor the United Kingdom recognizes as a "state," had become a party to the treaty. There would be no recourse under the treaty's language.

2. Communist Cuba, by complying with procedures under Article III, could, of course, qualify automatically as a party to the treaty. The treaty would prohibit Cuba from nuclear testing underwater, in the atmosphere and in outer space, but would permit—with the United States a party to the permission—underground testing in the caves of Cuba.

The United States, which only 9 months ago was on the brink of war because of the presence of Soviet nuclear warheads in Cuba, would now find itself in the role of a copartner extending sanction by treaty to the underground development of nuclear warheads by Cuba.

WHERE WE STAND TODAY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a recent column by Mr. Joseph Alsop, carrying the title, "Where We Stand Today," discussed in a reassuring way the weapons variance between the Soviets and ourselves.

Mr. Stefan Possony, director of the international political studies program of the Hoover Institution, has discussed this column in a very cogent manner and because it does bear upon the coming debates on the test ban treaty, I ask unanimous consent that his discussion be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

COMMENT ON JOSEPH ALSOP'S ARTICLE "WHERE WE STAND TODAY"

(By Stefan T. Possony, director, international political studies program, Hoover Institution)

In his article "Where We Stand Today," Joseph Alsop argues reassuringly that the United States is way ahead in the kind of weapons we want, while the Soviets are ahead in the kind of weapons they want. We have a lead in warheads and bombs up to 10 megatons; the Soviets, it is now admitted, are leading "in the development of weapons of very high megatonnage." However, the present Soviet rocket delivery system allegedly cannot use 100-megaton warheads. The second generation of Soviet ICBM's can deliver 30-megaton warheads but these vehicles are very large and cumbersome and require liquid propellants. By contrast, the military advantages of our more dependable and accurate solid propelled missiles outweigh the disadvantages of the smaller yields. Hence, Mr. Alsop concludes, "it is hard to see why the United States will lose by the ban." Unfortunately, things are not that cozy.

1. The Soviets announced that they have a 100-megaton warhead for use in missiles as well as a 160-megaton aircraft bomb. Soviet announcements of this type usually are premature but they are rarely mendacious. Hence the wishful hope that the Soviets will not have 100-megaton missiles will be sorely disappointed.

2. The Soviets presently are deploying a 30-megaton missile system. Mr. Alsop belittles this momentous threat by arguing that Soviet liquid fueled missiles are ineffective. Yet attacks against hardened missile sites require yields so large that liquid fueled missiles are indispenable. Moreover, liquid fueled missiles, while dubious for second strikes, are perfectly usable for a first strike strategy.

3. Mr. Alsop implies that we now have a force consisting of 10-megaton missiles. The fact is that only a limited number of liquid fueled missiles carry warheads of several megatons. The firepower of the solid fueled Polaris and Minuteman is believed to be about 1-megaton, or about one-thirtieth of the yield of the new Soviet ICBM.

4. "American military theorists * * * have consistently held that 10 megatons was about the limit of the really useful explosive power of the nuclear weapon." If this were so, the United States, with its second strike strategy, should continue to test until it achieves a 10-megaton warhead that is deliverable by a solid fueled missile. Actually, Mr. Alsop might ask his theorists whether, as targets are being hardened, the yield requirement does not rise? In a military world where all factors change constantly, there is no such thing as a constant limit of "really useful explosive power."

5. Even if we were to attain an American warhead "comparable to the Soviet 30-megaton type, we would not have any rockets capable of delivering it unless we made the step of returning to a liquid fueled delivery system." Atlas and Titan are remaining in commission and we do not have to return to them. Successful testing might allow us to replace present Atlas and Titan warheads with devices equal to or better than the Soviet 30-megaton warhead.

The Soviets now have weapons that are suited to their strategy: they can launch an effective disarming first strike, attack American cities, and through fallout threaten the entire population of the United States. Our own missiles are suitable for a second strike but relatively useless against military targets and hence unsuitable for our announced counterforce strategy. Relatively low yield weapons cannot effectively deter a possible Soviet anti-population strategy. Lastly, our growing impotence against military targets will make it increasingly difficult to honor our NATO obligations.

Khrushchev's willingness to sign a limited test ban agreement is entirely in line with the key purpose of orthodox Soviet disarmament policy, as defined by Lenin: to disarm the bourgeoisie and arm the proletariat.

ERNEST E. ROOT HIGH SCHOOL BAND, NORTH ROYALTON, OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am pleased to learn that the Ernest E. Root High School Band of North Royalton, Ohio, has been invited to participate in the 75th Annual Tournament of Roses Parade, Pasadena, Calif., on New Year's Day, 1964. Mr. Chris B. Carrino, director of this outstanding band, has been informed of the invitation in a communication from Mr. Walter L. Benedict, chairman of the music committee, Pasadena Tournament of Roses Association.

I join with the citizenry of Ohio, and particularly those of North Royalton, in extending congratulations to Director Carrino and the members of this band.

Mr. President, this is not the first time this outstanding band has gained national recognition. The E. E. Root High School Band Majorettes and Royalettes were recipients of the 1962 Grand Prize Trophy in the National Cherry Blossom Festival Parade of Princesses held in Washington.

Mr. President, in his invitation to the E. E. Root High School Band to participate in the forthcoming Tournament of Roses, Mr. Benedict said:

> Your band has been chosen to represent your area of the United States in the belief that your band is a superior organization, certain to reflect credit upon your home community and prove popular with millions of parade viewers.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today we are faced with one of the great crises in our history because we did not act sooner to bring the promise of America to all Americans. Our Nation is being asked to provide to a large number of its people civil rights to which they have always been entitled, but which in far too many instances are still being withheld from them.

America demands esentially the same responsibilities from all her citizens. We must all obey the law, pay taxes, and answer the call to duty when the Nation is endangered. Our servicemen who fell on foreign battlefields died without regard to race. But because of their race, some Americans today cannot vote, cannot get a job, cannot enter a decent school—frequently cannot even get a meal or a night's lodging.

The present crisis in civil rights has made a great many more people aware of the extent and the seriousnes of this problem to the national welfare. But for me it is only the most recent stake in a long, long battle. I have been fighting in the Congress for strong, responsible civil rights legislation for over two decades, and I have not done so for partisan political purposes.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a quotation from the Philadelphia Tribune of November 19, 1946.

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

> Philadelphia's six Republican Congressmen are all pledged to support in the next Congress an effective fair employment law.
>
> We have every reason to believe that they will keep their respective pledges individually and collectively.
>
> Congressman HUGH SCOTT, who was in Congress prior to joining the U.S. Navy, has an excellent record on FEPC legislation. His record is exceptionally good, since he has comparatively few colored voters in his dis-

trict. It is a matter of principle with him and not smart politics simply to get votes.

Mr. SCOTT. For me, civil rights has always been a matter of principle, not politics. I believe in the dignity of the human being. I believe that when that dignity is violated, it is necessary to enact laws to protect it.

During my years in both the House and the Senate I sponsored or cosponsored more legislation on civil rights than on any other one subject. Following is a list of civil rights bills I have submitted since 1956:

YEAR 1963, 88TH CONGRESS (SENATE, 1ST SESS.)

Senate Resolution 118, housing, loans without discrimination.

S. 1732, public accommodations.

S. 1731, administration civil rights proposal.

S. 1693, U.S. citizens rights.

S. 1591, prohibits discrimination in furnishing facilities for business under State licenses.

S. 1590, public schools.

S. 1219, make Civil Right Commission permanent.

S. 1218, hospitalization.

S. 1217, accommodations at hotels.

S. 1216, Federal assistance law enforcement.

S. 1215, criminal civil remedies.

S. 1214, voting.

S. 1213, housing.

S. 1212, prohibits discrimination in employment in Washington, D.C.

S. 1211, equal employment opportunity.

S. 1210, discrimination in employment.

S. 1209, school desegregation.

S. 1117, extends Civil Rights Commission.

S. 773, prohibits racial discrimination in interstate employment.

S. 772, public school desegregation.

S. 666, protects citizens right to vote.

YEAR 1962, 87TH CONGRESS (SENATE, 2D SESS.)

Senate Resolution 313, loans without discrimination.

S. 2983, prevents exclusion of members of minority groups from jury service, 1957, title III.

S. 2981, Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, prohibits discrimination by labor unions.

S. 2980, desegregation of public schools.

S. 2979, protects voting rights.

YEAR 1961, 87TH CONGRESS (SENATE, 1ST SESS.)

S. 478, prohibits poll tax in Federal elections.

S. 479, establishes a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity.

S. 480, prohibits literacy requirements for voting.

S. 481, authorizes the Attorney General to bring civil injunctive proceedings to safeguard rights.

S. 482, guarantees the rights provided by the 14th amendment.

S. 483, extends indefinitely the Civil Rights Commission.

S. 484, assists the State and local government to meet cost of school desegregation.

S. 1253, discrimination in public conveyances.

S. 1254, protects against bodily attack.

S. 1255, amends existing civil rights statutes.

S. 1256, Federal Anti-Lynching Act.

S. 1257, Indefinite extension of Civil Rights Commission.

S. 1258, Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act.

S. 1259, Federal Anti-Poll Tax Act.

Senate Resolution 5, amends cloture rule of Senate.

Senate Joint Resolution 58, poll tax.

Five amendments (to H.R. 7371) on Civil rights.

YEAR 1960, 86TH CONGRESS (SENATE, 2D SESS.)

S. 435, Civil Rights Commission.

S. 456, amends Civil Rights Act of 1957.

S. 942, establishes a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity.

S. 960, similar to S. 456.

S. 2868, poll tax.

S. 3001, provides enforcement of civil rights.

S. 3821, strengthens civil rights.

S. 3823, amends Civil Rights Act of 1960.

S. 3829, enforcement of civil rights.

YEAR 1957, 85TH CONGRESS (HOUSE)

H.R. 1254, further secures and protects the civil rights of persons within the United States.

H.R. 3088, similar to H.R. 1254.

YEAR 1956, 84TH CONGRESS (HOUSE)

H.R. 10349, establishes a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government.

H.R. 10426, provides means of further securing and protecting the right to vote.

H.R. 10428, strengthens the civil rights statutes.

I also supported civil rights measures from the 77th through the 83d Congress, including my testimony on FEPC before the House Education and Labor Committee in 1943.

It has taken the Congress a long time to come to grips with these issues. I hope we now may be approaching the time for meaningful legislation.

Back in 1959 I told the 50th annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People: "I intend to fight for civil liberties—win, lose, or draw."

But I do not want us to lose or draw. I want to win. Because if we lose, all America loses.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD some of my earlier statements on civil rights.

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

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH BY SENATOR SCOTT IN THE SENATE ON JULY 2, 1963

When speculation arises about the course to be taken by the Republican Party, there seems to be a serious omission about those of us who have for years and do now support further civil rights legislation.

In the past Congress, for instance, I sponsored 32 civil rights bills. This year I sponsored 16 such bills—including the famous part 3, or title 3. I am a cosponsor of the President's recent proposals.

Indeed, I have introduced more bills on civil rights than on any other single subject.

It is a moral issue, and it requires a moral commitment. I made that commitment long ago.

It is also a practical issue. I have long felt that our Nation cannot possibly realize its ultimate potential divided as it is from within.

It is time, I believe, to stop the speculation, the rumors, and get back to the facts; get on with the unfinished business of Abraham Lincoln, the founder of the Republican Party.

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH BY SENATOR SCOTT IN THE SENATE JUNE 11, 1963

Mr. President, eight Republican Senators have today joined in the introduction of a bill which is a broad version of part III of the Civil Rights Act, updated to present conditions.

I should like to say that those of us who join in introducing the bill, plus a number of other Members of the Senate, have been seeking to secure action on so-called part III, giving the Attorney General the right to intervene in individual cases. Numerous instances of violations of these civil rights have occurred. We have pursued this effort for many years, certainly since 1957. Many of us are of the opinion that without so-called title III, the power presently vested in the Federal Government is inadequate to do justice to an individual whose rights are being trampled upon or abused, because of the present law's requirement, for example, for consent of the Governor of a State to the intervention by Federal forces, or the existence of a situation indicating a breakdown of law and order, or because of other limitations and inadequacies which we were not able to get enacted as a part of the 1957 or 1960 Civil Rights Act.

Ever since the beginning of this year I have been active, along with a number of other Senators, in seeking to persuade the Department of Justice that, unless action were taken along these lines, they would be confronted with continuing outbreaks of violations and by ultimate recognition by a large segment of our people of the inadequacy of the law; that it would lead to frustration, and that frustration would lead to violation of the law; that unless we could get the provisions of the law firmed up, so that an individual may feel he has the full and due protection of the law of the United States, and therefore is justified in working out his rights within the framework of law and within our courts, the individual would resort to means outside the law, and that those means would continue to increase.

It is to avoid this situation that we are very hopeful that action can be had on the enactment of title III.

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH BY SENATOR SCOTT IN THE SENATE ON MAY 10, 1962

Accomplishments in basic civil rights are not realized through a few selected governmental appointments but rather in measures under which all our citizens who are now denied their rights can benefit by the recognition that the rights are indeed rights to which they are fully entitled as American citizens.

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH BY SENATOR SCOTT IN THE SENATE ON AUGUST 29, 1961

I would like to say what is obvious to Members of this body, and I think to the press at large. Amendments supported by the two Senators from New York, my senior colleague from Pennsylvania, and many other Senators, which would add provisions that would implement the civil rights proposal, are important amendments, amendments promised by the platforms of both political parties, amendments which would enlarge and dignify the rights of human beings. But, Mr. President, we know that proceedings here are cut and dried; that the planning, groundwork, and footwork have all been done. Whenever a measure of this kind is permitted to be introduced, we know that general staff work has been done. We know this administration does not intend to have civil rights legislation acted upon. It feels the executive department can handle all these matters. It does not believe in its platform. It does not believe that civil rights legislation should be adopted. Therefore, let not any of us be deceived by the subsequent oratory which will be heard in this Chamber. The measure has been foreclosed. The defeat of these civil rights amendments has been foreordered. Their fate is foredoomed. Nothing is going to happen except the extension of the Civil Rights Commission. But the ritual dance must be performed. The process of going through the motions must be endured. The public must be advised that some are for and some are against these amendments.

And then, after we have gone along for a suitable time, which I gather the majority leader thinks will be about an hour, suitable motions will be made, and the attempts for the corpse to rise and walk will be frustrated; the body will be buried; the casket will be locked; appropriate funeral ceremonies will be maintained; a suitable funeral and funeral statements will be entered of record; and the Senate will then resume its traditional and customary ways. It will proceed with legislation and appropriation. It will have the usual nongermane and irrelevant discussions. We will waste the time which we said was so essential to be conserved. We will throw time away on matters of less portent.

So, rather than wait for the funeral, I would like to make my eulogy before the body is buried, before the services are entirely complete.

I favor these amendments. I favor the legislation. I know that it is not planned to allow them to become law. I know that the tombstone has been engraved and that the words fittingly prepared for the civil rights amendments are, as they so often before have read: "Requiescat in pace."

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH BY SENATOR SCOTT IN THE SENATE ON MARCH 10, 1960

Mr. President, freedom is franchise. I recall that during the Korean war, when I was on temporary duty with the carrier *Valley Forge*, I visited a hospital ship in Pusan harbor. Soldiers of the 24th Regiment, then a Negro regiment, were lying on the dockside. Many were badly injured and were waiting for surgery, but they were stoical and were smoking cigarettes. The thought which filled my mind at that time was, "If these men are good enough to fight alongside other Americans and with them, and if these men are good enough to die for us, why, indeed, are they not good enough to vote with us?"

That was my thought at that time, and that is my belief, because I believe that any citizen who is good enough to fight for the security of all the States of the Union is good enough to vote in any of them.

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH BY SENATOR SCOTT IN THE SENATE ON SEPTEMBER 9, 1959

I believe—and I am sure the distinguished Senator from West Virginia will agree with me—that every day there is heard in this land and in this Senate Chamber the long, quavering, mournful sigh of the expiring life of John Brown, and the voice of that strange man, part fanatic, part religionist, part idealist; perhaps wrong, perhaps right, but a man who set a Nation to self-examination which has not yet ended, by any means; a man whose voice was raised, and will not die. The sound of his voice sweeps across our land from boundary to boundary, from shore to shore, and challenges the conscience of America, and says to us that, somehow, some day, this good land, with its heritage, may yet find the solution to its problems—to the problem to which John Brown and his adherents gave their allegiance, and to all the other problems which affect the American kind.

REAFFIRMATION OF THE POSITION OF THE MEMBER HOSPITALS OF THE GREATER NEW YORK HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the most heartrending aspects of discrimination is the unfair treatment to which both Negro doctors and patients are subjected in hospitals in many sections of our Nation.

The Federal Government has condoned these unfair activities by refusing to police the nondiscrimination provisions of the Hill-Burton Act and by its insistence on continuing to adhere to its unconstitutional separate but equal provision. I have brought this situation to the attention of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on many occasions but have yet to receive a satisfactory explanation of why this agency refuses to insist upon compliance with a policy of equal treatment in programs it supports with Federal tax funds.

In light of this background, I am deeply gratified by the statement recently adopted by the Greater New York Hospital Association. This statement reaffirms the association's support of a policy of nondiscrimination in the treatment of patients, the appointments to hospital staffs, and in appointments to the board of trustees. I commend the association for its position and ask unanimous consent that the association's statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REAFFIRMATION OF THE POSITION OF THE MEMBER HOSPITALS OF THE GREATER NEW YORK HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

In recognition of human equality and in the right of all men to equal opportunity, members of the Greater New York Hospital Association reaffirm their belief in the following practices:

That care be provided to all in need of medical attention regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin;

That there shall be no segregation of patients in our hospitals, on the basis of race, color, creed, or national origin;

That appointments to our hospital staffs shall be based on qualification regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin subject to the number of physicians who can be accommodated and the bed capacity of the hospital;

That appointments to our administrative staffs shall be based on qualification regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin; and

That appointment to our boards of trustees shall be based on community participation and leadership regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1703) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

THE GESELL REPORT AND PERVERSION OF THE MISSION OF THE MILITARY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, those of us who have long insisted that our military people be confined to their historic and traditional roles and missions are greatly disturbed by the fact that there has recently been introduced a new, different, and added mission which can only be detrimental to military tradition, discipline, and morale.

This new and previously unheard of mission is designed to shape our military force as an instrument for social reform and can only result in irreparable injury to the military profession. In addition, it is a grave and serious challenge to the long established and traditional concept of complete separation of the military from all political matters and activities.

The action of the Secretary of Defense which I shall discuss is but the latest step in the current massive and widespread assault upon constitutional principles in the misguided and so-called civil rights drive. It is now proposed that the military profession itself be utilized as a driving force in the establishment of a new social and political order which involves race relations and individual associations in off-base areas surrounding our military establishments.

This latest directive is based in large measure upon the so-called Gesell report, which came from a Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, appointed several months ago by the President.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I, of course, do not expect to be consulted about matters of this kind. However, I feel that we cannot perform our function unless we are advised to some extent when committees are appointed with such far-reaching and sweeping powers and opportunities.

I believe, too, that the chairman of the committee, who devotes so much of his valuable time to the real problems of the military services, was not informed and knew nothing about the activities of this committee until the report was issued. Of course, he can speak for himself.

I mention it because it is a source of great concern to me, as a member of that committee, that he was not informed. I know there was no opportunity for anyone in Congress to be heard or to present any idea or to consult with any of the members of the committee which made the far-reaching recommendations as to what should be the duty of a base commander. None of the members of the committee had any military service; that is, they are not in the military service now. The members of the committee are:

Mr. Gerhard Gesell, of Washington, D.C., Chairman; Mr. Nathaniel S. Colley; Mr. Abe Fortas; Mr. Louis J. Hector; Mr. Benjamin Muse; Mr. John H. Sengstacke, and Mr. Whitney Young, Jr. They compose the membership of this group. But back to the activities that have taken place.

It has been apparent for some time that the more extreme exponents of revolutionary civil rights actions have wanted to use the military in a position of leadership to bring about desegregation outside the boundaries of the military bases, and have desired that the full economic weight of military bases be manipulated by the base commander to reverse local laws, customs, and policies. It has even been suggested and specifically recommended that the economic coercion to attain these political objectives go to the extreme of curtailing or terminating activities at military installations near communities where desegregation is particularly prevalent.

The Secretary of Defense was called upon to take action in this field as the result of the work of a civilian committee consisting of seven members, not one of whom is a member of the armed services or recognized as a seasoned constitutional lawyer. This Committee, known as the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, on June 13, 1963, filed with the President its initial report dealing with "Equality of Treatment and Opportunity for Negro Military Personnel Stationed Within the United States." This report is popularly known as the Gesell report, after the name of Committee Chairman, Gerhard Gesell, a Washington attorney. The report was forwarded by the President to the Secretary of Defense for attention and action. However, the attention and action which should be given the report seems to have been predirected by the President by the following admonition:

> The Committee's recommendations regarding both off-base and on-base conditions merit your prompt attention and certainly are in the spirit that I believe should characterize our approach to this matter.

On July 26, 1963, the Secretary of Defense, responsive to the admonition of the President, issued a directive—incorrectly entitled "Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces"—based upon the recommendations of the Gesell Committee.

Mr. President, the directive referred to is so far reaching and drastic in its nature and effect that I believe every Member of the Senate should be familiar with its terms. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks the entire directive be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, paragraph B of the directive provides:

> 1. The military departments shall, with the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), issue appropriate instructions, manuals, and regulations in connection with the leadership responsibility for equal opportunity, on and off-base, and containing guidance for its discharge.
>
> 2. The military departments shall institute in each service a system for regularly reporting, monitoring, and measuring progress in achieving equal opportunity on and off base.

Paragraph C places clear and heavy responsibility upon the military commander in the field of social reform. It provides:

> Every military commander has the responsibility to oppose discriminatory practices affecting his men and their dependents and to foster equal opportunity for them, not only in areas under his immediate control, but also in nearby communities where they may live or gather in off-duty hours. In discharging that responsibility a commander shall not, except with the prior approval of the Secretary of his military department, use the off-limits sanction in discrimination cases arising within the United States.

I shall explain that in greater detail later.

This is not all. The following is a paragraph from the July 24, 1963, memorandum from the Secretary of Defense to the President, which responded to the Gesell report and transmitted the directive which I have previously discussed:

> The Committee also suggested the possibility of closing bases near communities where discrimination is particularly prevalent. I do not regard this as a feasible action at this time.

That is a statement by the Secretary of Defense in a communication directed to the President. He declined to say that he would remove bases from communities that did not conform to this requirement. He merely said he did not consider their removal feasible "at this time." Nevertheless, the threat remains. The recommendation of his Committee stands. It has been commended by the President of the United States. The Secretary said it is not feasible to close the bases at this time.

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

Mr. STENNIS. May I finish this point, first? Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

The background for this statement by the Secretary of Defense is that the President's Committee had recommended that military bases be closed or moved in those cases where the off-base business establishments did not submit to the politically inspired requirements. In this recommendation the Committee advocated the most extreme and brutal form of economic coercion.

The Secretary of Defense declined to follow this recommendation "at this time." The use of this phrase indicates, of course, that the threat of such action is still very much in existence. The very clear threat is that, if all else fails, the weight of the military purse will be used, not to increase our combat readiness and military striking power, but as a means of economic strangulation of local peoples and local communities in order to bring about the social and political revolution which the civil rights extremists so ardently desire.

I shall mention some round figures showing that the locations of military installations by the armed services, Congress, and the President are based upon military considerations. What will best serve the defenses and the security of the Nation? What about the air pattern, when the Air Force selects locations for the training of pilots? What about the considerations of the Navy for suitable locations? These are military considerations. That is why we have poured billions of dollars into the construction of military bases throughout the Nation. Missile sites are selected because of their relation to strategic requirements.

Based upon studies and surveys that have been made by teams of investigators, the Government has invested considerably more than $10 billion in military installations which might be affected by this directive. I venture to guess that to transfer, to move, or to recreate those bases elsewhere would cost in the neighborhood of $30 billion. In many cases, there is no other sound military location to which to go.

So this recommendation strikes at the very vitals, the very fundamentals of our military plans, purposes, and strategy. It is no ordinary recommendation. It goes to the very vital and technical parts of our military program.

I shall state later that I believe it would destroy the standards by which we select and promote officers in the armed services and the morale of many fine career officers.

I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator from Mississippi on the able speech he is making. I concur in his statements and share his views completely.

Our Nation is a Nation of civilian control; a Nation of law, not of military control. The Senator has read paragraph C of the order. The order is so far reaching that it directs military commanders to foster equal opportunity for people not only in areas under immediate military control, but also in nearby communities, where the military may live or gather in off-duty hours.

Does the distinguished Senator from Mississippi believe that the military has any control over a civilian area outside the military base?

Mr. STENNIS. Absolutely no control.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Constitution give them any authority to act in civil areas beyond the Military Establishment?

Mr. STENNIS. Absolutely none. As the Senator knows, there are certain working arrangements between the police departments, the civilian authorities, and the civic clubs and groups. But when it comes to legal jurisdiction and legal rights, there are absolutely none.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does a military base commander have authority to act as the Governor of a State or as a State legislator in dealing with areas beyond the jurisdiction of his Military Establishment?

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly not; in fact, the very contrary is the theory of our Government.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does a military base commander have authority to act as county commissioner, mayor, city council, or policymaking authority beyond the boundaries of his Military Establishment?

Mr. STENNIS. Of course, he does not have such authority.

Mr. TALMADGE. But does this order not purport to authorize military commanders to exercise authority beyond the boundaries of the military bases?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; it would put them right in the middle of the current of domestic partisan matters; and it could lead them right into elections. It would set them up as a special force; and they would be considered for promotion on the basis of their compliance with it.

Mr. TALMADGE. In short, their future promotion would depend upon that, would it not?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. I shall discuss that point later, and shall show how near they got to it.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is this order not strangely reminiscent of the orders in Reconstruction days when the South was occupied by troops and was divided into military districts under troop commanders who exercised authority in those areas?

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator from Georgia is correct as far as he goes; but this matter goes even farther than that. It invades the province of more than the civilian authorities and the State authorities; in addition, it would put this officer—who is trained and prepared to prepare us for war and to win that war, if it comes—and also puts his career right in the middle of the most controversial political debates and discussions and the most violent eruptions of partisan matters which exist in the Nation today. I think that is the most serious single phase of the entire matter.

Mr. TALMADGE. Furthermore, it purports to substitute, in those areas, military control and decision, for civil law and civil decision, does it not?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, that is its effect—attempted coercion through threats to remove bases, as I shall show later, and to mark stores or other establishments "off limits," with the result that no member of the Military Establishment would be permitted to enter them. Such economic coercion would be a crushing blow, a death blow, to many of the establishments in these areas.

Mr. TALMADGE. I fully agree with the able Senator from Mississippi. I think this is the most uncalled-for order in connection with a Military Establishment that I have ever heard of in my lifetime.

We live in a nation of laws, not of men. The fact that we live under civilian law, not under military dictatorship, has always been part and parcel of our system of government. However, the purport and effect of this order is to encourage military commanders in charge of various military areas in the Nation to participate in local politics and to attempt to inject the authority of the Military Establishment into civilian control; is that not true?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. If it is permitted to start, naturally it will grow in its impact.

Mr. TALMADGE. That is correct.

In fact, does this order not strike at civil control of our established system of government, and does it not attempt to inject therein military control in civilian areas?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that in his State there are a large number of military installations; but this order is not confined to one area or one State of the Nation. The order is national in its significance; and when attempts are made to disturb and upset the military pattern and the method of promoting officers, a blow is struck at the vitals of the entire Military Establishment.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his important statement and for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, Mr. President, I warmly congratulate the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for calling the attention of the Senate to this very dangerous approach to this matter, which does involve national security in the most complete way.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me ask whether the Senator from Mississippi has placed in the RECORD—if he has not done so, I hope he will—the names of the members of the Committee which made this recommendation to the President and Secretary McNamara.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, the RECORD already discloses their names.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then let me say, for myself—for I did not hear the Senator's comment on the personnel of the Committee—that I think it was as completely unrepresentative of the Nation, and particularly of the areas against which the order is directed, as it would have been possible to make it.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, not one member of the Committee is from the area to which the order is obviously directed; and no seasoned constitutional lawyer is on the Committee; and, so far as I understand, no military man is on the Committee—no one presently in the military service; some of them may have served for some periods in the Military Establishment during the war.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the personnel of this Committee contrasts completely with the requirements of the Civil Rights Commission membership, as illustrated by the appointments made by two Presidents, who by their appointments have indicated at least that that was a national responsibility, and that members from all parts of the Nation, representative of all groups in the Nation, should be appointed to it.

Let me say that I am intrigued by another suggestion the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has made and I regard it as entirely correct; namely, that the decisions in connection with the location of military bases were based solely on military facts and military reasons, not desires to help or hurt some community.

To refer briefly to some of the bases in Florida—and I know how familiar with them the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is—I ask him whether, for example, he thinks an order for abandonment of the guided missile base and the establishments in connection with it at Cape Canaveral would tend to ignore the importance of the geographical advantages of a base located at Cape Canaveral, whereas those geographical advantages constitute the primary reason for the location of the base there. Would it be likely that a person with any degree of military discretion would even consider abandoning that base, inasmuch as the decision to locate it there was based entirely on geographical reasons, and in view of the further fact that no similar location—a place with a shooting gallery of 8,000 miles of relatively clear water—is available.

Mr. STENNIS. Of course not. It is unthinkable; and the removal of many other bases would be equally unthinkable. In short, there would be no such basis for removing any of them.

Mr. HOLLAND. In this connection, I think of two other bases. One is the great carrier and destroyer base at Mayport, which, as the Senator from Mississippi knows, is located barely within the coastline; it is just off the mouth of the St. Johns River. The water there is 42 feet deep, the carriers can come there, and it is the only port south of Norfolk which can be used as a base for carriers which will have control of the entire South Atlantic and the Caribbean area. Would there be any semblance of reason for abandoning that base for any reason such as the one suggested by the terms of this recommendation or order?

Mr. STENNIS. There could not possibly be. In addition, it would greatly weaken the essential military defense of the Nation, as was illustrated so graphically less than a year ago in connection with the Cuban crisis.

It is unthinkable that the Norfolk base would be abandoned. It is equally unthinkable that the naval base and area in Florida to which the Senator from Florida has referred would be abandoned. It is equally unthinkable that one of the air bases there would be abandoned. At the time of the Cuban crisis this base was one of the most critical spots on the face of the globe.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Strategic Air Command base at Homestead is the one to which the Senator from Mississippi refers, is it not?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. Its abandonment would be unthinkable.

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly it would be unthinkable that any responsible military authority would advocate the abandonment of such a critically strategic base for some reason similar to the one advanced in this case, would it not?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. And to refer to Key West, the only place where deep, clear water is so closely available that the sonar school and the various other antisubmarine operations of our far-flown Navy are located there.

Would anyone of any reason or discretion think that because of some little racial disturbance on Key West, a limited area of approximately 2 miles by 4 miles, as I recall, that such a base should be

abandoned, despite the critical place that the base occupies in the security of our Nation?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The directive is not based upon the fact that the State of Florida or any other State is involved. It is not based upon any consideration around the base. The military bases mentioned have been indispensable for us. They paid off 100-fold in a matter of hours and days during the Cuban crisis. They have, as well, supplied a great function during past years.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, again expressing my deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, I merely wish to say that I have made these illustrations because I am more familiar with them. I could make similar illustrations of other locations in the Nation. It seems to me that the Senator has placed his finger upon the point—which is the critical thing in this whole discussion—that to mix the military security of our Nation with the question of solving a troublesome segregation problem—troublesome for the moment—is unthinkably unreasonable. I commend the Senator for bringing the subject to our attention.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much.

This threat—if carried out—would not only ravage and destroy the very purposes for which our Military Establishment exists but it would vest in the military unthinkable power and authority over the local civilian authorities who desire to abide by their own laws and political requirements.

Not one military man, from the Chief of Staff down, would wish that the military should be charged with such a responsibility. A year ago, when we were holding the so-called muzzling hearings, representatives of the military told us:

> Save us. Save us from the local political and partisan matter. We cannot carry out our function if we are to have responsibility in that field.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not heard all of the Senator's address. I am not sure whether the point about which I wish to speak has been covered. Is it suggested that the capital of the Nation be moved in the event some racial trouble should occur in the city of Washington on the 28th of August when we are to be greeted with a demonstration?

Mr. STENNIS. No, I have not reached that point in my address. In fact, it is not in my statement. There is nothing in that respect in the report yet, but there are other reports covering that situation. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, military bases are located by our military authorities on considerations of military effectiveness and strength. There is no other valid test.

Aside from its impact upon local communities and local social customs, the most tragic and perilous aspect of the Secretary's directive is that it is entirely inconsistent with and destructive of the primary obligation, responsibility, and mission of the military to be prepared for war and to fight and win if war should come. Instead of confining the military to its traditional and vital role of building up the defenses of the Nation, it is now proposed to use them blatantly and openly to intervene in local political and social controversies and to use the economic persuasion that local base expenditures carry with them to coerce, intimidate, and compel the commercial establishments of the area to conform to a social pattern which is alien to the habits and traditions of the local people. It is difficult to imagine that a more dangerous and divisive practice could be introduced into our Military Establishment.

I point out that my remarks are addressed to the off-base activity. On-base activities are integrated, and that subject can be considered a military question. My points are directed to the off-base activities.

This is not theorizing. The directive of July 26 expressly authorizes the commanding officer, with the prior approval of the Secretary of his military department, to use "off-limits sanction" in cases of alleged discrimination.

That language would not leave the base commander standing alone at the mercy of the coercion, intimidation, and pressure that could build up from various sources throughout the Nation against him, a lonely colonel, in relation to something off the base. The approval must come from the Secretary of the service. I commend the Secretary of Defense for making that requirement. But at the same time the threat is present, and the pattern of operation is now announced: "If you do not do what we say, we will place you off limits."

The directive means that not a single man from the 15,000-man military base may enter the door of that businessman, much less trade a dime with him. The military base commander and the Secretary of the service involved are the only two men who make such a decision. That is according to the directive.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The rule is not being made because of trouble in areas where troops are segregated.

Mr. STENNIS. The directive would not be based on that point at all. That is another question entirely. The Secretary has such authority now and we do not object to it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Is it not true that where the military has tried to integrate there has been trouble?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The reverse could have occurred. Where the troops had been integrated, the action might have been considered off base. There would be some reason for that, would there not?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I would agree with the Senator from Mississippi that, so far as the military is concerned, they should have nothing whatever to do with anything outside the military zone, a camp, or whatever it might be, and wherever it might be located.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree with the Senator. The military authorities have a right to make rules and regulations, but they do not have any right to say what will go on in a city which is normally outside the limits of the military zone.

Mr. STENNIS. The military rightly has command inside the limits of the Military Establishment. They carry out that right. They have been ordered to integrate and they have integrated. But now the commanders have been ordered to go beyond that limitation into private businesses. For no reason in the world, except that the social customs and habits of the people are contrary to what this Committee thinks they ought to be, they are permitted to declare businesses off limits. In other words, the directive would be an economic bludgeon with which a businessman could be hit over the head. If a businessman got on the black list, it would mean death to his business. There has been no mandate of the Congress on that point, and no law has been passed with respect thereto. It has not been brought up here in that way. But that is an Executive order: "Do it."

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. On the contrary, has not every court of the United States, from the Supreme Court down and including the Federal district courts, from 1883 to the present time, held exactly the opposite?

Mr. STENNIS. Without exception, the courts have held as the Senator has said.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is not the effect of the order, then, to empower the military to do diametrically the opposite of what the Supreme Court and other Federal courts have said the Congress itself could not do?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is absolutely correct. If the Executive order applies in the present case, the concept or idea could apply on other subjects with the same force.

As the Senator from Georgia has said, the Supreme Court of the United States said, "Congress shall not do this." But the executive branch goes ahead and does it anyway.

Under the provision to which I have referred, the local commander, with the approval of his Secretary, is authorized to control the off-base patronage of business establishments by military personnel and their dependents and to prohibit them from doing business with an establishment unless it meets with the approval of the commander.

The high priority which is being given to mobilizing the military might for civil rights proposals is indicated by the fact that the Secretary's directive provides for the creation of a new Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Rights. Since the activities in this field and the political motives which inspire them are so far removed from established military functions it is reasonable

to believe that the occupant of this new position will take his directions, not from the Secretary of Defense, but from the Attorney General of the United States or one of his deputies. I do not make this statement lightly. I say it deliberately and with full knowledge of my solemn responsibility as a Member of the Senate. This is the only possible inference from the facts which have developed over the last few years.

Mr. President, since I came into the Chamber I have been handed a quotation from the Washington Star of July 30, containing a statement attributed to Mr. Fitt, who has been elevated by the Secretary of Defense to the newly created position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Rights.

Mr. Fitt is quoted as saying:

> I came over to this building because I was excited at the prospect of doing something about eliminating discrimination in the Army.

That is what he told reporters.

> Now I will have a chance to do this throughout the whole Defense Establishment.

He was previously assigned to the Army. He is not limiting the application only to the Defense Establishment. He also contemplates taking over jurisdiction of all surrounding areas.

This illustrates what I have said. This is a plan. The mysterious papers move around and move around, and finally culminate in orders.

I am not attacking Mr. McNamara. I have had little opportunity to talk with him about this problem. I know he considers it to be a serious matter. I infer from other facts with which I am familiar that he did not originate this order, but that the mysterious movement came from somewhere else.

These developments and others which I shall not discuss today thrust the Military Establishment—against the will of its top uniformed leaders, I believe—directly into the middle of the strongest and most explosive current of American politics. Is there a Member of the Senate who disagrees with that statement? If there is, then he need only look around him. Pending at the very top of the Senate Calendar for the committee hearings are the most extreme and far-reaching civil rights bills which have ever been submitted to the Congress. The Chief Executive is demanding that he be vested with almost unlimited power in the fields of education, qualifications of electors, public accommodations, employment opportunities, and the power to withhold Federal grants, loans, and guarantees to States and individuals. Clearly the action taken by the Secretary of Defense is part and parcel of the powerful drive to vest the Government with the power to regiment and control the most sensitive phases of our society and economy.

Make no mistake about it. This directive will place the members of our Armed Forces in the mainstream of swirling political currents and, unless rescinded, will keep them there for years to come.

What will become of our military strength in the meantime?

It will have a most serious and detrimental effect upon our entire Military Establishment and can only be destructive of long-established military traditions and discipline.

All this action comes when there is pending before Congress the matter of making appropriations for our vast Military Establishment and widespread military programs. It comes at a time also when there is pending before the Congress a proposal to increase the pay of military personnel. What is the purpose of the military pay proposal? I believe it is to make the military stronger in the military field. Is it to weld a stronger military force and to bolster the morale of members of the Armed Forces, or is it for the purpose of building a more efficient agency to create and enforce a new, different, and unwanted social and political pattern in areas surrounding our military bases?

We should consider the military pay bill as strengthening the forces we have and building even stronger ones in the future. I refer to this subject to show that the Congress is now engaged in consideration of the vital parts of the vast military program. The Executive order is then put before us.

Let me remind the Senate, Mr. President, that just about a year ago the Senate Special Preparedness Subcommittee had concluded its lengthy hearings on the alleged "muzzling" of the military. Almost without exception those persons in positions of responsibility in our Military Establishment—in and out of uniform—took a strong and unequivocable position that military personnel should be wholly aloof from political matters and should not be called upon to take part in local or national activities or programs which might involve them in political matters, local issues, and other partisan or controversial issues and areas.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina. I know the Senator is vitally interested in this question, not only as its relates to South Carolina, but also because of his interest in the military program.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator. I commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for the appropriate remarks he is making on this subject.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THURMOND. This is a very vital subject which concerns our national security. I am sure the Senator from Mississippi will agree that a commander has his hands full merely looking after the training of our troops, looking after the base or Army camp or fort, as the case may be, looking after morale, doing the things he must do as a military man, without having to try to change the social patterns of the surrounding community.

I feel confident the Senator would agree with me that that is the way a commander should spend his time, in military ways, rather than to try to change the social customs of a community and, in a great many instances, at places where it could seriously affect the economy of the community and act to the inconvenience and detriment of the troops involved.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree with the Senator wholeheartedly. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks by the Senator from Mississippi a statement I have made on this subject and editorials from the Columbia Record and the Augusta Chronicle may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished friend from Mississippi. I think the Senator is doing a great favor to the country and to the Senate by bringing these matters to the attention of the people of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I do not think the people understand it. I do not think they know what is going on. I do not think they realize the seriousness of the situation.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I say again that I am trying to present this question from the standpoint, not of any sectional area of the country, not of any State, but rather from the standpoint of the military itself and our military strength and effectiveness.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I understand that. I was a soldier in the First World War. I went in as a private, and I came out the same. There was nothing very private about my life at the time, for somebody always directed it.

I remember that at times I was sent to various locations and camps. Certain places were designated "off limits." I would ask, "What is wrong?" And I would be told, "There is disease" or something detrimental. I would be told, "You should not go there, because it will hurt you."

Now it is said that situations like that can exist around certain places merely because somebody does not like what is going on, when there is nothing wrong at the particular place but good citizenship.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Such a policy is completely beyond the authority of our military forces.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his fine comments.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I think we should make it abundantly clear, at the outset of this discussion, that while in the minds of some people this may have a relationship to civil rights in my mind it does not. In the minds of some people those of us who object to this move will be held up as segregation-

ists. To my mind that is completely false.

The step which has been taken—and I feel taken reluctantly, I might say in his defense, by the Secretary of Defense—was pushed on the Secretary of Defense by someone else, and is a complete flip-flop from the administration's concept of the danger of a military man taking over.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I remember the words, "Don't let them taste the meat." Now we are asked to put the whole chunk in their mouths, and then to order a commander to bite it off. I am sure the Senator agrees.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senator aware of the fact that Mr. Fitt, the man in charge, is traveling around to the bases of this country to promote this kind of action?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi has been so informed, yes. I have not had a contact with him, but he is the gentleman who has been going around.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senator aware of the fact that when the committee goes into a community it goes in completely armed with dossiers on the businessmen of the community, dossiers complete with every figure the committee can get out of income tax returns?

Mr. STENNIS. Would the Senator mind repeating that question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I asked if the Senator was aware of the fact that the committee which Mr. Fitt heads, the name slips me now, though it has a Spanish connotation—visiting the bases around the country in the preliminary efforts to get the commanding officers to act in a way commanding officers have never acted before—goes into the communities with complete dossiers on every businessman.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. With facts and figures gleaned from Internal Revenue reports.

It started in the Attorney General's office. They have used the full force of the Internal Revenue documents. I think this goes much further than what we are talking about here today; namely, the threat of a military takeover should things change in this country and we find that the military commanders have become used to running politics and the social life of the community—I do not care where it is. It goes further than a discussion of the civil rights question. In my capacity as a Reserve officer in the Air Force, I was assigned the tour of duty to visit bases. I questioned about the base relationships. I found as much trouble in this field on the northern Canadian border as anywhere else. Yet I may say these bases have not been approached by these teams.

I suggest as a followup to the Senator's point—and I have suggested this to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Mr. RUSSELL—that I would give my full support to a complete investigation into Mr. Fitt and Mr. Yarmolinsky and other persons in the Pentagon who are forcing Secretary McNamara—I am convinced, against his will—to take this dangerous step.

I do not think there is a Senator who will defend that directive. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for the speech he is making on the subject.

Mr. STENNIS. First, let me thank the Senator for his services and for contributing his fine knowledge of this subject matter. The Senator has shown how it affects the first point the Senator from Mississippi made, as it bears upon the question of our military might, planning, and strategy. I thank the Senator for his willingness to stand up, with his fine knowledge in this field, to make this point, which is characteristic of him. The Senator from Mississippi did not know this group was armed with this information about individual persons. It shows this plan and singles out the coercion and intimidation and the telling people that "we are going to put the mark on you," and that it will break many of them.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In partial answer to the question put by the Senator from Florida as to the makeup of the committee, I believe an investigation will show that every one of these people can be identified with this type of thing from college days to the present time. This is a "stacked" committee, if Senators will excuse the use of the word. It strengthens my suggestion that a complete investigation be made into the effort and the directive and those people who have pushed it and the full use of the power of the police state by the Attorney General.

Mr. STENNIS. I heartily agree with the Senator from Arizona. We are not fulfilling our duty to the American people—to all the people; this is not a civil rights issue, and we are not fulfilling our duty as custodians of the military program and military preparedness unless we investigate it to the full and lay it on the table, so there will be seen the design and the plan proposed to be carried out along this line. I may say that the military is going to be the most to suffer.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I warmly commend the Senator from Mississippi for the timely and splendid speech he is making in behalf of the welfare of our country.

I point out that on July 31, 1618, the colonists at Jamestown elected a group to govern them. That was the first legislative assembly on this continent. That group developed a program of representative democracy that eventuated in the formation of a document in Philadelphia in 1787 which the historian Gladstone said was the greatest instrument ever struck off by the hand and purpose of man.

Behind that instrument was the work of the great George Mason of Virginia and his Bill of Rights. Behind it was the political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, one of the greatest political philosophers we have ever had. Behind it was the work of James Madison, the real architect of the fundamental law under which we have been operating.

Yet, following the unfortunate War Between the States, when Virginia and other States were crushed by superior force, the Senate adopted a resolution which said Virginia was not capable of self-goverment. Virginia, it said, will be designated as Military District No. 1. So the Army was sent into Virginia and, at the point of the bayonet, after all Confederate veterans and all who sympathized with the Confederate cause had been disenfranchised, that Army elected a general assembly and, at the point of the bayonet, the general assembly was forced to ratify both the 13th and 14th amendments.

This was the first time, and the only time, the U.S. Army has ever been brought into the political arena.

When Virginia regained its independence, it enacted a law, which we have enforced ever since, that no length of residence in Virginia by a military man would qualify him to vote. Why did we do that? We did not want men temporarily stationed in Virginia to be put in the position of playing party politics. So we said, "You cannot vote."

Now it would appear that our Army, in this grave emergency, when we need the highest morale and the highest loyalty to our Nation, united and undivided, has proposed to push our military men into the most controversial issue which has faced our Nation since the War Between the States.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may make one further comment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida, but I have an engagement to keep.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very brief.

I have just seen in the New York Times an editorial which I never expected to see in that newspaper during the segregation discussion. I wanted to call it to the attention of the distinguished Senator, because it seems to me so clear that the philosophy announced in that editorial applies to the military security matter which the Senator is discussing. The title of the editorial is "Breakthrough or Breakdown?"

The first paragraph reads as follows:

> In the name of good sense and better race relations, what in the world do the leaders of the integration movement in this city hope to gain by the tactics they now are using to attract public attention?

I think the editorial applies so completely to the situation which the Senator is discussing, though it is addressed to the tactics being used in the city of New York, and not to the military situation, that I wonder if the Senator would agree that I may insert it in the RECORD, to emphasize the point I have made?

Mr. STENNIS. Very well. The Senator may ask unanimous consent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BREAKTHROUGH OR BREAKDOWN?

In the name of good sense and better race relations, what in the world do the leaders

of the integration movement in this city hope to gain by the tactics they now are using to attract public attention?

Item: Eighteen Negro children aged 2 to 13 years being placed by their elders at the entrance to the site of the Downstate Medical Center in Brooklyn;

Item: Seven older demonstrators jumping on a construction truck at the same location and entwining themselves around a portable crane so tenaciously that 20 policemen were required to pry them loose;

Item: A white couple and a Negro man blocking access to Mayor Wagner's office in City Hall;

Item: Others maintaining an around-the-clock sit-in at Governor Rockefeller's New York City office on West 55th Street.

It can be doubted that these and similar unlawful sit-ins, lie-ins, stand-ins that have been carried out in recent weeks in New York City have advanced the cause of equality under the law by an iota. Or speeded up action to bring about a redress of just grievances. They may very well have had the adverse effect of alienating some old friends. They can hardly have won many new ones.

There comes a time in any campaign when the law of diminishing returns begins to operate. That time seems to have come, and to have been passed.

A recent statement by the Public Affairs Committee of Freedom House is commended to the campaign leaders for careful reading. The members of that committee hardly can be accused of being hesitant whites or Negro "Uncle Toms." The statement points out that it is at the conference table where settlements must be reached in a democratic society, not in the streets. That is where they must be reached if "breakthrough" is not to become "breakdown."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, while the subcommittee did not approve of some of the restrictions which had been placed upon some of the military officers, the majority of the subcommittee emphatically concluded that it was of major importance that rigid adherence be given to the traditional and time-honored concept that the military shall under no circumstances become involved in partisan and controversial matters. The majority report of the subcommittee solidly upheld this position.

What has happened since then? There is no valid answer.

The directive will affect the promotion and career advancement of officers affected, including the base commanders. The Gesell report proposed that "officers showing initiative and achievement in this area"—this is highly important—"will enhance their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement."

I point out with emphasis that the Gesell Committee went about the country, with no military members on it, or anyone who had any attainments in that field, and it actually recommended, in connection with the off-base activities, that officers will enhance—those officers are the base commanders—their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement.

That is one of the most injurious recommendations that I have ever seen in print regarding our great military profession. Most of us know that these selections are made by a very carefully chosen group of men. Those men walk the floor at night, I understand, deciding between many worthy choices as to who shall be promoted to major or to lieutenant colonel or to colonel or to major general. Still, this group, in the Gesell report, would propose that there be a rating based on this qualification, and that that be given favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement.

Imagine a man like Jack Pershing in World War I, or a man like General MacArthur in World War II, or General Eisenhower in World War II, carrying the responsibility of leading millions of men, if his promotion and career advancement had depended upon activities of this kind beyond a military base. God save us and our Nation from such a day.

Every officer in uniform knows that that recommendation was in the report, whether or not it was specifically adopted and accepted by the Secretary of Defense. How can a base commander, in the back of his mind, at least, escape the inference that necessarily arises?

While the Secretary's directive does not expressly go this far, it does provide for a system of "measuring progress" in the civil rights field. That is the way it is covered by the Secretary's directive. It does not say that promotion will be based on it, but it does speak of a system of "measuring progress" in the civil rights field.

Every base commander knows of the original recommendation of the Gesell committee and knows that he will be on the spot in this respect. I can hardly conceive of any step which could be taken which would be more destructive of officer morale.

In any event, the executive department does not have the final say as to what shall be considered "fitness and efficiency" entitling an officer to promotion. The final power rests with the Senate and only those are promoted who are confirmed by the Senate. Those who might be ranked high by the President's Commission when it comes to "measuring progress" might not be ranked quite so high by those who finally act on proposed promotion. I emphasize this point to show that this directive clearly proposes to throw the military directly into political activities of the most sensitive nature and to introduce a strictly nonmilitary factor into the promotion system.

The consequences can only lower—and I emphasize "lower"—the military efficiency and morale, and injure numerous able and conscientious military officers. What about the great LeMay? Could we think of his coming up the ladder on any such point as this?

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to call the Senator's attention to a comment on this situation by a man who is not from the South. He made his reputation as a writer and as a correspondent for the New York Times. His name is William S. White. This is what he says:

The latest and most cutting was the order by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, in effect, inviting military base commanders to declare "off limits" to the troops any community practicing "relentless discrimination" against them. "Relentless discrimination," of course, is refusal of private business to serve Negro customers.

To put a town off limits means to strike at its economic life with all the power of the Federal Government. It is a bald effort to force integration of private business by Executive fiat at the same moment the same administration is asking Congress to do the same thing in a lawful way—by act of Congress.

Ironically, southerners in Congress have repeatedly saved this same Secretary of Defense. Senator STENNIS notably did it by a temperate investigation drawing the heat from charges that Mr. McNamara was muzzling high officers. The Senator supported Mr. McNamara because the Senator believes in the Constitution, including that part which puts the civilian defense head superior to the military.

But Senator STENNIS also believes in the rest of the Constitution, which to him does not mean that the Armed Forces, supported by the billions provided by southerners and other conservatives as well as civil rights extremists, are to be used to force social changes even before Congress has had a chance to say whether they are lawful changes.

I wish the Senator to know that he is not alone—and Mr. White is not from the South—in expressing his resentment and alarm at this new development in our military program.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. It is certainly true that this situation is causing the deepest concern in every area of the country.

The only manner in which such consequences can be avoided is to take action to insure that our military people are confined to their proper and legitimate function. Theirs is the job of maintaining military might at the highest state of combat readiness and insuring that we will win in any contest that may come.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, and as chairman of its Preparedness Subcommittee, I have constantly come in contact with the immense problems which confront the Secretary of Defense, the Department Secretaries, the Joint Chiefs, and the other civilian and military officials who are responsible for our military security.

I do not believe that any of them initiated the action which resulted in this directive. They cannot carry out such missions and still perform their primary duty and function.

I am convinced that it is the duty of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other high ranking military officers to urge that the directive in question be reconsidered and rescinded. I have not conferred with any of these gentlemen about this point. That is my opinion. Our military men must not be cast in the role of political zealot and social reformer.

For the same reasons it is the duty of the Secretary of Defense to reconsider his position. The President, I believe, should give his personal attention to this matter and avoid pushing the military into this unheard-of political role. This may only be the beginning. If political activity is condoned and encouraged in this field the President some day may not be able to extricate the military from other political activity that could follow.

I warn the Members of the Senate and the American people that it will weaken our defenses and imperil our safety and survival if we commit our Military Establishment to this mission. This is the first and only time in our history that our military commanders have been given to understand that the process of "measuring progress" for themselves and their installations will depend on how strongly they enforce a political policy and upset and disturb off-base social orders. This understanding is coupled with the knowledge that their promotions and career advancement are necessarily involved. I repeat that that is the saddest part of this entire directive.

My purpose today is to expose the meaning and implications of this directive with the hope that its implementation, which is now scheduled for August 15, can be prevented. My further purpose is to appeal to the President and the Secretary of Defense to reconsider the position to which they have committed themselves. I hope that the Members of Congress and the American people will immediately express their opposition to this dangerous innovation which will lead our military men in uniform down the road to outright official intervention in the political and social affairs of the Nation.

Mr. President, if the power of the military base commander can be used to influence the social and political life of the people in the area where the base is located, he can also influence a particular election in the area when it comes. If he can use the tremendous economic power which he commands by withholding purchases himself or by prohibiting servicemen from becoming customers of certain businesses by marking them off limits, then he has a punitive power over citizens who pay taxes to support the military services—punitive power that can mean life or death to the businesses involved.

Thus, a base commander could soon amass social, political and economic power of sufficient strength to be the dominating force in a community or area. Such a system operating in a chain of base commanders could generate dictatorial powers beyond recall. God save the military and the country from such a fate.

Furthermore, under this directive, a base commander can be awarded promotions in proportion to his zeal and effectiveness in this field.

The military services and the country must be saved from such a fate.

Mr. President, this is just one phase of the entire pattern for control of the Nation through Federal expenditures. It is the most serious.

Legislation pending here—Senate bill 1731—carries a sweeping provision that seeks to repeal all existing formulas as to expenditure of Federal funds and vests the President with authority not subject to review by the courts or by the Congress, to withhold all Federal expenditures of all kinds should he think there exists any kind of discrimination in the administration of any of the funds.

I refer to the civil rights bill solely because it is a part of the pattern. I have on my desk copies of forms used by elevator operators or warehousemen who put a few bales of cotton into the cotton loan plan. They have to agree in the contract, in order to get it, that they will fulfill certain conditions. If they violate that clause, they forfeit the entire contract; there can be no recourse to the courts. They are forced to agree that as to all future contracts they will not even be eligible for consideration, if they violate that particular clause in the contract.

I understand that directives containing a similar provision have been issued to the highway departments of the various States.

This is all a part of a pattern which is rapidly leading us down the road of control, not by Congress, but by executive orders with reference to the expenditure of funds.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator has very properly described the proposed military order which is to become effective, I believe, on August 14, as leading to dictatorship, or potential dictatorship. Is it not true that in the history of the world no dictator has ever come to power except by force and by the use of the armed services?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Virginia is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that all dictators have maintained themselves in power by the use and control of the military?

Mr. STENNIS. So far as I know, that is largely true.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that the dictators of our day and generation have used the military not only as a means of aggression against other nations, but also to implement their own domestic policies?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. I thank him for his contribution to the discussion.

I shall conclude in a few words.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall take a view contrary to the Senator's view. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's speech now. I believe he is well acquainted with my views. Nevertheless, I think something should be said on this subject. I shall be very brief. I understand the Chair proposes to recognize next the Senator from Florida rather than me; but I ask the indulgence of the Senator from Florida for 5 minutes to enable me to reply to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from New York that I am overdue at a meeting which I must attend. I shall conclude my remarks in about a minute. Perhaps the Senator from Florida would then yield to the Senator from New York for a few minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I am sorry that I cannot remain.

Mr. President, if such a pattern is followed our constitutional form of government will be no more. Essentially, we will be on the road to a dictatorship.

If this pattern is inaugurated and continued, we will, of course, continue to have a military organization of a kind. But it will not be one devoted to its primary mission of national security and defense. The military will be given political missions and assignments which could be the first step toward a military dictatorship.

I shall do what I can to alert the Nation and all Members of Congress particularly the membership of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, to these alarming facts and their consequences.

I appreciate the indulgence of the Senate.

EXHIBIT 1

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE—EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN THE ARMED FORCES

I. POLICY

It is the policy of the Department of Defense to conduct all of its activities in a manner which is free from racial discrimination, and which provides equal opportunity for all uniformed members and all civilian employes irrespective of their color.

Discriminatory practices directed against Armed Forces members, all of whom lack a civilian's freedom of choice in where to live, to work, to travel, and to spend his off-duty hours, are harmful to military effectiveness. Therefore, all members of the Department of Defense should oppose such practices on every occasion, while fostering equal opportunity for servicemen and their families, on and off base.

II. RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Office of the Secretary of Defense

(1) Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of Defense and the provisions of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) is hereby assigned responsibility and authority for promoting equal opportunity for members of the Armed Forces.

In the performance of this function he shall (a) be the representative of the Secretary of Defense in civil rights matters, (b) give direction to programs that promote equal opportunity for military personnel, (c) provide policy guidance and review policies, regulations, and manuals of the military departments, and (d) monitor their performance through perodic reports and visits to field installations.

(2) In carrying out the functions enumerated above, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) is authorized to establish the Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Civil Rights).

B. The military departments

(1) The military departments shall, with the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), issue appropriate instructions, manuals and regulations in connection with the leadership responsibility for equal opportunity, on and off base, and containing guidance for its discharge.

(2) The military departments shall institute in each Service a system for regularly reporting, monitoring, and measuring progress in achieving equal opportunity on and off base.

C. Military commanders

Every military commander has the responsibility to oppose discriminatory practices affecting his men and their dependents and to foster equal opportunity for them, not only in areas under his immediate control, but also in nearby communities where they may live or gather in off-duty hours. In discharging that responsibility a commander shall not, except with the prior approval of

the Secretary of his military department, use the off-limits sanction in discrimination cases arising within the United States.

III. IMPLEMENTATION

Not later than August 15, 1963, the military departments shall forward for the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) an outline plan for implementing this directive.

IV. EFFECTIVE DATE

This directive is effective immediately.

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense.

EXHIBIT 2

NEWS RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF U.S. SENATOR STROM THURMOND OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The new order by the Secretary of Defense authorizing entire communities and cities to be placed off limits because private businessmen do not choose to have integration on their private property is preposterous and represents economic blackmail in its rawest possible form. This could mean that entire cities such as Charleston, Columbia, Sumter, Augusta, Beaufort, Myrtle Beach, and surrounding communities could be boycotted by Defense Department edict. This would be detrimental not only to the local economy but also to individual servicemen and their families, and the entire defense program. What we are witnessing today is the imposition in America of a second era of Reconstruction. The American people resent blackmail at the hands of Government and are generally opposed to coercion in any form. This order will not be accepted by the American people and will be particularly resented by military commanders who understand their mission to be defense of their country, rather than creation of domestic turmoil and strife by engaging themselves in sociological and political activities at the behest of a power-mad administration.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, July 27, 1963]

MILITARY TO ASSUME CONTROL OF LOCAL RACIAL PRACTICES

Civilian communities will be subjected to military dictation to achieve complete racial integration patterns acceptable to Federal Government monitors.

Commanders and their subordinates will be ordered to effectuate desegregation near military bases. Their promotions and assignments will depend on the degree of success they attain in securing civilian compliance.

Government race-mixing demands will cover the entire spectrum of community life, including restaurants, hotels, housing, theaters, golf courses, swimming pools, poolrooms, bowling alleys, schools, dancehalls, and social centers.

Base commanders will be ordered to liquidate present military-civilian community councils and appoint new ones composed of white integrationists, Negroes who are "not subservient to white interests," and white and Negro military personnel.

The program in each community near a military base will start with a campaign of persuasion. If voluntary compliance is not forthcoming, business places that refuse to sign a pledge for complete integration will be placed "off limits" to military personnel and their dependents. Pledge signers will be constantly monitored. If the boycott system does not get satisfactory results, commanders will be required to initiate litigation against private enterprises in the name of the Federal Government. As a final resort, military operations will be curtailed or bases will be closed.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, in his recent memorandum countermanding his earlier directive encouraging military personnel to participate in racial demonstrations, pointed out that the Defense Department "is implementing the recommendations of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces relating to off-base discrimination."

The forced mixing plan is detailed in the initial report of the President's Committee, which is published in a 93-page book entitled, "Equality of Treatment and Opportunity for Negro Military Personnel Stationed Within the United States."

Since some of the major Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force installations are based in South Carolina, and racial segregation is practiced in every community of the State, the Federal Government's military offensive against existing social customs are of primary importance to this area.

The following analytical summary is based on the President's Committee's report, with quoted words taken from the report itself:

Universal integration of civilian communities will be "the policy of the Department of Defense and part of the mission of the chain of command from the Secretaries of the services to the local base commander.

"A different concept of the base commander's function in the racial field must be evolved. * * * Explicit orders and more detailed directives" will be provided. Base commanders will be measured by their performance in effecting community integration. They will be monitored and must report progress.

"It should be made clear that officers showing initiative and achievement in this area will enhance their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration and promotion and career advancement. * * * They will receive the support of all echelons of command if their programs are attacked by local interests. A constant showing of serious, intense effort is the minimum performance accepted.

"A sense of responsibility for problems of off-base discrimination replaces the prevalent notion that matters outside the gate are of no concern to the base commander."

Base commanders must study "the history of the Negro's struggle to achieve equality," must attend seminars and conferences on integration techniques and success, and must cooperate with other Federal agencies to achieve integration.

Commanders will be required to appoint new military-civilian community relations committees for their bases. "Satisfactory results cannot be obtained by relying on the types of committees which have heretofore existed." The new racially mixed committees will have specific objectives and timetables.

The approach of the base commander to the civilian community must be that he is "correcting forms of discrimination which interfere with morale and efficiency of members of his command. The pattern the community chooses to follow as to its own civilians cannot be accepted as the pattern which must be imposed upon men in uniform or their dependents." By this strategy the commander must make it appear that the significant tradition of noninvolvement by military authorities in local political matters will be unimpaired.

Since bases are "economically important to the communities that surround them" and because of the "economic dependence of the community upon the base," the base commander "should lead patriotic citizens to join together, where their business interests are common, to find appropriate solution.

"Where efforts to achieve progress by persuasion and discussion are unsuccessful," the base commander may initiate "litigation, brought in the name of the Federal Government." As this method is "piecemeal and time-consuming at best," the commander must take more direct action "under which military personnel of all races would be permitted to patronize only those facilities which receive his express approval."

In other words, the commander would impose a boycott against all establishments that refuse to comply. Firms which took the pledge would be constantly monitored under threat of disqualification. All other businesses would be off limits to military personnel.

Should this method fail, "the Services must consider a curtailment or termination of activities" at the nearby base.

"Such relocation of activities is particularly important at bases that play an important role in the training of new recruits or officers or in the orientation of representatives of foreign governments."

Where punitive action is taken against communities, it must be proclaimed that the objective is "preservation of morale, not the punishment of local communities which have a tradition of segregation."

New installations will be opened only in communities where "explicit guarantees" against segregation are given.

Implementation of the new program of controls on the civilian communities will require a new bureau in the Department of Defense and offices in each Service to "monitor developments and provide assistance." All resources of the Federal Government will be made available and "brought to bear on the intelligent solution of specific problems." Commanders will be under surveillance and special officers will be appointed at each base to receive Negroes' complaints and take them up directly with the commander.

The President's committee anticipates that suits initiated by the Department of Justice will "compel the integration of the other schools (not on bases) serving military dependents, including dependents who live off base." Where there is only token integration, local commanders must place children of military personnel promptly in desegregated schools, put the full force of the military "squarely on the side of Negro parents as they attempt to overcome administrative barriers," and continue efforts "until dispersion of children of Negro military personnel within the local school system is complete."

Under the new program, ROTC and National Defense Cadet Corps units will be withdrawn from segregated schools and colleges, military personnel requiring special college training will be enrolled only in integrated institutions. Recommendations for integration of National Guard and Reserve units will be contained in a subsequent report.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, July 30, 1963]

A CASE OF PLANNED BLACKMAIL

A Defense Department order authorizing base commanders to declare off limits to troops businesses which do not serve or cater to Negro servicemen and their families is an insult to the character and the integrity of every owner of a private concern in the Nation who refuses to knuckle under to governmental blackmail.

There can be no other connotation placed on the infamous effort of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to dictate this offensive policy, for the sanctions which he plans to impose may be likened, he said, to those invoked in "vice-ridden areas."

This equating of a privately operated business in the public domain to a house of ill repute not only flies in the face of all that is sacred in the commercial life of this Nation, but, as we have previously said, threatens a rupture in the morale of America's Armed Forces and a devastating blow to the national economy.

McNamara's sadistic order is based upon his compliance with recommendations made by the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. That it was one weighted against the white was early indicated in its report.

While admitting that Negroes within the armed services are on equal plane with their

white counterparts, the committee—as though it were intent upon creating dissension—declared that "the great progress made is not enough."

It is unwilling to let this "great progress" set the pace for further and harmonious advances for the Negro. It prefers, evidently, to move on a course that will antagonize almost every white businessman in the Nation, none of whom hereafter may feel any security in the free operation of his business.

Worse still, if that be possible, is the almost complete lack of concern the committee evidences for the irreparable harm that can befall the Nation as a result of its socialistic and unholy presentments. By giving greater credence to color of skin than to merit—an example of which is its demand that "energetic efforts must be made" to increase the number of Negroes in the service academies so as to boost the number of Negro officers—the Gesell Committee is playing a major role in determining the makeup and, as a consequence, the effectiveness of America's Armed Forces.

Its recommendation that base commanders be wary of groups and clubs and functions that practice their constitutionally guaranteed right of freedom of choice and assembly denies to these commanders the intimate civilian-military relationship so valuable to the well-being of the community and the installation. It places on them, too, a morale-breaking burden which could destroy their effectiveness as commanders of all their troops, colored as well as white.

Failure of a community to fall in line with the Defense Department's dictatorial tactics not only, then, might lead to off-limit sanctions and to the destruction of its economy, as we have noted, it could tear down the morale of white troops at whom it would be aimed just as much as at Negroes, and it could mean—if the committee recommendations are followed—loss of promotion to highly qualified military commanders whose failure to advance because of nonmilitary actions over which they would have absolutely no control might work against the survival of the United States in some future war.

It was on such a report that the Secretary of Defense now moves to blackmail businessmen in the area of military installations into accepting Government dictation of their business practices.

Loss of their liberties, just as surely as night follows day, will react to the loss of individual freedoms for all Americans in the years to come. The loss will be as great to the Negro as it will be to the white.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, first, I express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi for calling to the attention of the Nation the very somber facts which he has mentioned. I concur completely in his point of view. When the time comes that extravagant people, having an ultraliberal philosophy, such as that which now dominates those who are behind this effort, seek to control all the rest of the country, with the vast power of the Federal Government to control it to the degree that they will have the power to destroy, we will not have the same kind of America that we now have.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have no intention of monopolizing the floor. The reason why I am being recognized is to make the opening remarks with reference to the pending business.

I announce that I have agreed to yield first to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]; second, to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and third, to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If other Senators have brief remarks to make, I shall be happy to yield to them. I believe the debate on which we are about to enter may take some time.

I now yield briefly to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

DEFENSE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I appreciate his courtesy.

Mr. President, on July 18 I took the floor to defend the Republican Party organization against self-serving and destructive attacks by a small handful of ambitious men. I said then and I say now that a man who would take such desperate and destructive measures against his own party in a gamble to gain some temporary personal advantage has already forfeited any claim to loyalty from any part of the Republican Party organization.

I said then and I repeat now that this so-called Republican leader is using exactly the tactic that the northern Democrats have adopted to tar the whole conservative movement with the brush of extremism. He is using exactly the strategy that the Democrats themselves have decided would be the most destructive of Republican chances in 1964, right down the line, right down to the local offices.

Mr. President, I am not surprised that this attack on the Republican Party organization has been condemned in editorial comment on a broad scale. I believe it is important to draw direct attention of the Senate to some of the excerpts from the editorial outpouring. Here are some of them:

From the New York Daily News, July 22, 1963:

The dirty tactics consist in sly hints that GOLDWATER is anti-Negro, and that he runs around with the John Birch Society if not with the Ku Klux Klan. GOLDWATER is not anti-Negro and he never has been anybody's captive throughout his political career. His published speeches, book and syndicated column make idiotic any assertion that he is an extremist or a pal of extremists.

From the Fort Lauderdale News, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., July 16, 1963:

That the liberals of both parties are fearful of what might happen should the GOP nominate Senator GOLDWATER can now be seen from what has all the appearance of a planned campaign to make it appear that the Arizona Senator and his followers are trying to convert the GOP into what they call a "white man's" party. This is a smear of the worst type for Senator GOLDWATER's record in public office and his private life is as clean as a whistle on the racial issue.

From the Cincinnati Enquirer, July 18, 1963:

Some political figures—among them Senator BARRY GOLDWATER—were kind enough to describe Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's "policy statement" as an announcement of his candidacy for the Presidency. But inasmuch as Governor Rockefeller's overwhelming desire to sit in the White House is a secret to no one, we saw between the lines—and in the lines of the statement a certain counsel of desperation.

From Newsweek magazine, July 29, 1963:

But Rockefeller made little hay with the GOP professionals, who are dedicated conservatives almost to a man. Most of them thought Rockefeller's statement was an act of desperation that backfired.

From Gould Lincoln in the Washington Star of July 19, 1963:

The Democrats are chuckling with appreciation at the Rockefeller attack on the champion of Republican conservatives.

From the San Francisco Examiner, July 18, 1963:

As concerns the Republican Party it was a disruptive statement. As concerns Senator GOLDWATER it was grossly unfair.

From the Knoxville Journal, July 17, 1963:

Rockefeller proposes at one stroke to eliminate the whole South and part of the Midwest and West as part of the national electorate.

From the Los Angeles Herald Examiner, July 17, 1963:

But if the Republican Party wants to win the White House next election, then it must face the facts of life. The candidate most likely to succeed should be somebody who does not parrot the J. F. K. oratory. Let's have a real choice.

From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 17, 1963:

Senator GOLDWATER's choice for his country is for self-reliance instead of abject dependence upon Government, and for Government doing only those things which Government must do, and which no one else can do.

From the Sun-Sentinel, Hollywood, Fla., July 16, 1963:

Governor Rockefeller has launched what appears to be the eastern bankers' attempt to retain control of the GOP nominations through another convention.

From the Pittsburgh Press, July 21, 1963:

In other words, Rocky believes in party unity only when he's the frontrunner. Otherwise, he would be willing to split the party—and perhaps guarantee a Democratic victory—unless he has his way.

From the Indianapolis Star, in a recent edition:

A calm reply to an invitation to debate has shown that Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican from Arizona, is more interested in the welfare of his party than personal advancement.

From Newsweek magazine, July 29, 1963:

Essentially, GOLDWATER believes in attaining reasonably conservative ends through supporting the Republican Party and all its candidates. His moving speech at the Republican convention seconding the nomination of Richard Nixon urged his followers, who were crying out for his nomination, instead to get into the Republican ranks and work and support the ticket. In the campaign which followed, GOLDWATER made innumerable speeches supporting the Republican Party and all its candidates.

From the Redlands Daily Facts, Redlands, Calif., July 16, 1963:

Rockefeller, who couldn't even remember Nixon's middle initial at Chicago, probably can't remember what GOLDWATER said for the good of the party in 1960. But that is the way it goes in the jungle of politics. Tear

down, knock off the leader if you can, and hope that from the wreckage will appear a new face that can accomplish the job of winning the White House.

From the Derrick, Oil City-Franklin-Clarion, Pa., July 18, 1963:

Moreover, such a wailing cry, whether it be used against Mr. GOLDWATER or any other potential candidate, implies a defeatist attitude and squarely ignores the fact that public opinion polls show the popularity of the present White House incumbent sharply on the decline.

Again I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. It has been a pleasure to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, pursuant to my previous statement, I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS TO STATES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, much has been said during the past 12 months about the great generosity of a benevolent Uncle Sam as he handed out thousands of dollars in Federal grants to various communities on the Eastern Shore.

But what was not explained with these announcements was that during the past 12 months our Government has taken away $5 for every $1 that has been given to either Maryland or Delaware.

On October 13, 1962, under the Accelerated Public Works Projects and Community Facilities Act, Congress appropriated $400 million; and as of June 1, 1963, $389,293,000 of this amount had been pledged in the form of grants.

Of this total amount, Delaware, on 7 projects, had received a total of $368,000; and Maryland received a total of $1,493,000, for 15 projects.

Based upon Treasury Department reports, fifty-two one hundredths of 1 percent of all the revenue collected by the Federal Treasury comes from the taxpayers of the State of Delaware. That means that Delaware's share in the cost of the $389,293,000 of total grants made under this program last year cost the taxpayers of our State $2,024,000. We received in return only $368,000, or a ratio of $1 for every $5.

Based upon the same Treasury statistics, Maryland pays 1.94 percent of all the income collected. This means that the taxpayers of Maryland paid $7,552,000 in the Federal Treasury as its share of the overall cost while it received back as grants only $1,493,000—again, a ratio of one for five.

Yes, Maryland and Delaware taxpayers paid into the Federal Treasury an extra $5 for every $1 Delaware and Maryland communities received as grants last year under the program.

Where did this other $4 go? Part of it went to pay the cost of the Washington bureaucracy that was set up to to run the new agency and the rest to States which have greater political pull.

For instance, New Jersey, which is certainly not a poor State, collected in grants under this same program a total of $18,495,000. New Jersey pays 4.29 percent of all our taxes, which represents a payment of $16,700,000. This means New Jersey had a net gain of $1.8 million, or about what Delaware taxpayers lost under this program.

Where did Maryland's extra $4 go? Maryland's tax bill to support its portion of this program last year was $7,552,000, and she collected only $1,493,000 in grants, thus representing a loss of $6 million.

Pennsylvania, another of our so-called poor neighbors to the north, received grants, under the same program, totaling $35,417,000 against a tax payment of only $26,939,000. Pennsylvania pays 6.9 percent of all Federal taxes.

This gave Pennsylvania a net gain of around $8.5 million. Why should Delaware and Maryland taxpayers be forced to subsidize work in Pennsylvania and New Jersey?

In making this report I want to make it clear that I am not criticizing the communities which have received grants under this program. Their elected officials would have been negligent in discharging their responsibilities had they not taken advantage of a law which has been passed by Congress and for which our taxpayers will have to pay regardless of to what extent we may benefit. If they can show equal need, they are entitled to equal treatment.

What I am criticizing very strenuously is the erroneous impression that the Washington bureaucracy tries to create when it claims that these many giveaway programs are economically sound.

In my opinion this boondoggle program is nothing more than a political pork barrel, and it should be abolished.

In particular, our State cannot afford the luxury of these free grants which cost us five times as much as we get.

The moral to this story is that you cannot get something for nothing from Washington. Whenever the taxpayers of Delaware or Maryland hear the pleasant announcement from their Congressmen or Senators that the Federal Government is giving a certain community in their State a sizable grant, they should remember that for every dollar that community is receiving it will cost the taxpayers of that State $5 in extra taxes.

I ask unanimous consent to insert a chart showing a breakdown for all of the States.

This chart shows the number of projects that were approved for each State prior to June 1, 1963, the total amount of dollar grants, along with the percentage of the overall cost that will be paid by the taxpayer of each State.

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

[Dollars in thousands]

State	Number of projects [1]	Estimated APW cost [1]	Proportionate overall cost [1] paid by each State	Percent of Federal taxes paid by each State [2]
Alabama	107	$9,862	$3,776	0.97
Alaska	36	4,777	428	.11
Arizona	37	5,778	2,413	.62
Arkansas	167	7,732	1,751	.45
California	133	13,611	43,445	11.16
Colorado	32	2,905	3,776	.97
Connecticut	36	4,289	8,642	2.22
Delaware	7	368	2,024	.52
Florida	54	6,385	9,810	2.52
Georgia	118	7,863	5,177	1.33
Hawaii	6	545	1,323	.34
Idaho	59	3,897	1,012	.26
Illinois	124	12,313	26,978	6.93
Indiana	64	6,652	8,914	2.29
Iowa	2	528	4,476	1.15
Kansas	9	655	3,737	.96
Kentucky	149	19,380	4,009	1.03
Louisiana	107	14,657	4,788	1.23
Maine	30	2,529	1,712	.44
Maryland	15	1,493	7,552	1.94
Massachusetts	47	8,999	13,742	3.53
Michigan	332	30,782	17,401	4.47
Minnesota	106	6,732	6,384	1.64
Mississippi	83	7,263	1,790	.46
Missouri	121	5,607	8,875	2.28
Montana	54	3,946	1,167	.30
Nebraska	20	1,321	2,530	.65
Nevada	5	452	817	.21
New Hampshire	$9	$1,129	$1,284	.33
New Jersey	58	18,498	16,700	4.29
New Mexico	150	8,671	1,440	.37
New York	96	13,379	52,710	13.54
North Carolina	119	8,726	5,644	1.45
North Dakota	7	502	817	.21
Ohio	72	11,302	22,345	5.74
Oklahoma	98	8,772	3,659	.94
Oregon	66	7,185	3,698	.95
Pennsylvania	216	35,417	26,939	6.92
Rhode Island	21	6,154	2,024	.52
South Carolina	86	5,822	2,530	.65
South Dakota	7	1,064	856	.22
Tennessee	82	10,347	4,632	1.19
Texas	90	10,490	16,583	4.26
Utah	60	4,077	1,440	.37
Vermont	5	410	661	.17
Virginia	34	2,326	6,617	1.70
Washington	114	8,481	6,150	1.58
West Virginia	143	20,112	2,647	.68
Wisconsin	103	3,980	8,058	2.07
Wyoming	16	784	700	.18
Guam	1	105	(3)	
Puerto Rico	123	9,909	(3)	
Virgin Islands	3	330	(3)	
Total		389,293		

[1] Source: P. 7 of Department of Commerce report of June 1, 1963 (Area Redevelopment Administration).

[2] Based on the proportionate part of Federal taxes collected from each of the respective States. Source: Tax Foundation based on Treasury Department data, p. 112.

[3] Not available.

THE GESELL REPORT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to my previous statement, I yield at this time, for 3 minutes, to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Florida. I shall not be long.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to answer the recent remarks of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who in the last few minutes has had to leave the floor, but who, nonetheless, knew that I would reply to his remarks.

Mr. President, it is almost taken for granted that a Member of the Senate from the State of Mississippi would protest against an action of the Federal Government such as the Defense Department directive, which I feel is intended to enforce the Constitution insofar as the civil rights of U.S. citizens are concerned; and many speeches of that nature have been made. I suppose those who have made them expect us to make, in reply, speeches in which we set forth our views in regard to civil rights.

However, Mr. President, when an important Member of the Senate who serves on the Armed Services Committee addresses himself to a question of the promotion of military officers and to the question of what the Senate can do in that connection, certainly it is time for Senators to speak out.

Are we to understand that an effort will be made to impose sanctions against military officers who obey directives issued by the Department of Defense? Is that what we are to understand from the speech of the Senator from Mississippi? If so, such a doctrine would be shocking.

Mr. President, I have served in the Armed Forces, as have many other Members of the Senate. All who have served in the Military Establishment have seen places of business declared "off limits" because improper conduct has been allowed in them or because members of the Military Establishment have been victimized or "rolled," as the expression goes, in such places of business. But, Mr. President, how much more serious is it when one who wears the uniform of his country is barred—solely because his color is black—from admission to a place of business. The persistence in such action is in many cases the fault of Congress which has not yet adopted laws to implement constitutional guarantees; not the fault of the Negro involved, who is told that he will not be admitted to a place where his white buddy is admitted.

Mr. President, I understand that today the Senate was asked whether any Member of the Senate would rise to defend the action taken by the Department of Defense. I rise to defend it, Mr. President, and I am proud to do so; and I am proud that the Secretary of Defense has sufficient insight to issue such an order and to direct that it be complied with.

Mr. President, certainly it is the duty of the Armed Forces to observe the provisions of the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the United States and to defend the dignity of the members of the Armed Forces; and, in that connection, the commander of a base has a duty to maintain a high standard of morale. However, could there be anything more shattering to the maintenance of a high standard of morale than to have a soldier ordered—merely because of his color—to stand in the rear of a bus, and to be threatened with a beating if he does not do so—even though he is wearing the uniform of his country—or to be denied admission—solely because of his color—to a restaurant, a drugstore, or any other civilian establishment located near a base.

However, Mr. President, in the absence of State law or State cooperation, Congress cannot direct such establishments in all communities to admit them until Congress passes a law to deal with that situation to the extent it can act. That is the situation and the difficulty we face.

However, the Secretary of Defense under appropriate conditions can direct the officers of the Military Establishment to declare "off limits" private establishments which take action of that sort. This order merely states to the soldiers of the United States that action of that sort is not compatible with the dignity of our Military Establishment or with the dignity of those who serve in it.

So, Mr. President, I sustain and honor the directive issued by the Department of Defense, and I think it is high time that it was issued.

Furthermore, I do not conceive that the promotion of any officer will depend on that. I simply do not believe that, Mr. President, and I do not believe any officer will believe it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before I get to my discussion of the pending business, I wish to express my disappointment that the Senator from New York was not present to hear in full the statement of the Senator from Mississippi. If he had been, he would not have gone so far afield as he has.

The Senator from Mississippi quoted from the recommendations of the Gesell Committee. I agree with the Senator from Mississippi completely in the words that he used. The Committee had recommended to the President and to the Defense Department the subjects which have been mentioned casually by the Senator from New York. A part of that recommendation was that the attitude of the commanding officers of the several bases that operated under the very drastic course of action recommended would become a part of their official records, and thereby would have important influence upon their promotion or their lack of promotion. I am sorry that the distinguished Senator from New York, which is not in accord with his general custom, has not done his homework on this particular subject, probably due to the fact that the Senator came in near the end of the very fine address of the Senator from Mississippi.

If the Senator from New York will take the time, which I think he will, to read the address of the Senator from Mississippi, he will probably desire to make some comments by way of apology tomorrow to the Senator from Mississippi.

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

Hr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope it will be a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. If it is not a question I will decline to yield. I tell the Senator that I have been waiting since noon to start my discussion of the pending business.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator has made pretty sharp accusations against me, and the Senator understands the courtesy of Senators in yielding.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida has told the truth about what the Senator from New York said. The Senator from New York came in for the last few minutes of the very able comments of the distinguished and highly moderate Senator from Mississippi.

The Senator from Florida happened to hear those comments. He happened to read the report of the Gesell Committee, and he knows what was said. He knows how far afield his friend from New York went in making the impassioned statement which he has just made.

The Senator from New York is like a good many people now. They are like locomotives running toward a precipice. They do not realize that the precipice is there ahead of them, but they are about to go over the brink. In this particular instance that committee threw completely overboard any question of maintaining the security of this country and placed in the document recommendations which no thinking person—and the Senator from New York is a highly intelligent person—could possibly accept and approve. For that reason the Senator from Florida said what he has said. I yield again to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from New York was present in the Chamber. The Senator from New York heard the statement, to which I refer, made by the Senator from Mississippi, who is a high-minded man of the highest character. I have said nothing in my statement—whether it was or was not impassioned—which would derogate from that. That is my judgment. I say it in the most deliberate way. I may differ with the Senator as to the merits of what he said, but I certainly do not charge him with any less sincerity than I hope he will charge me with. I think he is a very sincere, honorable, and high-minded man.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed in the RECORD the excerpt from the prepared text of the Senator from Mississippi to which I refer.

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

In any event, the executive department does not have the final say as to what shall be considered "fitness and efficiency" entitling an officer to promotion. The final power rests with the Senate and only those are promoted who are confirmed by the Senate. Those who might be ranked high by the President's Commission when it comes to "measuring progress" might not be ranked

quite so high by those who finally act on proposed promotion. I emphasize this point to show that this directive clearly proposes to throw the military directly into political activities of the most sensitive nature and to introduce a strictly nonmilitary factor into the promotion system. The consequences can only lower military efficiency and morale and inure numerous able and conscientious military officers.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, he did say that it is not only the military officers and the President who have to do with Army promotions, but the Senate specifically must pass on the confirmation of those nominations, too. I believe that statement coming from a Senator who stands so very high in the Committee on Armed Services has an implication which even the Senator from Mississippi would not wish to place on it. One does not understand one's own implications unless they are laid out on the table and stated, so that perhaps on the morrow both the Senator from Mississippi and I may both have something else to say on the subject. But I did not wish the Senator to think I had spoken on a point of the speech that I did not hear. It was only that fact which brought me to my feet. I would not have risen on the general proposition about which the Senator from Mississippi spoke because, as I have said before, and as the Senator from Florida knows, we all make speeches on that particular subject based upon our general views. It was that one point that I wished to call to his attention and to the attention of my colleagues and to mark as a special thing, because I think that the statement has special implication.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. I invite his attention to the lead editorial appearing in today's issue of the New York Times, which I asked to have printed in the RECORD during the debate of the able Senator from Mississippi. The editorial entitled, "Breakthrough or Breakdown," is applicable to the position taken a few minutes ago by the distinguished Senator from New York. The first paragraph of the editorial, which was emphasized later by recalling and listing actual cases, made it very clear that the able editorialist thought that the impassioned advocates of integration, of whom the distinguished Senator from New York is one of the ablest, were going far afield and hurting their cause. As the editorialist suggested, they were breaking down their case by the extreme positions which they were taking. The Senator from Florida happens to know that the distinguished Senator from New York was not present during all the speech of the Senator from Mississippi. I do not believe that the Senator from New York was here as the Senator from Mississippi read from the report of the Gesell Committee. It is from that report and upon the terms of that report that the Senator from Mississippi was commenting as he did that the expectation of promotion of high-ranking officers having command of the various posts throughout the United States was very definitely involved in the recommendations of the Committee.

That was the point which the Senator from Mississippi made over and over again. The Senator from Florida recalls that the Senator from New York stated that he expected, and others expected, the Senator from Mississippi always to make addresses of a certain kind on this subject which, at the very least, I would say he meant would be interpreted as extreme. I believe the Senator from Mississippi is a moderate man. If the Senator from New York was excoriating the Senator from Mississippi, he was excoriating many others of whom the speaker is one. I could never give my consent to the military department taking over the power of destroying communities—businesses, churches, clubs, and various other activities in a community—near Army, Naval, or Air Force bases, for the simple reason that segregation was the rule in such communities instead of integration. I think such action would be destructive of the security of our Nation.

When I think of the great leaders who have defended our Nation who came from a part of the country that could never support that kind of philosophy, and think of the place they occupied in the winning of World War II and every other war in which we have engaged, it seems to me that it is clear that people get so enthused over the objective that they are working toward that they forget the tragic destruction which they are inviting to be placed upon the security program of our Nation.

To state a few from my own State whose names will be well known to the distinguished Senator, I mention General Geiger, who led in the recapture of Guam, General Landrum, who led in the recapture of Attu, and General Van Fleet, who led in the surrounding and the capture of the Ruhr. I could name a dozen others from my State alone. I have not mentioned the Pattons, the Courtney Hodges, the Patches, and all the others, from the South.

Can our Nation afford to take a position in this matter of giving such vast power to military commanders which runs counter to the philosophy and the deep convictions of a great part of our country? Are we going to eliminate from military service and say that we do not desire the services of the boys and the girls, the men and the officers, from that great part of the Nation which does not view this problem through the same eyes that the distinguished Senator from New York views it?

Mr. President, I do not think we can afford to take that position.

I support enthusiastically and wholeheartedly the comments of the Senator from Mississippi. This program, if carried further, in the field of military control of our communities will be destructive of our military security and of our military morale. I would not be satisfied in my own conscience if I did not voice that belief. If the Senator from New York has had military experience, so have I. The Senator from New York knows it. There are a great many other Senators here who have had military experience and who, I believe, will support the position which I have stated. What I am now asking is that the Senator from New York examine carefully the prepared remarks of the Senator from Mississippi. He was not speaking spontaneously. He had carefully prepared and documented his remarks. I hope the Senator will read and examine those remarks tomorrow in the printed RECORD.

I predict that he will then come to the floor and offer an apology to my distinguished friend from Mississippi.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield again.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall read with the greatest care every word the Senator from Mississippi has said. Second, I was addressing myself to a particular statement about a particular thing. Third, and most important of all, I was not excoriating anybody. I do not intend to do so. For that I would apologize, because I had no such design.

Mr. HOLLAND. I anticipated that the Senator would apologize, and I appreciate the Senator's apology, but I hope he will make the apology to the Senator from Mississippi and not to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JAVITS. We are talking about excoriation, and that is not what I had in mind. I was excoriating no one, and I apologize to no one. I say to the Senator—because he raises an interesting point about those who serve in our Armed Forces from the South—that I hope very much that there will never be a change in the patriotism of those men. I have never heard of an instance in which anyone from the South refused to serve or was inhibited from service or was encumbered in his service by what the United States might do to eliminate racial segregation or discrimination. I hope that day will never come. I do not think it will.

I say, affirmatively, with respect to any person in the South who has the patriotism to serve his country in the Armed Forces, and many heroes have come from there—I say, with pardonable pride, that we from New York have had our share of heroes, as have other States in which the people do not feel the same about these matters as do such persons. I shall always believe, as I believe now, that no southern person who is able to serve this country in the Armed Forces would withhold that service or diminish that service one whit because of what the United States might do in pursuance of this very deep and trying issue in which we are engaged. I deeply feel that way.

I understand the Senator's feeling on the subject. I often wish that we could be given as much credit for sincerity in this particular controversy at issue as Senators from our Southern States feel we should give to them. I find that we are always assumed to be speaking politically, always assumed to be extreme, and always assumed to be going over a precipice; but that is not considered to be true of our southern friends, notwithstanding the fact of tremendous disorder, tremendous protests, to say the least, and tremendous measures of repression which we see now not in the North—where we have our share of troubles, too—but in the South.

I believe that history and the facts are on our side.

Be that as it may, I say only that I wish to affirm my deep feeling for the patriotism and the sincerity of any southerner, no matter what may happen in this controversy, and my deep feeling that the sincerity and patriotism for our Nation, in and out of the armed services, will continue, regardless.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement by the distinguished Senator. Insofar as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he thinks he understands the situation. The editorial to which he has referred came from the New York Times. It referred to what was happening on the part of integration leaders in the city of New York.

It is that reference which the Senator from Florida has placed in the RECORD; and he hopes that his distinguished friend not only will read that but also will ask himself the question—as to whether the extreme character of the activity complained of by the editorialist, which he says is making for a breakdown of a movement in which that paper deeply believes—whether that comment might or might not apply to him and others who have taken some rather extreme positions on the floor of the Senate.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1703) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, anticipating the fact that other Senators will wish to be present for the debate which will follow, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion briefly?

The Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], who is across the hall, and I have been trying to obtain the floor all day. We wish to speak for only 15 or 20 minutes. Our names are on the quite informal, illegal list at the desk. I wonder if the Senator could give us the benefit of a few minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly do not wish to be discourteous to my friend. I have been waiting since 12 o'clock for the Senate to consider a bill on which I am acting merely on the mandate of the committee to which I belong, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, under instructions to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that a number of Senators who are much more interested in the subject than I can be present. It is now 3 hours and 25 minutes later, and I think my friend will agree that is rather a large showing of courtesy to associates.

I would prefer to have the quorum call and then to move ahead. When I complete my remarks, which will not take more than 15 or 20 minutes, I shall be glad, of course, to have the Senator take the floor on his own time. If the Senator has a comment of 3 minutes or so, I have yielded to other Senators for such comments.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator's name is on the list before mine. I withdraw my request.

Mr. HOLLAND. My name was not put on the list at my request. It was put on the list because I was expected to speak on the bill, I suppose. I assume that is what the Senator refers to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be discontinued.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for the purpose of my making a point of order?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin so that he may make a point of order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I make a point of order that the bill which is now under consideration is not properly before the Senate because, at the time the vote to report the bill was taken in committee, a quorum was not actually present. I have checked this with the clerk of the committee, and it is my understanding that only six Senators answered to their names.

It is true that there had been a quorum of the committee earlier in the day and that that quorum had been present during the discussion of the bill. The fact is that there was not a quorum physically present at the time the vote was taken, and for that reason I feel that the bill is not properly before the Senate.

I wish to make one further point in discussing my point of order against the bill; I do not make this point of order merely to delay the bill. I do it because I feel very strongly that S. 527, the so-called Williams bill, should receive consideration before this bracero bill is acted on. S. 527 would give domestic agricultural workers—American citizens—the same protections that we provide in the pending bill for the braceros—Mexicans.

In the second place, I make this point of order because the committee acted on the bill without giving it any significant consideration. Although several of us on the committee pleaded for hearings, no hearings were held. Hearings were desired. The situation regarding the braceros program has changed dramatically in the past 2 years since this matter was last before the committee. The bill should be returned to the committee to permit the Senate to have the benefit of hearings.

Mr. President, the committee has failed to secure the opinion of the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Labor.

Why should the Senate be afraid of determining where the administration stands on this bill before we act? I will tell you why; because the administration is against this bill in its present form.

Mr. President, I ask for a ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must inquire of the chairman of the committee as to what the facts are. The Chair is not conversant with the facts, and must depend on the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Chair sustains the point of order of the Senator from Wisconsin, I should say 50 percent of the bills that come from committee would be in the same category as the one that is now before the Senate.

Ever since I became chairman of the committee, I have made it a rule to have a quorum present and, after a quorum is present, if any member of the committee desires to leave because of some other meeting, a proxy is left, and I am usually told how to vote that proxy.

In this case at the time of the actual voting to report the bill, I believe six members of the committee were present. The others had left proxies that were cast by me pursuant to instructions by Senators who were present at the meeting.

As I have said, committees have been proceeding in that manner for many years—in fact, ever since the act was put on the statute books in 1946. I am very hopeful that the Chair will rule with us.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator recall that, before the committee began the discussion of this bill, there were some 11 or 12 members of the committee present, one of them being the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. There were 12 members of the committee present when discussion of the bill began. All members of the committee voted in person or by proxy, and the vote was 12 to 5 in favor of reporting the bill. Every member of the committee had the chance to express his views and to vote on the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator recall that, after substantial discussion, the Senator from Florida, and perhaps other Senators who had critical appointments—I, for instance, had an appointment for the markup of the space bill, which had been going on for about an hour at the time I had left—left the committee, and with full knowledge of the issue before the committee, left with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana his proxy to be cast, as I am sure he cast it, for reporting the bill? Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do. That is the same thing that obtained with respect to a number of other Senators. It would seem to me that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin had ample opportunity to make a point of no quorum when the bill was actually voted out. He was present at the time. I cannot understand this situation.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to inquire specifically if a point of no quorum was made by any of the members of the committee who were present and who opposed the passage of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. They voted, without raising any question as to the presence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the chairman of the committee inform the Chair specifically whether a quorum was present at the time the vote was taken on S. 1703?

Mr. ELLENDER. At the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the time.

Mr. ELLENDER. By proxies, yes; but not actually.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The committee record shows that a quorum was present. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. No point of no quorum was made at the time the bill was reported.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. The record shows that a quorum was present, and no point of order was made at that particular time, and members drifted in and out. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That is exactly the way it happened, and it happens in all committees.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. A majority of the committee voted to report the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I was present at the meeting when the bill was called up. A majority of the committee was present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin press his point of order?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; I press my point of order. I wish further to point out that it has now been disclosed and stipulated and agreed upon by the chairman of the committee that a quorum was not present at the time the vote on the bill was taken. It is true that a quorum was present earlier. It is true that a substantive majority was present earlier, but at the time the vote was taken no physical quorum was present in the committee room to vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. The records of the committee show that a quorum was present at the meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By proxy?

Mr. ELLENDER. A quorum was present at the time the meeting began, when the question of a quorum arose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Was a quorum present at the time the vote was taken on S. 1703?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In view of the point of order that has been made, and the rule which necessitates that a ruling be made, the Chair rules that under section 133(d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which operates as a rule of the Senate, and provides that: "No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any such committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present," the Chair sustains the point of order.

If the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported the bill (S. 1703) in question without a majority of the members being actually present, the action of the committee in ordering the bill to be reported to the Senate was in controvention of the above section of the Legislative Reorganization Act, and therefore such action was without authority and void.

Being "actually present" means the member would have had to be present in committee, and a poll does not present a compliance with the rule.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is the status of the bill following the ruling of the distinguished Presiding Officer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The status of the bill is that legally it has never left the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. The status of the bill is that it is still in the custody of the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in the custody of the committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I do not question the ruling of the Chair in this respect. The Chair is entirely correct in his ruling. It has been my understanding that this is the rule of the Senate. It is my understanding that the Chair has ruled in accordance with a rule of the Senate. I have no quarrel with that ruling. However, I have certain facts that I believe should be made clear to the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin knows, as does every other Member of the Senate, that in using this extra-legal maneuver to defeat the bill, he is employing an artifice which could keep 90 percent of the bills in the Senate off the calendar the day they are reported to the Senate.

This morning the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported three bills. All three of them are here illegally according to the artifice employed.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I will not yield at this time. I have been waiting since noon. It is now 3:40 o'clock, p.m.

I believe the facts in the case should be known to the Senate and to the public. The work of Senators on committees is so voluminous that it is impossible to remain in a meeting of a committee all the time. If the work of the committee is to be accomplished, it must be accomplished in the way the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has accomplished the work here, and as the distinguished Senator from Florida has stated it.

As an example, this morning I had one committee meeting at 9:30. Two other of my committee meetings were being held in adjoining rooms at 10 o'clock. I talked with another Senator, who said he had five committee meetings to attend this morning. It is obvious that no Member of the Senate can attend every one of his committee meetings.

However, the Chair has stated the rule. I would like to suggest the modus operandi nevertheless, because the modus operandi of the committees of the Senate has been, for the 9 years that I have been a Member of the Senate, exactly in conformity with the manner in which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana stated it today. If this is to be the rule from now on, we can use the rule. However, there will have to be a drastic change in the way the Senate is operated, or about 90 percent of the bills will have to be sent back to committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, I gladly accede to the ruling of the Chair, which I understand is based on the advice of the Parliamentarian. I wish the RECORD to show quite clearly what is accomplished by this delay. Hearings on the bill were held in the House of Representatives. Printed hearings show a record of nearly 400 pages. They show that even in the last year, though the number of the Mexican laborers on the farms of the West has been declining, substantially 200,000 were relied upon and were necessary to move the highly perishable crops in that great part of the country. I wish the RECORD to show the names of the minority members of the committee who signed the minority report. I understand there were 4 of them—4 out of the entire membership of 17. I wish to do this so that farmers throughout the country may know who is holding up the consideration by the Senate of this measure which is of such great importance to them.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the four signers of the minority views appear in the RECORD at this time, as a part of my remarks.

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

WILLIAM PROXMIRE.
EUGENE MCCARTHY.
MAURINE NEUBERGER.
GEORGE MCGOVERN.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in reply to the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], let me say that there was nothing extralegal about this procedure. My action is not an artifice as the Senator from Colorado said. Every Senator is free to use the rules of the Senate. The fact is that 90 percent of the bills are passed by the Senate on the so-called Consent Calendar. Any Senator is free to object to the passage of any bill when the calendar is called, and no Senator feels that it is wrong or unfair for any Senator to object. What I have done in making a point of no quorum is the same kind of thing.

This very point of order was raised against one last year in connection with the appointment of the collector of customs in Superior, Wis. The Committee on Finance reported the nomination of John G. Green, for collector of customs. My distinguished friend the then senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Wiley, made the point of order on the floor of the Senate that the nomination was improperly before the Senate, inasmuch as a quorum was not present at the time the nomination was reported by the committee.

I did not complain; I did not say it was unfair. He had every right to do

so. He was against that nomination; I am against this bill. I will do anything I possibly can to kill the bill. The bill is morally wrong; it is economically wrong; it is unsound.

I hope that the extra time that will be afforded will give Senators an opportunity to study the hearings which were held yesterday, and to give deep consideration to the measure.

The bill was killed in the House. It was killed, as the distinguished Representative from Rhode Island, Mr. FOGARTY, put it, because it was a slave-labor bill. It would be very bad legislation. It would be bad for the Mexicans, who are brought here as peons, and separated from their families for months. It would be bad for American domestic farm laborers, who are the most depressed people in the country, having no representation, really, in Congress, because they drift from State to State and therefore have no political force. They are people who earned last year an average of $900 a worker. Their wages are being artificially cut down because the Government of the United States maintains a program of importing Mexican workers to compete with them to perform this labor at a very low wage—70 cents or 60 cents an hour.

I make no apology for the part I played in delaying the bill. I earnestly hope that it will result in the death of the bill.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Would the Senator from Wisconsin like to clarify one point? He commented about hearings held yesterday. I believe no hearings were held in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct. The only hearings that were held to get information on this bill were hearings on another bill, S. 527, which was before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] courteously notified some of us who are members of the Agriculture Committee, so that we could appear and ask questions of the Secretary of Labor about the bill now before the Senate. The Secretary of Labor was vehemently opposed to the bill in the way in which it is drafted. He proposed the adoption of a far-reaching amendment before he would endorse a year's extension. The language of Under Secretary of Labor Henning was particularly strong. Let me read to the Senate what he said, in two or three short sentences:

> Essentially, Senator, it is because of this that we submit Public Law 78 is a broad law—

That is the one proposed to be extended—

> it is a wretched law that should be buried. Being an American citizen places one at a serious disadvantage under the option of this law, because the simple fact is that under the present system an employer can refuse to offer domestic workers the same terms and conditions that he is required to offer alien workers. If the domestic worker refuses to accept the job at less favorable terms, the employer is permitted to bring in Mexican workers who are then afforded the very terms and conditions which were denied to our own workers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has the Chair ruled on the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The Chair has sustained the point of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then I see no need of continuing the discussion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I had almost concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish I had been informed about the situation ahead of time, because I assure Senators that the proposed legislation would not have been placed before the Senate. I knew nothing about the situation until I was called in my office and informed that a point of order had been made and that it had been upheld. The reason why I asked the Chair for a ruling now was to confirm what I had been told.

I hope that if things like this ever happen again, the leadership will at least be given the courtesy of being notified. If we had been notified, I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that the measure would not have been laid before the Senate; nor would the Senate have been notified last week that on Wednesday of this week the bill would be the pending business.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, 25 minutes ago, I had no notion of making the point of order; but another Senator, gifted in parliamentary procedure, suggested that this might be a way to dispose of the bill. So I checked with the clerk of the committee and then with the Parliamentarian, and found that it was a possibility. As a courtesy, it was suggested that we should wait until the chairman of the committee was on the floor of the Senate.

I think Senators are aware that points of order are sometimes made when the consideration of proposed legislation is underway.

The majority leader has every reason to request Senators, when it is proposed to make points of order, to notify the leadership, provided the action is contemplated a day or more in advance. But many, many times in fact, I would say it is the rule, not the exception, a point of order is made impromptu, without previous plan and no one is notified. Certainly it has not been a common practice in the Senate to notify the leadership when a point of order is made, as the point was made in this case.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand. But in this instance, the action was a little uncommon. I have been placed in a very difficult position. The leadership has been accused of trying to railroad the bill through the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Not by me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have responded to the questions asked by Senators in good faith—I always assume—and answered in good faith—I always know—as to when the proposed legislation would be taken up. I assure the Senate that had I been informed that the bill had not been considered by a quorum of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that a point of order would be raised against the bill, it would not have been laid before the Senate; the leadership could have made other plans.

I say this not in criticism of the Senator from Wisconsin, because I understand his position perfectly; he knew about it only a short while ago; I make this statement in explanation of the position of the leadership on this proposal.

Now that the Chair has rendered its decision—and it is a correct one—I hope that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will, at the most appropriate time, call the committee together, if he so desires, make certain this time that a quorum is present, and either report the bill to the Senate or retain it in committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to correct one impression the distinguished majority leader may or may not have. There had been more than a quorum present when the earlier discussion of the bill took place. Some members of the committee had to leave because of important assignments elsewhere. For instance, the Senator from Florida, speaking only for himself, was assigned to participate in the markup of the important space bill at the same hour that the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was held. The Senator from Florida remained 45 minutes, perhaps an hour—I am approximating—and when it became apparent that we all knew what the bill provided, I announced that I was for the bill and left my proxy to vote for the bill with the distinguished chairman of the committee.

It developed that I held the proxy of another Senator, so I called the Senator whose proxy I held and got his consent for me to leave his proxy with the distinguished chairman of the committee.

The only thing that could be properly said to have been out of order—of course, I bow to the opinion of the Parliamentarian, upon whose advice the Presiding Officer ruled—was that a majority was not present at the precise moment of the vote. So the point of order is well taken.

I have no criticism to make of the Senator from Wisconsin or of any other Senator who might raise the point of order. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished majority leader that, as a matter of courtesy and cooperation with the majority and minority leaders, in such a case advance information should be given. Whenever the Senator from Florida has been in such a situation, he has followed that practice in connection with his own matters.

I have never raised a point of order in such an instance as this, because I know from long practice that in most cases committee reports are finally acted upon after some members of the committee, who had to go to other pressing assignments, when they knew what the issue was and had heard enough of the debate to be certain of what they wished to do, left their proxies either with the distinguished chairman or some other member of the committee.

I would not want the RECORD to indicate that a majority of the committee had not been present during the discussion of the bill, because that was not the case. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin will recognize that statement to be true.

The Senator from Florida, having presided a good many times himself, knows pretty well on what the decision of the Chair is based. I am trying to relieve my friend the distinguished Presiding Officer, from any responsibility of having had to draft this decision out of thin air, which he did not do; he acted upon the advice of the Parliamentarian. The Senator from Florida was trying not to have any erroneous impression embedded in the RECORD. If anything I have said might be considered a discourtesy to the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Florida would be glad to withdraw that remark.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am sure that no discourtesy was meant to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who, during this proceeding, has been the Presiding Officer of the Senate, because he is the soul of honor and dignity.

I am certain that every Senator has acted honorably; but I express the hope that if this idea is ever contemplated again, at least the leadership will be given the advantage of advance notice, so we can protect the Senate and can avoid any such situation.

At this time I wish to make another personal appeal to the chairmen of all the committees; namely, please to get busy on the proposed legislation on which they are holding hearings or on which they intend to hold hearings, and to report some bills to the Senate, so that they will be available for floor consideration, if they wish them to be considered at this session. Time is short.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am very much embarrassed by this situation. Not since 1946, when the Legislative Reorganization Act was placed on the statute books, have I known such a point of order to be made.

As the Senator from Florida indicated a moment ago, I wish to state that at all times in the committee when we discussed this bill, except when we were voting, as many as 12 Senators were present. It was suggested that any Senators not present be polled on the question; and the record shows that all members of the committee voted either one way or the other. Twelve voted in favor; five voted against. The only unfortunate thing is that a quorum was not present at the time when the vote was actually taken.

I have no quarrel with the Chair, although I do have with the Senator who raised the point of order. He should have notified us, or he should have made the point of no quorum at the time when the reporting of the bill was voted by the committee. But he did not do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say that I helped write the rule in 1946, and it is as unequivocal and as clear as crystal. It is the fruit of abuses which used to take place when there were 32 Senate committees and 43 House committees. Subsequently we streamlined that number to 15 Senate committees and 19 House committees. But bills used to be reported from committees when only one or two members were present.

I recall very definitely—for I was a member of the joint committee—that in writing that rule we used the words "actually present"; and a quorum of the members must be present.

So I think this rather embarrassing situation comes as a timely reminder that when the vote on the question of reporting a bill is taken in a committee, the members should be certain that a physical quorum is present. In fact, on occasion I try to make sure that a quorum is present—having in mind that I might make use of that very rule with respect to bills to which I am opposed.

However, the situation which has developed here is not irrevocable. Following such a ruling by the Chair, at a time when no bill is before the Senate the majority leader can move that the Senate adjourn; and when the Senate adjourns, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana can quickly convene a meeting of the committee—even in the cloak room, for that matter, for five or six members of the committee are now present—and then the committee can order the bill to be reported; and then it can be reported, and can again be placed on the calendar.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that the colloquy which has occurred during the past hour indicates the great interest in the bracero bill, and I believe it behooves the chairman of the committee to consider having some testimony submitted by the Department of Labor. On the prior occasion, the committee refused to hold hearings; but now there is much evidence that perhaps hearings should be held before the bill is summarily reported.

INCLUSION OF DISTRICT JUDGE OR JUDGES ON JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF EACH CIRCUIT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 244, Senate bill 979, so that the bill will be laid before the Senate and will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 979) to amend section 332 of title 28, United States Code, in order to provide for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I announce that no further business will be transacted this afternoon. Calendar No. 244, Senate bill 979, has been laid before the Senate because there is no other measure to lay before the Senate. At the moment, the entire calendar of legislative business comprises only one page of the calendar; therefore, we have no choice but to do what we have done.

It may be that some Senators will wish to address the Senate later this afternoon.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it stand in adjournment until Friday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATUS OF THE CALENDAR

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I compliment the majority leader on keeping a streamlined calendar. I have never served in a session in which the calendar was so short, as regards the number of bills on the calendar. This is testimony to the dispatch with which the majority leader continues to dispose of the legislative business which finds its way to the calendar of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The compliments of the Senator from Illinois should be extended also to the minority leader and to the Senate as a whole.

PROGRAM FOR AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to ask a question: In the event that Senate bill 1703 is reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is there a possibility that the bill might be made the business before the Senate during the following week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will not be made a matter of business for the Senate until the leadership is 100 percent certain that a quorum was in attendance when—and if—the bill is ordered reported from the committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. Suppose the distinguished majority leader were assured that a quorum was present—all the bodies counted and blood-tested, and all

accounted for. Would the majority leader think the bill might then become the business of the Senate for the following week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is that possibility for the following week; but I would not want to make a hard and fast commitment now, and I am sure the Senator from Colorado would not want me to, because I could not. But if the bill is reported, ample notice should be given. Personally, I would wish to make sure that a quorum was actually present at the time when the committee voted to have the bill reported.

READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I invite the attention of the majority leader to Calendar No. 319, Senate bill 5, to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Texas need go no further.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I wish to assure the majority leader that a quorum of the committee was present when the committee voted to have the bill reported.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am sure of that; but, as the Senator from Texas knows, the majority leader is under instructions as to certain questions he should ask in certain quarters; and at the moment he is in process of undertaking that quest.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished majority leader for the inquiries he is making, and I sincerely hope they are successful.

I point out that 39 Senators have joined in sponsoring Senate bill 5; and that bill—which is of great importance, in view of the fact that 5 million veterans are not going to school, and in view of the further fact that the number of veterans in that category who are unemployed is more than twice as great as the number of nonveterans in that age category—is in a critical status.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Texas has said.

HUMANE TREATMENT OF ANIMALS USED IN EXPERIMENTATION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I are joint sponsors of Senate bill 533, known as the bill for humane treatment of animals used in experimentation.

Recent editorials published in magazines and other periodicals have focused attention on the fact that the bill is quietly resting in one of the Senate's committees.

I, myself, have been the recipient of a great deal of mail on the subject of humane treatment of laboratory animals. Not all of that mail has been in support of my position; in fact, some of the negative mail I have received has come from persons in the scientific world whom I respect very highly.

But in nearly every case I have noted that they obviously have not read the bill. I am sure that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and sponsors of similar proposed legislation in the House, including myself, do not feel that we wish to deter the advancement of medical science by preventing medical science from experimenting on animals. But because a great deal of progress is being made in that field all the time, our attention has been called to the need for some rules and guidelines for the handling of the animals. A person whom I respect highly and who has taken issue with me in my support of the measure admits that there is a need for some kind of control. I quote part of his letter:

> I think what we must keep clearly in mind is a distinction between the humane care of animals, and the regulatory control of scientific experiments which are spelled out in these bills. Most responsible investigators will welcome inspection procedures which insure adequate housing, the use of trained animal-care personnel and the availability of proper facilities for the humane care of the animals.

That is what the sponsors of the bill hope will be accomplished by our proposal.

One of the prominent doctors of the world is Dr. Albert Schweitzer, a Frenchman who 50 years ago went to what was literally then deepest and darkest Africa. He became a medical technician, a doctor, and a lover of the people of West Equatorial Africa. He has devoted his life to working with those people. Therefore, it was a great delight for me to receive a letter from Dr. Schweitzer when he heard—not from me—of the proposed legislation in the Senate. The letter is written in German, and since I do not read German—and I doubt if many Senators do—I had the letter translated. I should like to read the translation at this time:

> MY DEAR SENATOR: As you feel it right for me to give my support to the law for compassion toward laboratory animals, I do so gladly. The ethic of reverence for life obliges us to be watchful always to treat animals with compassion, and all the more so when it concerns those creatures that serve medical research. If you pass such a law in the United States, it will have important meaning for the world. The law will then gain recognition in other nations, too.
>
> "In the beginning was the deed" is an old saying. I am happy that you and the animal welfare institute are taking the initiative.
>
> Faithfully yours,
>
> ALBERT SCHWEITZER.

I emphasize the fact that Dr. Schweitzer refers to concern for creatures that serve medical research, which is indicative of the fact that neither he nor the supporters of the bill are opposed to the use of animals in medical research.

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

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to emphasize what seems to me to be the great importance of having Albert Schweitzer, one of the great philosophers of the world, as well as one of the leading doctors in the world, with a career in helping to cure people of illness, support the measure which I was happy to sponsor and of which my good friend from Oregon is the principal cosponsor.

I hope that the Senator will have printed in the RECORD the letter from Dr. Schweitzer which she has just read, so that we can obtain reprints and have them widely distributed. If the Senator does not object, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter from Dr. Albert Schweitzer which the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] has read.

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

> LAMBARÉN, GABON,
> *West Equatorial Africa, May 6, 1963.*
>
> Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER.
>
> MY DEAR SENATOR: As you feel it right for me to give my support to the law for compassion toward laboratory animals, I do so gladly. The ethic of reverence for life obliges us to be watchful always to treat animals with compassion, and all the more so when it concerns those creatures that serve medical research. If you pass such a law in the United States, it will have important meaning for the world. The law will then gain recognition in other nations, too.
>
> "In the beginning was the deed" is an old saying. I am happy that you and the animal welfare institute are taking the initiative.
>
> Faithfully yours,
>
> ALBERT SCHWEITZER.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend, the Senator from Oregon, how her mail has been running on the bill?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. My mail has been running 5 to 1 in support of the bill which the Senator and I have cosponsored. Even the negative mail in most cases admits that there is reason for the introduction of some kind of control measure, though the writers of such letters do not go the entire way with the bill. Responsible workers in research laboratories admit that there are abuses which need to be looked into.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to advise Senators that since the first of this year, and through July 12, I received 1,070 letters supporting S. 533, and only 345 letters in opposition; the opposition coming, I regret to state, largely from doctors, medical students, and scientists.

One could tell from reading their letters that the writers had not read the bill. One could tell how terribly misinformed they were as to what the bill contains. I am confident that if those highly intelligent people had not been so misinformed, they would certainly have written very different kinds of letters.

I have received 412 letters in support of, and 362 letters in opposition to a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative RANDALL, H.R. 4856. In my opinion the Randall bill is not as good a bill, from the point of view either of orderly administration or of the proper protection of animals from unnecessary cruelty, as the bill the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and I are supporting. Therefore, some of the

letters against the Randall bill come from proponents of our bill.

I ask my friend, the Senator from Oregon, if she would briefly outline, so readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will get the truth, what our bill would do.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to comply by summarizing what is stated in the introduction to the bill. It is proposed to provide for the humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in the experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States, and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes. One of the most important provisions of our bill is that it would require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue certificates of registration to persons applying for licenses to work on animals, and that they show that they have proper facilities and personnel, such as proper kennels and treatment for the animals; that they have some experience that gives them the equipment to comply with the requirements of the act; and that the animals shall receive adequate food and water, and shall not be caused to suffer unnecessary or avoidable pain.

The point that those who criticize the bill fail to note is that we have a provision that the animals used in any experiment which would result in pain shall be anesthetized so as to prevent the animal feeling the pain during and after the experiment, except to the extent that the use of anesthetics would frustrate the object of the experiment. Throughout the bill there are a number of safeguards to indicate that the sponsors of the proposed legislation are encouraging experimentation that would be of benefit to mankind.

The other point that worries some of our detractors is that they seem to think a great many uninformed, do-gooder sort of laymen will come marching through the laboratories and attempt to criticize and expose the inhumane treatment of animals.

The bill provides that a scientific authority or board shall determine the facts and make reports to the Secretary. An annual report would be required to outline the type of experiment, and to receive approval, but I do not see why there need to be much worry about needless reporting and inspection under the terms of the bill. Many laboratories and research centers with which I am familiar would not have a qualm in the world, because they are caring for the animals and conducting their experiments according to the very best we would expect of them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not a fact that the bill is modeled on legislation which has been in effect in Great Britain ever since 1876?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. That is true.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true that that legislation, so far as one can tell, not only has been accepted by the general public in Great Britain as salutary, but also has received no serious condemnation by the medical profession of Great Britain.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. That is quite correct.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend whether she does not agree with me that we ought to press very strongly for prompt hearings on the bill before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I think that is where the points on which the Senator and I are commenting today should be properly presented.

Again, one of my detractors, who is a close friend, a man I admire a great deal, has indicated that he is aware that there is some need for some legislation, because he says, in his letter:

> You could introduce legislation to improve the facilities for laboratory animal care. These urgent needs have been outlined by Dr. Hiram Essex, emeritus professor of physiology at the Mayo Foundation, who heads the group of distinguished scientists making up the National Society for Medical Research.

This doctor and other doctors who recognize the need for some legislation suggest that these measures be included:

1. Research in animal husbandry.
2. Training of animal care technicians.
3. Building of better animal care facilities.
4. Communication of the latest information about animal care methods, and so forth.

I think this bears out the contention that there is a real need for legislation.

Mr. CLARK. I agree. There is one point I should like to clarify. Some of my mail takes the quite erroneous position that this is a bill sponsored by antivivisectionists. The antivivisectionists oppose the bill, do they not?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. That is correct, because they think it would encourage research on animals by providing good facilities for them.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not clear also that the bill contemplates a continuation of scientific experiments on animals, in the interest of improving the findings of science and improving the medical profession, and that the Senator from Oregon and I and everyone else behind the bill knows that we must continue to conduct experiments on animals in the interest of science?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. That is correct. The Senator and I support appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, which make grants to primate centers and laboratories for research on animals. The Senator and I and our colleagues approve that sort of research.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. All we are trying to do is to see that, in the course of conducting the necessary experiments, unnecessary cruelty will not be imposed on helpless creatures, but that instead, if a painful operation is necessary, the animals will be anesthetized; and, if, after the operation, they are in suffering and pain and cannot recover, that they will be painlessly killed.

In general, we wish to give to the animals of our country who unwittingly and unwillingly, to be sure, are making such a great contribution to scientific development, the kind of decent treatment we would unhesitatingly give to our own cats and our own dogs.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I quote once more from my friend who has written me such a wonderful letter on this subject, because he makes a point which I think is of interest, which we should consider. He says:

> The only scientists who are affected by this legislation are the recipients of Government grants and are the men in the large research institutes and universities who are doing the finest work, with the best equipment and facilities. These are the people who use the most humane techniques. The incompetent or careless worker with poor facilities would not be affected at all.

If that is true, I should like to see the bill go further, so that all would be licensed. All through the letters it is admitted by the opponents that there are places where such abuses are being continued. The scientists who conduct the proper kinds of laboratories really bemoan the others. It seems to me that if we could have appropriate regulation, it would be a guideline to which all could subscribe.

Mr. CLARK. As the Senator well knowns, Mr. Cleveland Amory, a noted author who has written many fine books, has taken up the torch and is a strong supporter of the bill. In the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post Mr. Amory has an article entitled "Science Is Needlessly Cruel to Animals." I wish to read a couple of paragraphs from that article in order to emphasize what the Senator from Oregon has said:

> In an experiment at Creighton University, for example, researchers starved dogs to death. Some took 65 days to die. It was later found that researchers at the same institution had performed exactly the same experiment 3 years earlier.

Presumably there had been extracted from the earlier experiment all the scientific value, if any, which could come from starving dogs to death.

> At Harvard University—

I say this with shame, being a graduate of Harvard myself—

> At Harvard University, scientists forced dogs to inhale flame and then did not kill them until 3 to 5 days afterward. In Dallas a humane-society worker discovered that high-schoolers were performing "survival surgery" on live dogs.

But the incident that stirred up real nationwide indignation occurred 1 cold day last March in Gainesville, Va., not far from Washington. A chance visitor to a farm there discovered scores of dogs in an unheated barn, dead animals lying among the live ones. Many of the latter seemed to be starving. Outside the barn the bodies of hundreds of dogs and cats were found heaped and half-buried in bulldozed trenches.

Investigators learned that the farm had been leased to a firm that supplied animals to laboratories. One of its customers was the National Institutes of Health, the vast research arm of the Federal Government. As the official Santa Claus through which Congress gives almost a billion dollars a year to research institutions—your tax money—the National Institutes pays for enormous numbers of lab animals. The firm, quaintly entitled Zoologicals Worldwide, Inc., had made a shipment of animals to the National Institutes just 10 days before the discovery at Gainesville. When ques-

tioned, officials of Zoologicals Worldwide tried to explain away conditions at the farm and said they were "trying to do the right thing."

This is only a small amount of the voluminous evidence which could be brought before a Senate committee, once we get hearings on the bill and establish the need for the legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. Amory's article, entitled "Science Is Needlessly Cruel to Animals," appear at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Is there objection?

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

SCIENCE IS NEEDLESSLY CRUEL TO ANIMALS

(By Cleveland Amory)

The era of big science is new, but it has already brought one hideous result—cruelty to animals on a staggering scale. In the laboratories of U.S. hospitals, medical schools, and industries an estimated 300 million animals are currently in use in every conceivable, and in many cases inconceivable, way that can be devised by the mind of man.

So shocking has the situation become that calm and reasonable men, including many Members of Congress, are up in arms. There are, in fact, six bills on the subject before Congress. And not one of them is an antivivisectionist measure. On the contrary, the bills' supporters accept experimentation on living creatures as essential to scientific progress. What appalls these persons, and what has begun to appall the whole Nation, is the needless pain, the suffering, that serves no scientific purpose.

In an experiment at Creighton University, for example, researchers starved dogs to death. Some took 65 days to die. It was later found that researchers at the same institution had performed exactly the same experiment 3 years earlier. At Harvard University, scientists forced dogs to inhale flame and then did not kill them until 3 to 5 days afterward. In Dallas a humane-society worker discovered that high-schoolers were performing survival surgery on live dogs.

But the incident that stirred up real nationwide indignation occurred one cold day last March in Gainesville, Va., not far from Washington. A chance visitor to a farm there discovered scores of dogs in an unheated barn, dead animals lying among the live ones. Many of the latter seemed to be starving. Outside the barn the bodies of hundreds of dogs and cats were found heaped and half buried in bulldozed trenches.

Investigators learned that the farm had been leased to a firm that supplied animals to laboratories. One of its customers was the National Institutes of Health, the vast research arm of the Federal Government. As the official Santa Claus through which Congress gives almost a billion dollars a year to research institutions—your tax money—the National Institutes pays for enormous numbers of lab animals. The firm, quaintly entitled Zoologicals Worldwide, Inc., had made a shipment of animals to the National Institutes just 10 days before the discovery at Gainesville. When questioned, officials of Zoologicals Worldwide tried to explain away conditions at the farm and said they were "trying to do the right thing."

The day after the story broke in the Washington papers Representative THOMAS ASHLEY, of Ohio, a man with no previous connection with humane work, introduced a bill calling for regulations to prevent cruelty to animals used in research supported with Federal funds. Almost immediately he received thousands of letters of encouragement from Americans across the country who had read of the Gainesville incident and were horrified.

And suddenly there was renewed interest in the hearings held last fall before a House subcommittee. For documented testimony at these hearings had shown even before the Gainesville outrage that all was not well behind the locked doors of this Nation's laboratories. Helen Jones, for example, the small, slender executive director of the National Catholic Society for Animal Welfare, told the subcommittee that she had visited many of this country's most "respected" laboratories. It would take "days of testimony," she declared, to describe "even in the briefest form" the "atrocities that are routine" in scientific research going on today. "Animals," she said, "are truly beaten, starved, burned, frozen, blinded, drowned, forced to swim and run until they die, accelerated, deprived of sleep, irradiated, skinned and subjected to other methods of inducing pain and fear in infinite variety.

"Often after undergoing burning, major surgery, the crushing of muscles, the breaking of bones and other mutilating injuries," she continued, "they are given little or no postexperimental care to relieve their pain and terror. In most laboratories the animals are simply returned to a wire-bottom cage to suffer unattended. It is not unusual to find animals housed in cramped cages, without even a solid place on which to sit or lie, for as long as 5 or even 10 years."

Another witness was tall, aristocratic looking Christine Stevens, head of the Animal Welfare Institute. Herself the daughter of a distinguished medical scientist, the late Dr. Robert Gesell (brother of the famed Arnold Gesell), Mrs. Stevens had visited hundreds of laboratories all over the country, and she described one such visit for the subcommittee directly from her notes:

"All dogs caged, never released for exercise. Three emaciated dogs curled up and uninterested even though most of the dogs were barking furiously. A gray poodle did not respond in any way, but stood mute and motionless in its cage. * * * Many were too sick to rise; some had had two operations. One heart-surgical case was emaciated, had a tremor and lacked one eye. Red flesh extruded from the socket. Apparently this did not deter its use for heart surgery."

Another witness was author-and-scientist Rachel Carson. And, in a letter to the subcommittee, Dr. Charles Breed, a practicing New York surgeon, took issue with his own profession:

"Some animal research is, of course, most essential. Experimental dog surgery by medical students is absolutely needless. Furthermore, in many of our outstanding teaching medical centers there are so many surgeons who are doing experimental animal surgery more to keep the surgeons busy than to accomplish anything of value. This is a disgrace. Repeating already proved sound surgical procedures is only a form of sadism on the surgeon's part."

Then Madeline Bemelmans, president of the Society for Animal Protective Legislation in New York, and widow of author Ludwig Bemelmans, placed on record a brief portion of testimony by the eminent naturalist, Sally Carrighar. Miss Carrighar quoted a young doctor. "It is the prevalent attitude in medical schools now," he told her, "that dogs don't feel pain—that dogs do not suffer."

Perhaps the most gruesome testimony was delivered by Alice Wagner, editor of the magazine Popular Dogs. Mrs. Wagner put into the record an article by a student of "one of Chicago's well-known and wealthy medical schools." He described a great Dane that had been kept in a small cage for 8 months. ("He was a blood donor for a heart-lung machine that required blood to prime it.") The dog was in "terribly poor condition," and was badly tormented by the caretaker boys who believed it high amusement to poke at the animal to make him lunge at the door. The student also wrote of dogs which grew extremely long toenails because the dogs were never exercised. One dog had been for 2 days actually fastened to the wire-mesh floor of his cage by his long, curved nails. "About 60 percent of them," the student's report said, "had their nails grown completely around and into the foot. * * * A puppy there had finally chewed its foot off to free it from the wire. He died 2 days later, his leg swollen like a balloon."

The student told of encountering an untrained technician who had been instructed to inject compounds into the thigh veins of a fully conscious dog at timed intervals. She had only an idea where the veins lay, and she often hit a nerve, causing great pain. The dog visibly resisted crying out, until it could no longer stand the pain.

The most damning indictment of the laboratories was delivered by Fred Myers, whose Humane Society of the United States is the largest organization of its kind in the world. Credited with having almost single handedly rejuvenated the humane movement, Myers has steered it away from the emotionalism and fuzzy futilities of the old antivivisectionist societies. "My society," he told the Congressmen, "is opposed to cruelty of every kind under every circumstance, but we recognize that animals are going to be used in medical research for as long as anyone can foresee. We bring you no vivisection issue. We submit to you only a question of morality."

Myers argued that besides curbing cruelty, the proposed legislation would actually improve medical research and save large sums of money now being poured into unnecessary experimentation. He introduced into the record the names of more than 200 nationally prominent citizens, including 24 university presidents and 46 professors of medicine and surgery, all of whom had signed a statement that the use of animals in research and teaching should be brought under control of law.

There was opposition testimony, too, of course, most of it from spokesmen of the organizations the proposed legislation would control. This opposition was rebutted by Senators and Congressmen who have sponsored control bills. Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, for example, put the matter on a business basis. "Just as responsible investment bankers in time found that the SEC is in their best interest," he said, "so responsible scientists would find this legislation will benefit them by controlling the acts of the few irresponsible and thoughtless individuals among them." Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER recalled her conversation with a member of the faculty of the Oregon Medical School who had told her that no good research can be carried on on an animal that is not well treated.

"Well, then," said Senator NEUBERGER, "you surely would not mind legislation which just guarantees that treatment."

There is no way of knowing which, if any, of the six bills now pending will pass. Roughly, each provides for—

1. Unannounced inspection of laboratories that use animals;

2. Licensing of all scientists desiring to use live, vertebrate animals, the licenses revocable for cruelty;

3. Painless killing of animals that still are suffering after an experiment;

4. Humane care and housing, and

5. The requirement that student work, as distinguished from research conducted by qualified scientists, be painless.

Veteran observers on Capitol Hill are somewhat incredulously predicting that at long last Congress will defy the powerful medical lobby and vote legislation. If the Congressmen do, it will be in large part because over the past 10 years such groups as the Humane Society have helped erase the stereotype of themselves as slightly funny clubs of little old ladies who have 16 cats each and hate people.

ANIMALS' FALSE FRIEND

They also have dramatically presented the fact that there is at present literally no protection for the animals. Even the so-called American SPCA (actually it is New York only) is not only completely ineffective in the field but under its current president, William Rockefeller, is given to pious pronouncements that humane societies ought to sell animals to laboratories. Other SPCA's, independent of the American, are better, notably the Massachusetts SPCA.

One thing is certain. If Congress does nothing, the animals will not be the only ones to suffer. So will medical research. For the American public is rapidly reaching the point where, without specific assurances that its money is not going for inhumanity in the laboratories, it can no longer be counted on to continue to write out check after check for cause after cause.

And the public is also rapidly reaching the point when it will not ask, but demand, that its Government and its scientists obey the highest law of all. The Right Reverend Monsignor LeRoy McWilliams, at the hearings, put it best. "St. Thomas, the great doctor and theologian," he said, "warns about the proper use of animals, lest they appear at the final judgment against us." Here Monsignor McWilliams paused. "And God himself," he said quietly, "will take vengeance on all who misuse His creatures."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me once more? This is the last time.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder if my friend from Oregon has seen the column "First of the Month" which appeared in the Saturday Review of Literature for August 3, 1963, also written by Mr. Amory.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Yes; I have followed the Saturday Review discussion on the bill with great interest.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator will recall that on the first of June Mr. Amory wrote a very strong article in the Saturday Review, taking the same position he took in the Saturday Evening Post article. He points out in the August 3 article that as a result of the June 1 article, he received 10,000 letters, 9,000 of them in support of his position and the position the Senator from Oregon and I take. What surprises him is that, with respect to the critical portion of the letters—one-tenth of the total number—very few letterwriters seemed to understand that Mr. Amory was not opposed to medical experimentation with animals, but what he was opposed to was unnecessary cruelty to animals in experimentation.

In a sardonic vein, he refers to his "doctors mail." He says among the most stupid letters are those from doctors. I quote from the article:

Among those who pulled out all the old anti-antivivisectionist arguments was none other than Dr. Morris Fishbein himself who, although happily no longer the mouthpiece of the AMA labeled both us and the bills in Washington "antivivisectionist."

I am sure my friend from Oregon is far too young to remember Dr. Fishbein, but I can remember when I was a middle-aged man the complete disrepute he came to for taking the American Medical Association down the garden path of opposition to the medical care program. In due course, he was let out as the head of the American Medical Association, because of the position he took. I am afraid this kind of mail on antivivisection is being publicized for the people of the country with respect to the issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the August 3 article from the Saturday Review be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From Saturday Review, Aug. 3, 1963]

FIRST OF THE MONTH

(By Cleveland Amory)

Our column of June 1, broke, we believe, the Olympian record of Saturday Review's writer-righters. We received more than 10,000 letters, 9,000 favorable. What surprised us most about the critical portion of the mail was that very few of the letterwriters seemed to understand that we are not opposed to medical experimentation on animals; we are opposed to unnecessary cruelty in such experimentation. Quoting nothing but our "doctors mail," however, Dr. Donald Hayes of Wake Forest College, N. C., suggested "that all individuals who are opposed to animal experimentation should sign a pact in which they would agree not to avail themselves of antibiotics, antihistamines, and anticancer drugs." (The personal approach of these researchers to research would itself make a fascinating article.) Another who signed himself just "Dr." couldn't wait, he said, "until you, Mr. Amory, are being wheeled into an operating room. I wonder then if you would care about the animals." Still another dedicated unsignee wanted to know how much differently we would feel "if your mother had cancer." (As a matter of ironic fact, she has.)

Among those who pulled out all the old anti-antivivisectionist arguments was none other than Dr. Morris Fishbein himself, who although happily no longer the mouthpiece of the AMA, labeled both us and the bills in Washington "antivivisectionist"—despite the fact, as even he knows, (1) of the seven bills being considered, not a single one is an antivivisectionist bill, and (2) not a single one of them is being supported by a single antivivisectionist organization. (For further discussion on this point, see our article in the current Saturday Evening Post.)

We enjoyed, too, our medical student mail. "People like yourself," wrote Joy Schildkraut, of the NYU Medical School, "not engaged in scientific research, cannot comprehend the purpose of experiments on animals." Joseph Becker, a student at MIT, went further. "The very fact that we do kill animals," he wrote, "proves that we have the right."

Several doctors, among them Dr. Sheldon Adler of Cambridge and Dr. Richard Nystrom of Delaware, both pointed as evidence of the necessity for unrestricted experimentation to, of all things, the recent thalidomide case—yet hardly were their letters received when Dr. Widukand Lenz, of Hamburg, Germany, who first noted the link between thalidomide and infant deformities, told the International Conference on Congenital Malformation meeting in New York, that "no method of testing with animals allows us to say with assurance that a drug would be wholely safe in pregnancy." And Dr. Clarke Frazer of McGill went further. "You cannot assume," he said, "that because a drug appears safe in animals that it will be safe in man."

Dr. Thomas Brock of Indiana University told us flatly that "most experimental animals are bred specifically for experimentation" and, "since such animals would never have otherwise existed, it is hard to imagine that their deaths, however induced, should be of any particular importance." Yet in the same mail came a letter from a doctor at MIT who admitted that he was revolted by the fact that the animals are "frequently stolen home pets. They are supplied by dealers dealing directly with the thieves and purchased from them by the research laboratories. No questions are asked and no records kept."

The letters came, too, from Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. From Harvard, Dean Berry declared that the proposed legislation would "seriously impede the progress of science" because it was "rarely possible to carry on a significant series of experiments without the ability to modify, change, and redirect the work as it progresses." (Obviously, Dean Berry has not read even one of the bills, because not a single one would rob any scientist of any such power.) Yale's Dr. Kline declared that "virtually every State of the Union already has laws to punish irresponsible cruelty to animals and children." (The fact is—again research would have helped—virtually every State exempts laboratories from anticruelty laws. In some States the exemptions are created by the implied meaning of statutes, and by previous judicial rulings. In other States, the exemptions for "scientists" are explicit and absolute. For example, the Wisconsin statute: "As used in this section 'torture' does not include bona fide experiments carried on for scientific research." Princeton's Dr. Harvey Rothberg's research on the subject was equally extraordinary. He wrote to us of the "positive efforts" of the National Society for Medical Research and its so-called animal care panel. Yet again, even the barest attempt to get his facts would have told him that the latter is actually a public relations front in front of another public relations front—the NSMR itself is neither a medical society nor a research society but merely the paid whitewasher of the animal-using laboratories.

But the real dilly came from a lady doctor, Dr. June Greenspan, of Riverton, N.J., who first declared that we should "offer ourselves as a laboratory experiment," then added:

"I note with interest most of your published replies are from women agreeing with Mr. Amory. But naturalment. Women are fine protecting babies and house pets and some husbands. This is their job. It is to be expected that they would be the first (obviously along with some so-called intellectuals) to raise a cry against such goings-on with poor little pussy cats and doggies and those cute little ole' white mice. Let's keep these women out of the labs and let the scientists work. Ask some women scientists for their opinion."

As a matter of fact we will—we can hardly wait to get any other opinion than that one. In conclusion, however, we should like to quote from a doctor who asked that his name be withheld but declared: "I hold a Ph. D. degree and I am working at one of the most highly regarded academic institutions of the United States * * * The facts are not consistent with the oft-repeated claim that all is well in biological research. * * * I have indeed witnessed cases of callous indifference,

as well as unnecessarily cruel experiments, on numerous occasions. I wish to mention only examples which I myself have encountered repeatedly:

"(1) Operations on unanesthetized animals because anesthesia was inconvenient to the investigator.

"(2) Undergraduate students dissecting unanesthetized but drug-immobilized animals for 'practice' in their spare time.

"(3) Animals in cages too small to turn around in (some of these animals were pregnant).

"(4) Animals dead from thirst and starvation when their care over the weekend had not come to work and had not notified a substitute.

"(5) Graduate students who professed their pleasure in performing painful experiments. There is no reason to assume that these students, after receiving their doctorates, will not set up research programs of their own."

The doctor also pointed out that all this commotion is to get the same kind of bill that a country named Great Britain passed in 1876.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate the Senator from Oregon for cosponsoring this legislation. I pledge my support to attempting to have hearings and getting the bills to the floor. If we do so, perhaps we can meet the desire of the majority leader to act promptly and get bills to the floor for early consideration.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Oregonian of November 5, 1962, on this subject, be included in my remarks.

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

[From the Oregonian, Nov. 5, 1962]

ANIMALS IN PAIN

That laboratory animals must often be subjected to some measure of pain, even a painful death, to enable medical researchers to discover ways to prevent human suffering and death, is understood. Yet it is not conceivable that unnecessary suffering and discomfort by these animals could in any way further the cause of medical science.

Two bills now pending in Congress call for the licensing and inspection of individuals and institutions who conduct laboratory experiments on living animals and who receive Federal grants for research.

The bills, H.R. 1937 and S. 3088, are sponsored by Senators MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, and JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS, Democrat, of Michigan. First introduced 2 years ago, the bills have been since bottled up in Senate and House committees.

Testimony and evidence offered at September congressional hearings on the bills indicated gross and unnecessary abuse of laboratory animals in several instances.

Identical in structure, the bills in no way hinder legitimate, responsible research involving living animals. They would insure humane housing and treatment of laboratory animals, including adequate and comfortable resting and exercising areas, proper feeding, sanitation, and ventilation.

More important, "animals used in any experiment which would result in pain shall be anesthetized so as to prevent the animals feeling the pain during and after the experiment except to the extent that the use of anesthetics would frustrate the object of the experiment, and in any event, animals which are suffering severe and prolonged pain shall be painlessly killed."

Both bills are patterned after legislation adopted in England nearly 90 years ago. Passage would mark only the second time that humane laws have been enacted on the Federal level. The first governs the slaughter of meat animals in processing plants holding Federal Government contracts. Oregon adopted a similar State law in the 1961 legislative session.

An objective and unemotional study of H.R. 1937 and S. 3088 reveals that the bills do not attempt to prohibit experimental research. Enactment would of course increase the administrative costs of such research, since records would have to be kept and reports submitted periodically to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But we do not need to count our research pennies as closely as that. These are good bills, and should be adopted.

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS SUPPORTS NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am heartened by the news that the Federation of American Scientists has announced its endorsement of the nuclear test-ban treaty recently initialed in Moscow. This endorsement was announced at a press conference held in Washington this morning.

The Federation of American Scientists is a national nonpartisan professional organization of more than 2,500 scientists concerned with the impact of science on national and international affairs. The federation was established in 1946.

As I have indicated in earlier statements in the Senate, it is most important that we take full advantage of the scientific information that will be developed in regard to the technical considerations involved in ratifying this treaty. The Federation of American Scientists expressed the following opinions concerning certain matters of a technical nature:

First, there is almost no chance that a nation could perform a series of militarily important nuclear test explosions without being detected.

Second, that testing in the far reaches of outer space, while technically feasible, was likely to yield little information that could not be obtained through permitted underground explosions on earth, or through use of the "escape clause" contained in the treaty to test in the atmosphere. All attempts to test illegally in outer space would be extremely expensive and involve considerable risk of detection. In regard to atmospheric testing, techniques have been developed during the past years which permit detection of tests at all altitude ranges.

Third, the federation points out further atmospheric nuclear testing is not essential to the development of the antimissile missile. In fact, nuclear weapons technology is only one of the many fields that must be mastered if an effective missile defense is to be achieved. The federation pointed out that last weekend General Wheeler, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, stated in a television interview that the U.S. could not develop an antimissile system without further atmospheric nuclear explosions.

I note the opinions of the Federation of American Scientists on these matters because they represent a scientific judgment considerably at variance from others that have been expressed in regard to this treaty. These are respected, able, and professionally qualified scientists and their scientific judgments must be given great consideration and weight.

I do not wish to discuss these matters at length this afternoon. I suspect that we will have ample time for such discussion and debate in the weeks ahead. However, I do commend the Federation of American Scientists for their forthright statement in regard to the nuclear test ban. Since I know every Member of the Senate will want to read the federation's statement, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF THE FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS ON THE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY

The three-power nuclear test ban agreement recently initialed in Moscow is strongly endorsed by the Federation of American Scientists. Our members who have participated in the development of nuclear weapons welcome this first step in the control of the nuclear arms race. The federation believes that this treaty is in the overall interest and that the risks involved are small compared with those in a world without such an agreement. We hope that this agreement may contribute to the reduction of international tensions and lead to more substantial arms control and disarmament agreements. Those of us who know from our work the capabilities of nuclear weapons and the risks of annihilation to which mankind is exposed believe that our Nation should make every reasonable effort to achieve a system of effective international disarmament under proper safeguards. We are greatly encouraged by the test ban agreement and believe it deserves prompt and overwhelming support from the American people as a demonstration to the world that our Nation plans to lead in the path away from nuclear destruction.

President Kennedy's speech last Friday night summarized eloquently the great risks of a continued arms spiral and the spread of nuclear weapons. We feel that the public may wish to have more information about possible risks of the nuclear test ban agreement, and we therefore discuss briefly here some relevant technical questions.

There is almost no chance that a nation could perform a series of military important nuclear test explosions without being detected. Techniques which have been developed during the past few years allow the detection and identification of nuclear explosions at all altitude ranges out to very great distances in space. For example, new electronic techniques for measuring perturbations in the ionosphere provide a very sensitive means of detecting explosions at upper altitudes. Methods of sampling for radioactivity, including both capture of actual debris on filters and observations of delayed gamma rays, provide a very sensitive method of identifying low-yield nuclear explosions.

It is conceivable that nuclear test explosions could be conducted so far out in space as to escape detection. However, present ground-base equipment can detect megaton tests taking place 1 million kilometers from the earth, and larger tests can be detected at correspondingly larger distances. If the U.S. decides to deploy satellite detection systems, then megaton tests could be detected at distances greater than the distance to the sun, out to several hundred million kilometers. Similarly, a megaton test behind the moon could be detected by delayed gamma radiation.

There are other reasons why tests at these distances must be considered unlikely. They would be difficult to conduct, would be very expensive, and might require months to elapse between the launch and the explosion. There is a high probability that the launchings would be noted and special efforts made to identify or to follow the space vehicles. The lack of experience of both the United States and the U.S.S.R. in conducting such experiments, would be another hindrance to such a program.

It has been suggested that the Soviet Union might attempt to shield multimegaton explosions in space by interposing shields containing lead dust between the explosion and the earth. Shields could reduce the detection range by perhaps a factor of 10. Such a shielded test in deep space could cost on the order of a hundred million dollars and, like all untried systems, would involve considerable risk of failure and detection. In view of the costs and uncertainties involved, it seems unlikely that the Soviet Union would consider it worthwhile to carry out such tests. Smaller tests could be far more easily conducted underground on earth.

Because of the great expense and difficulty of methods of concealing useful nuclear test explosions in the prohibited environments, any signatory nation that decided that it needed to conduct further tests would probably use the escape clause rather than embark on secret tests in violation of the treaty. Yet there is good reason to expect that none of the major nuclear nations will wish to end the agreement, for the continued ban on tests offers more advantages to the nuclear powers than a period of renewed testing.

If the Soviet Union should resume nuclear testing in the prohibited environments, our Nation would be prepared to conduct then such tests as required to maintain our position of nuclear deterrence. No decisive change in relative defense postures could be achieved by a sudden resumption of tests. Thus, since no major nuclear power can gain greatly by testing, we can hope that the test agreement will endure. Our Nation's weapon development laboratories can be maintained by a program of underground test explosions until satisfactory arrangements are found to ban these tests also.

It is sometimes asserted that further testing is necessary for the United States to develop a defense against missiles. In fact, nuclear weapons technology is only one of many fields that must be mastered if a missile defense is to be achieved, and it appears that these other areas represent far more significant barriers to the achievement of such a system than does the area of weapon technology. Thus, the problem of discriminating between an incoming missile warhead and various decoys that might be accompanying it is exceedingly difficult, as is the related problem of handling a large number of incoming vehicles at the same time. If these critical technical problems are solved, warheads for the antimissile missile can be developed underground. It is only measurements of radar blackout, warhead vulnerability, and actual live system tests that might require atmospheric testing. Measurements of blackout were made in recent tests in the Pacific. While atmospheric tests could assist in these developments, General Wheeler, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, stated in a television interview last weekend that the United States could now develop an antimissile system without further atmospheric nuclear explosions.

Similarly, the development of missile systems to penetrate any Soviet missile defense can proceed without atmospheric nuclear testing. Here is involved the development of smaller warheads and penetration aids such as new guidance, communication, decoy, and jamming techniques, and all these can proceed under the test ban agreement.

It has been suggested that the United States must develop a very high yield nuclear weapon to keep pace with the Soviet Union. On the contrary, there does not appear to be any justifiable military reason for the United States to have such a weapon. Our arsenal of nuclear weapons is already much more than adequate for any probable military targets. Smaller weapons, when used in sufficient quantity, provide a more reliable, more effective, and perhaps cheaper method of attacking targets than do a few high yield weapons. This is in fact the direction in which the United States has been moving in its weapon development and for which its present delivery systems are designed. If the United States had a military requirement for such large yield weapons, it would have tested them during the past years when there have been many nuclear explosions.

There are firm indications that other nations will soon sign the test ban agreement. All mankind is exposed to the dangers of radioactive contamination, and there will be great pressure from public opinion in all countries to urge governments to sign the agreement.

The Federation of American Scientists believes that it would be a national catastrophe if the pending test ban agreement were not ratified by the U.S. Senate. Ratification is clearly in our national interest. Moreover, peoples throughout the world would be deeply disapponted if our Nation should reject this chance to halt the dangers of radioactive contamination of the atmosphere, and to improve the chance for further agreements. Rejection by the Senate would have a disastrous effect on U.S. prestige. On the other hand, prompt ratification by a very substantial margin will demonstrate to all the world that the United States stands ready to join in further steps to control nuclear armaments and to reduce the worldwide dangers of the arms race.

The Federation of American Scientists is a national, nonpartisan organization of more than 2,500 scientists concerned with the impact of science on national and international affairs. Formed in 1946 as a combination of various groups of scientists who had worked on the development of nuclear weapons, the FAS membership has gradually broadened to include persons from all fields of science and engineering. Many federation members have been active in nuclear weapon development and in studies of the problems of nuclear defense and control of armaments.

Present officers of the federation are: Chairman, Robert R. Wilson, Cornell University; vice chairman, Louis B. Sohn, Harvard University; secretary, Marvin I. Kalkstein, Air Force Cambridge Research Center; treasurer, Jack Orloff, National Institutes of Health. Other members of the executive committee are: Freeman Dyson, Institute for Advanced Study; Allen Janis, University of Pittsburgh; Martin and Leslie Gellert, National Institutes of Health; and John S. Toll, University of Maryland.

PRESIDENT DE GAULLE AND THE COMMON MARKET

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned and disturbed by the statement of President de Gaulle in Paris on Monday expressing his attitude regarding the Common Market and its agricultural policy. I am sure that every Member of Congress is well aware of the important press conference which President de Gaulle of the French Republic held on Monday, July 29.

There was much in that press conference which should be reassuring to Americans, because the great President of the French Republic again expressed his friendship for the United States, and of course referred to the great historic friendship between the peoples of France and the United States. President de Gaulle also reiterated his strong support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the commitments of France to that Organization.

I have not been one of President de Gaulle's caustic critics. To the contrary, I have a high regard and respect and admiration for this unusually able and distinguished man. However, I disagree with President de Gaulle on some of his attitudes relating to Common Market policies, particularly its relationship to the United States, to Great Britain, and to the European free trade area. I also find myself at variance with President de Gaulle with respect to the singular role of Europe in the struggle with the Communist forces. I believe that a strong Europe is required, and I believe that a strong Europe must be in the closest cooperation with the United States and other free nations. Therefore, it appears to me that President Kennedy's concept of an Atlantic partnership is much more desirable and much more practical and much more meaningful in terms of the kind of world we want than the mere building of a so-called third force in Western Europe.

However, if the strengthening of Western Europe means closer cooperation with the United States, Canada, Great Britain, and other free countries, then indeed the strengthening of Europe makes a distinct contribution to the strengthening of freedom.

Returning to President de Gaulle's comments on the policies of the European Economic Community, I should like to quote what he had to say at his press conference with respect to the Common Market. He said:

> It is not worth talking of the European Economic Community if it must be understood that Europe does not obtain its food essentially thanks to its own agricultural products, which can be largely sufficient.

This statement, Mr. President, accompanied by the continued failure to adjust the sharply increased duties on poultry and flour imports from the United States, is an indication that the EEC will be approaching its goal of a common agricultural policy within the framework of narrow, nationalistic interests.

The only hope we have of changing that trend is in firm resistance on the part of the United States and for reconsideration of the policy on the part of our friends and allies in the European Economic Community. Certainly, the future of all international trade rests on the basic decisions which the Community is making with respect to agricul-

ture. If this is the direction, then we are witness to a deliberate effort to achieve self-sufficiency in a closed system, not the open competitive system we had visualized.

I digress for a moment to note that between now and 1966 each of the countries in the Common Market—that is, the so-called Inner Six—has the right to exercise a veto on agricultural policy, but that after January 1966, agricultural policy, including duties and levies and gate prices, and tariffs, and so forth, will be established by a majority of the Common Market members.

Therefore, it is important that we use the time between 1963 and 1966 and try to avoid having established a farm policy with relation to agriculture which is inward looking in the Common Market area and which tends to exclude a normal amount of commerce with the outside areas, particularly the United States.

However, no matter what the future may offer, I feel that we in the United States will be faced with tough competition in the Common Market area, and we will be hard put to maintain our share, in terms of historic figures or amounts, of the food consumption of the Common Market countries.

Last year we exported about $1.2 billion worth of food products into the Common Market countries—the Inner Six. From 1958 to 1962 we have had a rather steady increase in American agricultural exports to the Common Market countries. However, with the policies which are now being adopted, and with the expressions of view that are so evident in the discussion among ministers of agriculture in the Common Market countries, it appears that we will not share as well in the coming years in terms of agricultural exports as we did in the past years.

This is only a way of saying that we will lose some of our trade in Common Market countries. If the expression of General de Gaulle of last Monday becomes official policy, Western Europe will tend to become self-sufficient in agriculture. Americans need to contemplate such a situation, because with our problem of balance of payments, our commitment of troops in Western Europe, and our loss of exports amounting to millions of dollars—which could be the case—we could be in a difficult political and economic situation. What could happen in terms of the American economy might be catastrophic.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Minnesota suggests that the United States may be in for some trouble, so far as exports to the Common Market are concerned. What bothers me, and has bothered me all this year, is that the administration has not utilized a provision which the Senate wrote into the trade expansion bill last year, namely, that if Common Market nations imposed discriminatory, variable import duties upon our products, the President would have authority to take retaliatory action.

The Senator from Minnesota may recall that the Secretary of Agriculture made it very clear in his Paris speech earlier this year that that is what we would do. Still, I have seen nothing except speeches on this subject. I suggest that if we take action in line with the policy that Congress established last year, perhaps the dark future for the export of our agricultural commodities to Common Market countries will not occur.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Iowa. He has underscored a point that I intend to make in my speech, one that I made in my discussions about 2 weeks ago in Brussels with the Commissioner of Agriculture for the European Economic Community, Dr. Mansholt; in my discussions with Dr. Walter Hallstein, who is president of the European Economic Community; and in my discussions with our representatives in Brussels who are responsible for our negotiations with Common Market countries.

I believe that Congress needs to study the case once again and should call upon the executive branch of the Government to take the necessary action. I shall outline what I mean.

Let us examine the implications of General de Gaulle's statement.

First, it would mean he assumes there will be uneconomically high level international target prices sustained by high minimum import prices and variable levies.

Second, many of our farm exports will be subject to an economic wall so high that the result will be a sharp decrease in our shipments and dollar earnings.

Third, behind that wall the twin forces of high prices and modern technology will expand production so fast there will be a decrease in the need for imports.

Dr. Mansholt has called for a "code of good behavior in agricultural policy." He is seeking thereby a means for benefiting both producing and consuming countries.

I believe he is sincere in this effort, and I commend him for it. I found Dr. Mansholt to be one who spoke out vigorously for the Community's concept of an Atlantic partnership, as contrasted with General de Gaulle's position in favor of a Europe that is somewhat removed from or independent of the rest of the Atlantic community. Dr. Mansholt is seeking a means for benefiting both the producing and the consuming countries. I think it is fair to state that we, too, are seeking a code of good behavior when it comes to trade policies, and particularly within the area of trade with our Western European friends and allies.

However, as a part of that code of good behavior, we feel that uneconomic production by the European Economic Community should not be substituted for imports from friendly supplying nations.

We believe that a code of good behavior should provide more reasonable consumer prices for animal products and poultry than now prevail within the Community.

We believe that a code of good behavior should not result in a divergent policy of a strongly protectionist attitude in the agricultural sector and a liberal trade concept in the industrial sphere.

We believe that a code of good behavior, such as that suggested by Dr. Mansholt, should not lead to a misallocation of resources within the European Economic Community.

We believe that a code of good behavior should not adversely affect the balance-of-payments position of friendly supplying nations.

We believe that a code of good behavior should not sacrifice sound production and trade practices in order to precipitate or induce unrealistic and unsound domestic farm programs.

Mr. President, in passing the Trade Expansion Act, we have served notice to the world that in the next round of tariff negotiations, we will require that agricultural trade be an integral part of the process. This is of no small direct consequence to the farmers of this Nation. We must hold these export markets.

As a matter of fact, it is in the European interest that the costs of its basic foods should not be unnecessarily high, and that this in turn requires reasonable freedom for efficient producers to sell in international trade and, of course, to Europe.

In view of General de Gaulle's statement and the failure to restore equity to poultry producers, I urge the executive branch to act. I say this reluctantly but forcefully. It is only by action, such as the withdrawal of some trade concessions, that we can make our concern felt. We must stand behind our farmers in this struggle.

I call to the attention of the officials of our government in the executive branch, as well as to the attention of those in the legislative branch, the fact that our agricultural economy already has plenty of troubles; and unless we can maintain export markets for the abundance of our farms, there will be an economic catastrophe for American agriculture. This is not an academic subject; it is a subject of economic survival.

I fully realize that our friends and allies in Western Europe wish to improve their agricultural system and expand their production. They can do that because a higher standard of living is coming in Western Europe, and there is a greater consumption of food, including high-quality foods. As that situation improves and as individuals there improve their economic situation, there will be a larger consumption of the quality foods such as meat products, dairy products and processed food products. Therefore, there can be ample business for all. We can maintain our agricultural export levels, and at the same time our Western European friends and allies can increase their agricultural production and can improve their agricultural efficiency.

But, Mr. President, if the policy of the Common Market is going to be one of self-sufficiency, to be paid for by uneconomic measures—by holding on the land people who should be engaged in industrial life, by having unnecessarily high prices, and by forcing European consumers to pay high prices—if that is the policy—then I think we would do Europe a service by giving notice now that we

intend to take action and to withdraw certain trade concessions, because Europe needs a strong America and an America that is not constantly under the threat of a dwindling gold reserve. We have a terrific problem with our balance of payments, and that problem exists primarily because of the fact that we have helped finance the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Europe and of vast areas elsewhere in the world, and also because of the fact that today we have hundreds of thousands of our troops stationed in Europe in order to protect Western European freedom, as well as our own freedom.

Mr. President, there arrives a time in the affairs of men and nations when they need to take the big, broad look. Yes, temporarily European nations can get along by squeezing out American exports. But, Mr. President, let them not forget for a moment that the Members of Congress have authority, under the Constitution, to take whatever action is necessary in order to revise tariff laws and trade agreements; and we can, if we need to, in order to protect the solvency of this country, reduce the number of our Armed Forces stationed overseas, and can rely upon the Europeans to man their own ramparts and their own defenses. I do not recommend that this be done; I believe in cooperation and in understanding, and I believe we have a mutuality of interests.

But I believe it needs to be forcibly driven home that the United States will not stand by like a friendly, good neighbor and absorb punishment just because of the declared policy and attitude of one or more countries or their officials which would result in protectionist, nationalistic developments contrary to the enhancement and the advancement of the concept of the Atlantic community and of partnership and of a strong NATO.

So, Mr. President, today I again raise my voice on this issue, because I believe that time after time we need to remind ourselves, as well as our friends, of the seriousness of this situation.

THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this time I wish to comment on an address delivered in the Senate the other day by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. His address concerned the rural electrification cooperatives and the interest rate on loans made to them. His address was well reported in the local press and, I imagine, in the national press. I hold in my hand a copy of the Thursday, July 25, issue of the Washington Post; and in the business section appears the following headline:

SENATOR LAUSCHE ATTACKS REA'S LENDING AT 2 PERCENT

The first sentence of the article reads as follows:

Two percent money came under sharp attack by Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, yesterday. His target was the system under which rural electric cooperatives borrow money.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 25, 1963]

SENATOR LAUSCHE ATTACKS REA'S LENDING AT 2 PERCENT

(By Julius Duscha)

Two percent money came under sharp attack by Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, yesterday. His target was the system under which rural electric cooperatives borrow money.

Why, LAUSCHE asked in a Senate speech, should rural co-ops be able to get money from the Federal Treasury at 2 percent interest rates when the Government itself must pay 4 percent for the money it borrows?

The question he raised has been asked with increasing frequency in recent years by many Members of Congress.

LAUSCHE also questioned the emphasis the Rural Electrification Administration has been placing on loans to finance the construction of their own generation and transmission facilities.

Until the Kennedy administration took office 2 years ago, most REA loans were made to finance the building of lines and other facilities to bring electricity purchased by the co-ops to individual farmers and other users of electricity in rural areas.

MARKET RATES

LAUSCHE introduced a bill which would require the REA to obtain funds for loans to co-ops in the open market at current interest rates. Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Democrat, of Utah, is a cosponsor of the bill.

Since the REA was established in 1935, it has used Federal funds as the source of its loans. More than $4 billion has been loaned to co-ops.

The REA system, which was one of the pioneer New Deal programs, stimulated the expansion of electric service to rural areas. When the agency was set up in 1935 less than 11 percent of the Nation's farms had electricity; today nearly 98 percent have it. More than half of the farms are served by REA-financed co-op systems.

The 2-percent interest rate on REA loans was written into law in 1944 in exchange for an agreement that REA co-ops would serve all customers in their areas regardless of the cost or the possible return on the investment.

The low interest rate has been vigorously defended by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, an astute and powerful lobby, and by former Arkansas Congressman Clyde Ellis.

PRIVATE COMPETITION

But the interest rate has come under increasing attack on Capitol Hill as the rural co-ops have started to compete with private power companies. Rural areas are turning into suburbs and industry is moving into the countryside. An REA co-op can serve any consumer in the area it is authorized to operate.

Private power companies argue that they cannot compete with rural co-ops when the co-ops have the advantage of 2-percent loans.

The Senate and House Appropriations Committees have warned the REA about the increasing amount of money being devoted to generation and transmission loans. The committees have also cautioned the agency to make absolutely certain that REA's do not build their own generating plants unless they are unable to get power from private sources at fair prices.

Because of the long history of animosity between the REA and the private power companies, most REA co-ops want their own sources of power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me make clear that I have the highest regard for the views of all my colleagues, and particularly for those of the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. On this issue we have an honest disagreement of opinion. I wish to state my position, and to do so in a very respectful way, without casting any personal reflection upon the able Senator from Ohio or any other Senator.

At this time I wish to speak of our rural electrification program. I believe this program has been exceptionally good for our country, and I know it has been good for the State of Minnesota.

When the rural electrification program was started in 1935, fewer than 14,000 farms in my State had electricity. That was less than 7 percent of the farms in Minnesota, and at the time it did not look as if any of the other farms were going to get electricity soon.

The country was just beginning to come out of the great depression. Rural electrification was one of the great ideas that eventually helped to bring the country back to prosperity and to spread through the rural areas some of the benefits of our growing industrial economy.

In the process, nearly all of the farms and rural areas in Minnesota were electrified. By 1959, nearly 163,000 farms in my State had electricity. Only 1.4 percent of the farms did not have electricity.

What is more, the rural areas of Minnesota are using more and more electricity. They are making full use of the benefits brought by rural electrification. In just 8 years, for example, the number of kilowatt-hours of electricity consumed on the farms of my State has more than doubled.

Down through the years, the Congress has supported the rural electrification program, ever since it was brought into being by Democrats such as Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, and Republicans such as Senator George Norris, of Nebraska. President Kennedy, when he was a Member of Congress, supported the rural electrification program. He campaigned in 1960 for the 2-percent interest rate on REA loans; and I am pleased that our President continues to maintain that position and to fulfill his commitment, as I knew he would.

Mr. President, as a direct result of the rural electrification program, 5 million farms and homes have electricity. The output of the American farmer has doubled. REA borrowers have invested $4 for every $1 loaned by the Government. Rural electric consumers have spent $16 billion for appliances, plumbing, wiring, and equipment. Rural electrification is a great accomplishment, a tremendous, profitable program.

Each year, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association surveys the buying plans of rural electric cooperative consumers. I have before me a copy of the results of the 1963 survey, which shows that these consumers expect to spend $1.25 billion for appliances, plumbing, wiring, and equipment. The figure

is the highest in the 4 years of these surveys. I ask unanimous consent that the survey results be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From Rural Electrification magazine, March 1963]

RURAL ELECTRIC MARKET OUTLOOK

(By Dr. Charles R. Aiken, education and research specialist, Power Use Services, NRECA)

A bright outlook is in prospect for the rural electric market in 1963. Several factors combine to give nothing but an optimistic view.

The rural electric consumers have made known their buying intentions in the amount of $1¼ billion. This is the highest in the 4 years that the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has been taking an annual survey. A verification of last year's intentions to buy shows a close correlation with the actual sales. The huge number of appliances that are more than 10 years old, and still being used, assures a substantial replacement market. More than one-fourth of the rural residences are equipped with a 100-ampere or larger service entrance, allowing the purchase and installation of new appliances without an additional wiring investment.

These facts learned from the survey taken during November and December 1962, coupled with the aggressive coordinated appliance promotion program planned by the rural electric systems and the electrical manufacturers, gives firm assurance of a good year.

This rural appliance market will provide a healthy assist to the Nation's business for the year. The Nation's top prediction economists said there will be some improvement in business conditions over 1962 but no drastic change. The agricultural economists say there will be increased sale of products by the farmer but the net result will be almost the same as he fared in 1962. They summarized their predictions at the November 16 Outlook Conference in this statement: "We see no reason to expect any significant change either up or down in realized net income for the farm operator next year."

In spite of these not-so-optimistic views of the forecasters, there are good reasons for strong faith in the rural appliance market. There is bound to be some influence on the number of appliances purchased, from both the national business conditions and the farm income. This group of nearly 4½ million rural family consumers, however, is in several respects different from the Nation's average group of consumers in electrical appliance purchases.

One of the principal reasons that rural electric members are a special group of appliance purchasers is their relative newness as an electrical purchasing group. The average rural electric consumer has had electricity no more than 15 years. The electric appliance educational and promotional programs conducted in the last few years by the rural electric systems have been a definite factor in the increased appetites of these consumers for new electric appliances. The desires for new appliances among the urban consumers have been more fully satisfied due to their greater exposure to the pressures of merchandisers.

A further factor which makes this a potentially good market is its confinement to the membership of rural electric systems with their own publications for reaching this membership. The State associations of these rural electric systems have 27 publications covering 29 States. These States together have 87 percent of this rural electric market.

Does the fact that buying intentions are greater really mean that there will be more sales? Can we actually rely on the intentions to buy as an indicator of electric appliance sales in 1963? Verification of sales made during 1962 was made by means of a survey of the ages of appliances in use. A count was made of all appliances 1 year old or less. These appliances added since the last rural market survey are, in effect, the sales made during 1962. From this data, the following was established. For six of seven major appliances, there were from three to four times as many of each appliance purchased during 1962 as consumers said they definitely would buy.

Refrigerators amounted to 83 percent of all the definite and possible intentions to buy as reported in the previous survey. Freezers amounted to 80 percent of all buying intentions reported.

A check on small appliances showed even more startling figures. Television purchases totaled 180 percent of reported total buying intentions, electric blankets 114 percent, electric saws and drills showed 93 percent and 82 percent respectively, while fry pans were 70 percent of total buying intentions.

On the basis of these figures and the extremely conservative price figures used in computing the dollar sales potential forecast for last year's market, there is good evidence that the $1 billion-plus market forecast for 1962 was achieved.

The $1¼ billion market forecast for 1963 is within reason if extra effort is put into the programs outlined in the nationally coordinated rural electric sales promotion plan.

The already large replacement market continues to increase in size as the number of appliances over 10 years old increases. The average life of several of the major appliances is between 10 and 12 years. Experience has shown that, although most people own a certain appliance, sales of that appliance will not drop. Refrigerators, for example, when combined with refrigerator-freezers, have a 96.7 percent saturation, yet the buying continues to accelerate.

The survey indicated that more than one-fourth of all rural electric consumers have 100-ampere service entrance, a fact which will have a favorable effect on the immediate market. Rural electric systems have been actively promoting the increased sized services. The larger service entrance will make it possible for these consumers to purchase additional electrical appliances without incurring extra wiring costs. This means that at least 1⅓ million rural homes already have adequate electrical capacity for adding major electrical appliances.

Aside from house heating, gas appears to be a substantial competitor for operating only two appliances. The survey shows that 38.4 percent of the ranges are operated by gas and 22.8 percent of the water heaters. This compares to 52.1 percent electric ranges and 47.5 percent electric water heaters.

Practically all rural electric systems in the country today are actively promoting electric home heating. The 66,000 total buying intentions for resistance heating and heat pumps emphasizes the exceptionally strong interest in purchasing the convenience and comfort of automatic electric heating.

The all-electric kitchen promotion beginning in February promises the largest dollar volume sales potential among the promotions scheduled for 1963. All kitchen appliances show a healthy increase in buying intentions. The range is the standout with the highest number of units on the buying intention list for any item in the survey. The kitchen appliance potential, if all buying intentions for range, refrigerator (one- and two-door), dishwasher and garbage disposer are realized, will result in sales well over a quarter of a billion dollars.

The water heater was singled out for individual promotion this year since many rural electrics have already been conducting either continuous or intermittent promotions on this appliance alone. Buying intentions, if all are converted to sales, would mean 460,000 units.

Water systems continue high on the list of intended purchases by rural electric consumers. The water system is strongly promoted by many rural electric systems because water is recognized as a basic necessity for modern, healthful living in rural residences. The water system is also basic to many electric-using appliances.

Housewares had an amazing sales record during 1962 in terms of expressed buying intentions. The five housewares items, as previously mentioned, ranged in sales from a high of 180 percent to a low of 70 percent of the total buying intentions. With the addition of four items to this year's survey, which is still only a part of the important housewares items, the dollar sales potential reached nearly a quarter of a billion dollars.

The freezer, which has only a 25-percent saturation nationwide, shows a 56-percent saturation among the rural electric consumers. They have expressed interest in buying another one-half-million freezers during 1963.

Air conditioning, which until a few years ago showed little growth potential in the rural areas except in a few locations, is rapidly growing in prominence in the thoughts of rural consumers. They indicate that they may buy up to 41,000 central units and 388,000 room units this year. Another 21,000 indicated the heat pump among their intended purchases.

The dehumidifier is another item growing in popularity. It adds summer comfort and prevents the destruction of summertime moisture. A total of 61,000 rural consumers expressed an interest in the dehumidifier.

Laundry appliances all show substantially increased buying intentions with the exception of the combination washer-dryer. This appliance recorded a slight decrease. This has been the problem child of the industry. Sales of the combination unit have decreased in each of the last 3 years.

Photocell controlled outdoor lights, which go on at dusk and off at dawn, were included in the survey for the first time this year. This item is already enjoying tremendous success. The future for outdoor lighting looks even better. These lights are giving the rural people their own private outdoor lights similar to street lighting enjoyed by town people. The buying intentions reach nearly a half-million units, which attests to the popularity of this fast growing item.

The bright outlook for the 1963 rural appliance sales appears to extend well into the future. Several additional factors besides those affecting the 1963 market give promise for the years ahead. The increasing population, with the resulting new households in the areas served by the rural electric systems, will be a good appliance market builder. The growing demand for change to new models before the old ones wear out and the trend to "second" appliances in some households will create more sales. Appliances such as the dishwasher and garbage disposer, which have reached only a low saturation in the rural areas, will increase in sales as they become better known.

Each year there has been a growth in number of systems participating in the coordinated promotion program, and an increase in the use of advertising to support the promotions. More promotion and advertising mean increased sales.

Rural consumer ownership and buying intentions of electric appliances

	Number who own	Percent who own	Definitely will buy	Possibly will buy	Total buying intentions
All-electric kitchen:					
Range	2,258,100	52.1	143,000	530,000	673,000
Refrigerator	3,785,000	87.3	103,000	436,000	539,000
Refrigerator-freezer	407,000	9.4	32,000	132,000	164,000
Dishwasher	147,000	3.4	24,000	128,000	152,000
Garbage disposer	73,000	1.7	2,000	85,000	87,000
Water heater	2,058,000	47.5	89,000	374,000	463,000
Housewares—Gifts:					
Television	3,790,000	87.4	124,000	529,000	653,000
Radio	4,090,000	93.2	90,000	351,000	441,000
Record player	1,732,000	40.0	53,000	313,000	366,000
Coffeemaker	2,603,000	60.0	69,000	399,000	463,000
Fry pan	2,085,000	48.1	109,000	518,000	627,000
Blanket	1,446,000	33.4	133,000	553,000	686,000
Vacuum cleaner	2,828,000	65.2	71,000	372,000	442,000
Saw	1,422,000	32.8	84,000	358,000	443,000
Drill	1,804,000	41.6	69,000	334,000	403,000
Freezer	2,435,000	56.2	130,000	476,000	606,000
Air conditioner and dehumidifier:					
Central air conditioner	37,000	.9	8,000	33,000	41,000
Dehumidifier	84,000	1.9	7,000	54,000	61,000
Room air conditioner	574,000	13.2	52,000	336,000	388,000
All-electric laundry:					
Automatic washer	1,338,000	30.9	97,000	367,000	464,000
Wringer-washer	2,393,000	55.2	66,000	214,000	280,000
Dryer	838,000	19.3	97,000	464,000	561,000
Washer-dryer	61,000	1.4	3,000	53,000	56,000
Electric heat:					
Whole house electric heat	204,000	4.7	9,000	40,000	49,000
Portable heaters	1,080,000	24.9	42,000	254,000	296,000
Heat pump	41,000	.9	4,000	13,000	17,000
Pressure water system	3,128,000	72.2	59,000	220,000	279,000
Dusk-to-dawn automatic lights	218,000	5.0	50,000	424,000	474,000

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the report indicates that consumers expect to spend $1,250 million on appliances, plumbing, wiring, and equipment.

The 2-percent interest rate on REA loans is a most important tool. It is designed to help the rural electric cooperatives in providing to all who desire it in their areas the kind of quality electric service taken for granted by town and city dwellers.

The cooperatives must have this help in order to overcome four problems inherent in their operations: Low density of population, light electric loads, isolation from one another which prevents the pooling of facilities, and exposure to pirating of customers or territory.

The cooperatives serve about three members to each mile of line. Class A and B power companies have about 33 customers to each mile of their lines. In other words, a mile of power company line serves more than 10 times as many customers as does a mile of electric cooperative line.

This makes a great difference between the revenues of cooperatives and those of the power companies. In 1960, a mile of electric cooperative line produced an average of $414 in revenue. But a mile of power company line produced an average of $6,580 in revenue, almost 16 times as much as that from an electric cooperative line.

Members of rural electric cooperatives pay more for interest in their electric bills than do the customers served by power companies. In 1961, 7.4 percent of the gross revenues of REA borrowers was used to pay interest charges. In the same year, power companies spent only 6.2 percent of their gross revenues on interest charges.

This was true, even though the REA borrowers paid 2 percent interest on their loans and the power companies paid varying rates which they said were much higher.

We must remember, too, that the electric cooperatives are nonprofit organizations. The capital contributed by members to the growing equity they have in their own electric systems does not draw interest. The rate is not 6 percent, or even 2 percent. It is zero.

One of the best analyses of these problems was made by REA Administrator, Norman M. Clapp. I ask unanimous consent that this analysis be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From Rural Electrification magazine, May, 1963]

RURAL ELECTRIC EQUALIZERS, WHY THEY ARE NECESSARY

(By Norman M. Clapp, Administrator, REA)

People are asking "Why a rural electrification program, 28 years later, when central station electric service has been made available to nearly 98 percent of the Nation's farms?" Rural people have a big stake in seeing that the public knows the answer.

If rural people had been willing to disregard price and quality of service, most could have had electric service in 1935. I can recall in my home State of Wisconsin a farmer could get electric service if he was willing to pay around $2,000 a mile for the construction of the line to serve his place, and willing to dig into his pocket each month to pay a similar premium for the service itself.

Under such conditions rural electrification was available to farmers in 1935. The problem was that for 9 out of 10 rural people the price was more than they were willing and able to pay.

This was not rural electrification. The need which President Franklin Roosevelt, and Senator George Norris and Representative Sam Rayburn tackled as sponsors of the Rural Electrification Act, was to make it possible for people in rural areas to have electric service at rates and on terms comparable to those prevailing in urban areas.

INDISPENSABLE KEY

Electric service is an indispensable key to greater convenience, comfort and better living. Simple fairness would say that it should be as abundantly and reasonably available to rural people as it is to city people. Electric power is also a key to economic opportunity and development—new jobs, better living standards, better community services. Thus rural areas need to achieve a practical parity with urban areas in electric power supply and service if they are to participate in national growth and realize their full economic potential.

Numerical progress in rural electrification has obscured the fact that rural areas still have a long way to go before parity is achieved. The fact that the consumer on the lines of an REA borrower system still has to pay about 20 percent more for 250 kilowatt-hours used in a month than the average city consumer is just one measure of the rural disadvantage.

The truth is it costs more to provide quality electric service in rural areas. Even today the rural systems financed by REA have on the average only 3.3 consumers to each mile of line. The class A and B commercial utilities, and this includes all but the very small companies, have on the average 33 consumers to each mile of their line. The comparison from the standpoint of revenue is even more dramatic. The REA-financed systems in 1960 averaged $414 in annual revenue per mile of line, compared to $6,580 for the commercial companies.

MAJOR HANDICAPS

This low density of consumers—particularly in an industry of high capital requirements—is one of the major handicaps of rural service. It is the product not only of the relative population density—or lack of it in rural areas—as compared with urban areas, but also of the historic development of the industry through which the commercial utilities skimmed off the cream of the rural areas themselves, leaving the REA-financed systems the task of picking up what was left. This resulted in the development of many small rural electric systems, relatively isolated from one another. This isolation itself has become another factor in the high-cost handicaps of rural service.

When the investment must be high, as in modern electric practice, the only practical way to achieve low rates is by maximum utilization of costly facilities. Development of high-load factor, the interconnection and pooling of plant facilities, large-scale generation, and the integration of hydro and steam capacity are principal means of bringing power costs down. Unfortunately, the rural systems have had little opportunity to use these economizers because of the very conditions under which they operate—low density, lack of diversity, absence of protection against pirating of customers or territory, and isolation from one another.

EQUALIZERS

Under such conditions, borrowers had to use the available "equalizers," such as long-term, 2-percent REA loans, in their struggle for electrical parity.

The necessity of 2-percent loans is apparent from the fact—surprising to many REA critics—that rural consumers served by REA borrowers pay more for interest per dollar in their power bills than the city consumers served by commercial power companies. In 1961, 7.4 percent of gross revenues of REA-financed systems was required to pay interest charges. Whatever the rate the commercial utilities pay on their bonds, only 6.2 percent of their revenues were required, on an average, for interest charges.

Another equalizer has been supplied by the rural people themselves in the nonprofit operation of the cooperative systems they have built. By organizing into cooperatives they have voluntarily waived the normal claim to profit from their investment, except in terms of lower cost service. The capital they contribute to their growing financial equity in their systems does not draw interest at 6 percent, nor even at 2 percent, but zero percent.

The final major equalizer designed to help overcome the present high cost of rural serv-

ice is the REA-financed generation and transmission program. The wholesale cost of power accounts for 43 percent of the average cost of providing service through the REA-financed rural electric distribution systems. The rates for which power is available at wholesale are tremendously significant in determining the ability of the distribution cooperative to deliver electricity to its members at retail rates comparable to urban rates. A reduction of a single mill in the average wholesale cost of power for the REA-financed systems across the country would produce an annual saving of over $36 million for their consumer members.

SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS

From one source or another, the rural electric systems must obtain 100 million kilowatt-hours every day—worth about two-thirds of a million dollars at wholesale. This is substantial business, and it is a growing market for power companies as well as generation and transmission cooperatives. Recently a rural power system, in paying its wholesale power bill, turned over to a commercial power company the billionth dollar which power companies have received for supplying power to rural electric systems. This is the part of rural electrification they like.

But many of their spokesmen are among the longtime critics of rural electrification who are saying again that it is time to consider the job of rural electrification finished. They argue that rural electric systems financed by REA are simply stopgap devices to serve areas and loads the commercial companies did not choose to serve at one time. Their solution is to dismantle the rural electric systems, section by section as they become attractive to the power companies, leaving the fragmented rural electric systems weak, small, and plagued with high costs.

EQUALIZERS IN THE FUTURE

If the rural systems serve only the leftover loads and territories at the sufferance of the commercial utilities then there will never be an end to the need for equalizers, such as 2-percent loans. In fact, it is more likely they will need even greater equalizers in the future to serve their remaining areas of high cost if this is the course we pursue.

The other way to approach the job of rural electrification is to undertake a vigorous and determined program to strengthen the systems that have undertaken to serve the rural areas, to make them strong enough to stand on their own feet without any special assistance.

This kind of program must include territorial protection. The rural systems must be able to retain the portions of their service territories that experience population growth and provide the benefits of consumer density. They must be able to serve all loads in their territory, developing greater load diversity through large power sales as well as the smaller ones. They must develop greater access to larger scale generation and wider pooling of plant facilities, both public and private, with maximum utilization of power sources.

With the kind of climate where rural systems can do these things, the need for equalizers such as REA's 2-percent financing and technical assistance will diminish and, I am confident, ultimately disappear. This is the course we are pursuing in REA. This is the right course.

While it is possible to approach this job of rural electrification in either of these two fashions, it can't be done both ways at the same time. We cannot expect the rural systems to stand on their own feet while they are denied access to the maximum technological benefits of the industry and left to be cannibalized by the commercial power companies.

CONTRIBUTIONS WILL INCREASE

Where these systems are given the opportunity to develop, their impact in contributing to the total national economy will increase. In opening new markets for sale of electric power, they create a growing market for the sale of new appliances and equipment. For a number of years now, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has published surveys indicating that such purchases by members of these rural systems have developed into a billion-dollar annual market. During the present year, NRECA reports an expectation that these sales will reach a record $1,250 million. Tens of thousands of new jobs have been created both in the city factories producing this equipment, on Main Street of our small towns and in the operation of the power systems. Electricity has had a big hand in the growing efficiency on American farms.

Most of all, as use of electricity grows in rural areas, the areas themselves can offer new opportunity for people living in them.

These are the basic issues facing rural electrification in the United States today. If rural electrification is going to move forward toward parity with urban service, toward lower power rates and high standards of service, there must be public understanding of the job that lies ahead.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, rural electric cooperatives are independent, nonprofit organizations chartered in the States in which they operate. They are locally owned and they are locally controlled—yes, owned, managed, and controlled by the Rural Electric Cooperative members.

The cooperatives are responsible for the management of their own affairs, for the successful construction and operation of their electric systems and for the repayment of their REA loans.

REA and the rural electric cooperatives see their relationship in the same light. The REA is a lender; the cooperatives are borrowers, and the borrowers decide all of their own management questions without REA review or approval. REA neither owns nor controls any part of any rural electric cooperative system.

There is no better proof that cooperatives are free, private enterprises than the annual meeting of rural electric cooperatives. At these meetings, each member has just one vote. A member who uses the most electricity has no more votes than a member who uses the least.

Some people insist, however, that the cooperatives, because they can get 2-percent money, are competing unfairly with the power companies. They say the cooperatives are reaching into urban areas—the larger towns and cities—to lure commercial and industrial customers away from the power companies.

There is no evidence that power companies are being hurt by any kind of competition. In the life of the REA, power company total operating revenues have more than tripled, their investment in plant has more than tripled, and their earnings on common stock have more than tripled.

It does not appear to me that rural electric cooperatives have been injurious to the private utilities. In many areas of America the private utilities are working cooperatively with the rural electric cooperatives. That is the case in my own State of Minnesota, where there is a friendly, healthy, and efficient working relationship between the private power companies, on the one hand, and the rural electric cooperatives on the other. I believe that a little more of such cooperation and a little less antagonism and the whole country would be better served.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent report on power company net income, reprinted from Electrical World, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From Electrical World, Apr. 8, 1963]

WEST-SOUTH-CENTRAL UTILITIES TAKE THE LEAD AS INDUSTRY NET INCOME REBOUNDS IN 1962

Last year was the best ever for utility net incomes. Based on a sampling of 142 companies, representing roughly 95 percent of the total electric revenues for the utility industry, net incomes posted a 10.02-percent gain over 1961, as compared with a 5.4-percent gain in 1961 over 1960. The increase in 1962 got a boost from the new 3-percent investment tax credit, and the Internal Revenue Service's liberalized depreciation guidelines.

Every section of the country showed an increase in net income. However, the Mountain States, after spurting to the lead in 1961 with a 14.8-percent gain, relinquished its top position by dropping off to a 6.8-percent gain last year. Here's the region-by-region roundup of 1961 and 1962:

Region	Percent gain	
	1962	1961
New England	9.2	2.2
Middle Atlantic	10.3	8.9
East north central	8.5	4.5
West north central	5.7	5.0
South Atlantic	11.0	2.7
East south central	8.9	4.8
West south central	16.4	1.2
Mountain	6.8	14.8
Pacific	11.2	7.4

The area showing the biggest increase was the West South Central, which was low region last year. In that 1 section, 11 utilities registered net income gains of over 10 percent, the largest being the 28 percent posted by New Orleans Public Service. The Mountain States, which showed an 8-percent drop from 1961, contained 2 of the 7 utilities which registered declines in the 1962 net income sample of 142 companies. These two companies were Idaho Power (−8.4 percent) and Sierra Pacific Power (−2.8 percent).

Here are net incomes for 142 operating electric utilities for the 12 months ended Dec. 31, 1961 and 1962

[In thousands of dollars]

Company	1962	1961
Alabama Power [1]	22,856	21,646
Appalachian Power [1]	24,337	21,494
Arizona Public Service [2]	13,643	11,319
Arkansas Missouri	1,554	1,352
Arkansas Power & Light [1]	11,375	11,173
Atlantic City Electric	9,088	8,211
Baltimore Gas & Electric	23,500	22,772
Bangor Hydro-Electric	1,708	1,593
Blackstone Valley Gas & Electric [3]	2,296	2,084
Boston Edison	15,669	14,939
Brockton Edison	1,702	1,617
California Electric Power	5,746	5,505
California-Pacific Utilities	1,181	1,177
Carolina Power & Light	16,345	14,709
Central Hudson G&E	6,452	6,008

See footnotes at end of table.

Here are net incomes for 142 operating electric utilities for the 12 months ended Dec. 31, 1961 and 1962—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Company	1962	1961
Central Illinois Electric & Gas	4,698	4,393
Central Illinois Light	6,504	5,186
Central Illinois Public Service	13,110	12,235
Central Louisiana Electric	4,570	4,028
Central Maine Power	8,811	8,652
Central Power & Light [1]	12,879	11,179
Central Vermont Public Service	1,991	1,861
Cincinnati Gas & Electric [2]	22,710	21,726
Cleveland Electric Illuminating [2]	24,670	24,357
Columbus & Southern Ohio [2]	11,142	10,884
Commonwealth Edison	88,470	82,664
Community Public Service	2,351	2,160
Connecticut Light & Power	16,661	14,514
Consolidated Edison of New York	90,636	76,352
Consumers Power [2]	45,097	40,241
Dallas Power & Light [3]	13,339	10,693
Dayton Power & Light	13,664	12,549
Delaware Power & Light	9,938	9,005
Detroit Edison [2]	42,911	39,765
Duke Power	29,997	27,234
Duquesne Light	24,192	23,330
Edison Sault Electric	371	331
El Paso Electric	4,470	4,087
Empire District Electric	2,530	2,319
Fall River Electric Light [3]	984	862
Florida Power	15,620	13,601
Florida Power & Light	33,065	30,254
Georgia Power [1]	24,460	20,801
Green Mountain Power	853	746
Gulf Power [1]	4,466	4,013
Gulf States Utilities	18,951	16,047
Hartford Electric Light	8,046	6,729
Hawaiian Electric	5,963	4,818
Houston Lighting & Power	27,397	21,532
Idaho Power	8,856	9,668
Illinois Power	23,114	22,217
Indiana & Michigan Electric [1]	14,600	12,029
Indianapolis Power & Light	10,833	10,090
Interstate Power	5,032	4,786
Iowa Electric Light & Power	5,863	5,496
Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric [2]	7,116	6,551
Iowa Power & Light	6,056	5,568
Iowa Public Service	5,409	5,030
Iowa Southern Utilities	2,532	1,978
Jersey Central Power & Light [1]	9,944	9,309
Kansas City Power & Light	12,282	11,337
Kansas Gas & Electric	8,101	7,581
Kansas Power & Light	9,441	9,093
Kentucky Power [1]	3,170	1,881
Kentucky Utilities	8,937	8,417
Kingsport Utilities [1]	494	424
Long Island Lighting	25,184	21,953
Louisiana Power & Light [1]	9,221	8,470
Louisville Gas & Electric	12,313	11,339
Madison Gas & Electric	2,080	1,987
Maine Public Service	913	913
Metropolitan Edison [1]	11,779	10,439
Minnesota Power & Light	4,916	4,703
Mississippi Power [1]	4,517	3,896
Mississippi Power & Light [1]	6,154	6,003
Missouri Power & Light	2,224	2,009
Missouri Public Service	3,040	2,737
Missouri Utilities	877	808
Monongahela Power [1]	6,935	6,580
Montana-Dakota Utilities	5,746	5,162
Montana Power	14,477	13,310
Nevada Power	2,328	2,257
New England Electric System [4]	18,948	17,324
New England Gas & Electric [4]	5,075	4,743
New Jersey Power & Light [1]	3,367	3,235
New Orleans Public Service [3]	6,076	4,747
New York State Electric & Gas	18,529	17,487
Newport Electric	331	335
Niagara Mohawk Power	41,714	36,079
Northern Indiana Public Service	20,546	18,513
Northern States Power (Minnesota)	28,509	27,408
Northern States Power (Wisconsin)	2,623	2,662
Northwestern Public Service	1,415	1,449
Ohio Edison [1]	34,978	30,841
Ohio Power [1]	26,662	24,677
Oklahoma Gas & Electric	14,456	12,135
Orange & Rockland Utilities	4,495	4,146
Otter Tail Power	2,791	2,546
Pacific Gas & Electric	110,692	102,241
Pacific Power & Light	20,842	18,076
Pennsylvania Electric [1]	18,032	17,994
Pennsylvania Power & Light	25,984	25,525
Philadelphia Electric	47,581	46,596
Portland General Electric	9,025	7,880
Potomac Edison [1]	5,456	5,310
Potomac Electric Power	19,187	17,442
Public Service Electric & Gas	65,563	57,410
Public Service of Colorado	18,683	18,521
Public Service of Indiana	19,756	17,921

See footnotes at end of table.

Here are net incomes for 142 operating electric utilities for the 12 months ended Dec. 31, 1961 and 1962—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Company	1962	1961
Public Service of New Hampshire	6,033	5,682
Public Service of New Mexico	4,489	3,954
Puget Sound Power & Light [2]	8,589	7,746
Rochester Gas & Electric	11,751	10,563
San Diego Gas & Electric	11,615	8,623
St. Joseph Light & Power	1,412	1,350
Savannah Electric & Power	1,967	2,154
Sierra Pacific Power	2,103	2,163
South Carolina Electric & Gas	10,621	10,116
Southern California Edison	60,569	54,183
Southern Indiana Gas & Electric	3,551	3,273
Southwestern Electric Power [1]	8,901	7,871
Southwestern Electric Service	497	480
Southwestern Public Service	13,584	11,234
Tampa Electric	8,261	6,890
Texas Electric Service [1]	20,371	18,351
Texas Power & Light [1 2]	19,713	16,972
Toledo Edison [2]	9,370	8,266
Tucson Gas, Electric Light & Power	4,257	3,373
Union Electric	29,053	28,455
United Illuminating	6,452	5,828
Utah Power & Light	10,350	9,561
Virginia Electric & Power	38,358	33,443
Washington Water Power	7,063	6,819
West Penn Power [3]	16,416	15,718
West Texas Utilities [1]	6,324	5,969
Western Light & Telephone	2,555	2,312
Western Massachusetts	4,595	4,171
Wheeling Electric [1]	536	574
Wisconsin Electric Power	19,848	18,515
Wisconsin Michigan Power	2,254	2,142
Wisconsin Power & Light	9,342	8,807
Wisconsin Public Service	8,054	6,925
Total, 142 companies	2,007,583	1,824,594

[1] All common shares owned by a holding company.
[2] Revised.
[3] Most common shares owned by a holding company.
[4] Holding company controlling operating companies.
[5] Includes Pennsylvania Power Co.

Total increase in net income for the industry was almost $183 million, as compared with the $94 million increase in 1961, and the $114 million increase in 1960. The utility showing the biggest jump last year was Consolidated Edison of New York, which boosted its net income by $14 million. Runner-up for the second year in a row was Pacific Gas & Electric with an $8.4 million increase. In third place was Public Service Electric & Gas, which registered an $8.1 million gain.

These 7 companies made the largest net income gains

	Percent increase
Kentucky Power	68.5
San Diego Gas & Electric	34.7
Iowa Southern Utilities	28.0
New Orleans Public Service	28.0
Houston Lighting & Power	27.2
Tucson Gas, Electric Light & Power	26.2
Central Illinois Light	25.4

Other companies showing a 20-percent-or-over net income gain were: Dallas Power & Light, 24.7 percent; Hawaiian Electric, 23.8 percent; Indiana & Michigan Electric, 21.4 percent; Southwestern Public Service, 20.9 percent; Arizona Public Service, 20.5 percent.

While these companies showed a net income decline

	Percent decline
Savannah Electric & Power	8.7
Idaho Power	8.4
Wheeling Electric	6.6
Sierra Pacific Power	2.8
Northwestern Public Service	2.3
Northern States Power (Wisconsin)	1.5
Newport Electric	1.2

These were the only companies showing declines in net income for 1962. One company (Maine Public Service) showed no change, and three companies showed a less-than-1-percent increase. They are: Pennsylvania Electric; California Pacific Utilities, and Public Service of Colorado.

On a percentage basis however, Consolidated Edison posted an 18.7-percent income gain, well down on the list of those companies showing the largest net income gains for 1962. Pacific Gas & Electric registered an 8.3-percent increase, and Public Service Electric & Gas showed a 14.2-percent gain.

The greatest percentage increase was shown by Kentucky Power, which upped its net income by 68.5 percent—from $1,881 million in 1961 to $3,170 million in 1962. The reason behind this increase was that interest during construction credit was about $1.7 million in 1962 as against approximately $380,000 in 1961—making an increase of $1.3 million in 1962 in this category.

It's interesting to note that in the 142-company sample, only 7 showed a decline, while 12 showed a 20 percent or over increase, and 49 companies showed increases of 10 percent or over, in their 1962 net incomes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, that report indicates that our private utilities have done very well economically and are continuing to grow and expand at a very rapid rate in order to meet the power needs and electrical needs of the American people and the American economy.

Mr. President, no cooperative can get an REA loan to implement an invasion of an urban area. The Rural Electrification Act says specifically that cooperatives may bring service to rural areas of fewer than 1,500 population which are not already getting central station service.

What is happening is that the towns and the cities are moving into the areas developed by the cooperatives. I believe everyone knows that to be the case. That is what we call suburban development. Today the old cities have satellite communities around them. Many of the industrial plants have moved out of the large cities into what was once rural areas. Those rural areas were being served and are being served by the REA—the rural electrical cooperatives.

But even so, an REA study shows that less than 3 percent of all the consumers served by REA borrowers live in towns of more than 1,500 population. In most cases, these consumers live in rural areas; they were taken in by urban expansion.

There are some who criticize electric cooperatives on the ground that the co-ops do not pay enough taxes. Most cooperatives, however, simply are not as big as most power companies; they do not sell nearly as much power. Therefore they do not have the large gross or net revenues that rural electric cooperatives have. They pay property taxes. They pay local taxes. If members of the cooperatives have sufficient income to justify paying income taxes, they pay income taxes.

Again, the cooperatives operate at cost, even though they are expected to provide quality service in thinly populated areas. Any excess over the cost of service is returned to the co-op members, and that is subject to normal taxation—Federal, State, and local.

But the cost of service does include all taxes, other than income taxes, which are paid by the cooperatives as well as

the power companies and the income tax is collected from the co-op member.

Income taxes are on net income or profits. Rural electric cooperatives pay no income taxes because they make no profits. Any business, and this includes a power company, which chooses to operate at cost will pay no income tax.

What is overlooked is that rural electrics probably pay heavier property taxes per capita than do power companies. Where property taxes are based upon miles of electric line, this is bound to be true. In a rural area, this burden is shared by fewer consumers; the per capita taxes are heavier.

A tax burden shared by 20 customers is only one-tenth as great as the same tax burden shared by two members of a rural electric cooperative. The cooperatives and the power companies merely collect the taxes from their customers. The companies are guaranteed a reasonable rate of return over and above all costs, including taxes.

It also is said that the co-ops are unfair competitors because they are turning to REA for loans to finance their own generation and transmission facilities. Statistics show this is false.

Power companies are selling electricity to 80 percent of the Nation's electric power consumers. By 1980, the companies' customers are going to be using three times as much power as they are using today.

But cooperative generation and transmission systems are serving only 8 percent of the electric power consumers. And cooperative distribution systems are buying 38 percent of their power supply from private power companies.

The cooperative generation and transmission systems generate less than 1 percent of all the power generated annually in this country. From this small output, the co-ops get just 16 percent of all the power they distribute. They buy more than twice that much power from the power companies. This may be competition, but it certainly is not unfair competition.

Mr. President, the loads of electric co-ops are doubling every 7 to 10 years. The co-ops must have dependable supplies of power at reasonable rates if they are to do the job assigned by the Congress. If they cannot get such supplies and such rates, they must generate their own power.

The fact that they have the authority to obtain what we call G. & T. loans—generation and transmission loans—to establish generation plans gives them a lever, so to speak, to obtain power from the private companies at reasonable rates.

The situation is precisely as President Kennedy described it in his budget message last year. The amount needed for generation and transmission loan funds depends upon the willingness of private power suppliers to sell enough power at reasonable rates to the electric co-ops.

Not every REA borrower is going to come to the Rural Electrification Administration for a generation and transmission loan. Not every co-op is going to build its own plant. It just would not be feasible. But the availability of a generation and transmission loan, as a lever upon the bargaining process between cooperatives and power companies, should remain in the REA Act. The Congress properly can continue to rely upon the discretion of the REA Administrator in his use of this bargaining tool.

Mr. President, the job of rural electrification is not finished; not for the power companies, not for the REA, not for the rural electric cooperatives, and not for the Congress. The growth of our rural areas must be encouraged.

We need small industries in rural areas. We need to diversify the economy of our small rural areas. Such development will require a greater amount of electrical energy, and a rural electric cooperative surely has a very significant role to play in providing that energy.

We must have adequate financing; we must have an adequate supply of wholesale power; we must continue efficient, reliable electric service throughout our country.

Furthermore, rural electrification is a benefit not merely to the rural areas. It is a benefit to the entire country, to all electric consumers, urban and rural, and of great benefit to American industry.

The service provided by a rural electric cooperative is a yardstick against which consumers may measure the service provided by the regulated private power companies.

Let us consider what has been happening in the electric industry during recent years. Since 1954, power companies have been enjoying unprecedented prosperity and very high profits. More than half of the new construction by private power companies is being financed by retained earnings, which is the money consumers pay in their electric bills over and above the cost of doing business and providing a fair return on investment.

Mr. President, there is an urgent need to strengthen the rural electric cooperatives, not weaken them. They provide an important yardstick. Our economy requires at least a small segment whose incentive is to provide dependable, low-cost service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address on the REA program delivered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] to the Green River Rural Electric Cooperative annual meeting on July 20 at Owensboro, Ky., be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON TO GREEN RIVER RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ANNUAL MEETING, OWENSBORO, KY., SATURDAY, JULY 20, 1963

I believe in investing in the future of America, and that's why I consider the Rural Electrification program one of our most valuable and effective national programs.

The REA stands today as one of the great, lasting accomplishments of an amazing era in American history. To appreciate the REA I think you have to reflect just a moment on that era—and on some similarities you might notice today.

The REA came into being because a great crisis seized our country and shocked our Government into a new and dynamic concept of its responsibilities.

We had had a succession of what we called businesslike administrations. There was a fairly widespread acceptance of an old dogma which Calvin Coolidge put into words: "The business of the country is business."

The marketplace had become a shrine. Whatever happened there, from natural causes, was right and proper and good. Nothing else was supposed to happen. The U.S. Government stood and watched, a kind of halfhearted observer.

The Government was, in Franklin Roosevelt's words, frozen in the ice of its own indifference.

Then the whole edifice of business came tumbling down in disaster. And out of the ruins came a new American spirit which welded a Nation together, helped us to win the greatest war in history and to emerge as the strongest industrial economy on earth.

This new spirit—expressed in programs such as the REA—is something we should not forget, for it represented a great turning point in American history.

We discovered this spirit when we stopped sitting around and waiting for good things to happen and began, instead, to mobilize our people and develop our resources to make things happen.

Until then, we weren't supposed to think about such things. True, only one farm in 10 had electricity, and farmers lived a life not much different from that of their grandfathers. It would have cost them some $2,000 a mile to bring in electric power. It was a life of kerosene lamps and horse drawn plows and backbreaking manual labor. There wasn't much sanitation or education or recreation.

But this was the way it was meant to be. I never quite understood who meant it to be that way, but it was meant to be.

Then we suddenly found ourselves in such a crisis that even the captains of industry demanded that something be done. And in an amazingly short period of time, the American people, frightened into action and united by their fear, set the U.S. Government onto an entirely different course.

Obviously, one way to rebuild a shattered nation was to electrify the farms and extend for the first time the full benefits of our industrialized economy into rural areas. Naturally, a few called this socialism or communism. But as any historian can tell you, the really striking thing about this era is that the American people did not turn to socialism or communism, as people did in some other nations. Instead they chose something distinctly democratic and American.

They created independent, home-owned cooperatives, with capital provided on a strict loan basis from the Federal Government. The program was in the finest traditions of a free democracy—and the results were spectacular.

Today, the greatest testimonial to this inspired program comes from its bitterest enemies—the owners of the big private utilities who announce triumphantly that 98 percent of the farms of America are now electrified.

That's right—they are; the farms which American business leaders and the Government once thought it was better to leave in peasantlike poverty than to lift a hand to help—because they said there was no profit in it.

No profit to whom?

No profit in throwing a switch to send vital electric power into 5 million farms and homes? No profit in more than doubling the output of the American farmer? No profit in stimulating $4 worth of investment by REA customers for every $1 the Government loaned? No profit in triggering $16

billion in consumer spending for appliances, plumbing, wiring and equipment—a spending spree which continues at the rate of a billion dollars a year?

Any man who tells you there is no profit in such a program doesn't know what profit is. Or else he means to say that the profit was spread around a little too much.

In my opinion, the REA program was one of the most profitable ventures ever undertaken by America, and I think we should keep its shining example before us.

Today, America is the leader of the free world, locked in an endless struggle with the forces of oppression. In this struggle, every resource we have must be used to the fullest if we hope to win. It isn't enough to build armies and missiles and pile up enough nuclear weapons to incinerate the world. We have got to build a strong economy and a strong society.

We have got to educate our children, and train scientists and engineers. We have got to maintain full employment. We have 40 million people living on the edge of poverty. We have 4,800,000 unemployed. We need 22 million new jobs in the next decade just to absorb new young people entering the labor market. We have got to conquer ignorance and poverty and disease. We have got to save and develop our priceless natural resources. We have got to conquer outer space.

The nation that emerges on top in this struggle is the nation that does that job best. We cannot do that job if we sit back as we did in the twenties and wait for some mystical economic force to do the job for us.

I consider the REA program a vital, continuing part of this absolutely crucial effort to strengthen and expand the American economy to meet the needs of our people and to preserve our place in the world. Electric energy is a keystone of economic growth. India, for instance, produces about one-twentieth of the goods and services we produce—and its energy consumption is also one-twentieth of ours. In the Soviet Union, half the population must work at raising the food to feed the nation. In America, with electrified farms, less than 9 percent of our total work force is occupied in farming.

Yet the REA program is under bitter attack today from some of the same hidebound people who fought it a generation ago on narrow ideological grounds; from a comparatively few fast-buck artists who think they could make a killing if they could get REA out of the way; and from some well-meaning people who just don't understand the need for such a program.

I want to deal with some of the arguments used in this attack.

They say that the REA was a great success but its job is done so now it should be liquidated. Anyone who says that simply does not understand the REA program.

Its job was to supply the rural areas of America with electricity. It is doing that job and we hope it will continue to do it. This job did not consist of throwing up a few poles and stringing a few wires. It takes all the ingenuity and resources of our local REA cooperatives to supply the growing demand for electricity in rural areas. REA loads have been doubling every 7 or 8 years.

Or they say that it was all right to allow cooperatives to distribute electricity but not to generate and transmit it. Here again you see the attitude of some businessmen wearing blinders.

The private power companies were so prejudiced against the REA—or so anxious to exploit it unfairly—that they lost some of their best customers. They chiseled with the dual rate device—making co-ops pay a higher rate when they used extra amounts of power—just the opposite of the usual practice in the industry. And they used their position as a supplier to punish the co-ops in every way they could.

Generation and transmission of electricity by rural electric cooperatives was the obvious and logical answer in cases where this happened.

There is no question as to its legality. It is written into the law and it has been upheld in the courts. Strict standards are set, and the amount of power so generated is only seven-tenths of 1 percent of the power generated in America today.

But where private power is not available, or where the rates are unduly high, or where some hostile power company is out to "get" the cooperative, generation and transmission becomes a necessity.

It brings electric power to the places where it is most needed—and at reasonable rates. It provides a valuable yardstick for electric rates throughout the area. And most important, it removes the last barrier to rural area development and the creation of new jobs.

Some businessmen wearing blinders may oppose such a program, but we must not let them impose their blinders on the Nation. We have an obligation to look at the total needs of an area and of our country, and not just at the needs of one so narrow that he would never realize that you can stimulate the sale of lemonade by working with a man who sells salted peanuts.

They also say that the REA Administrator in Washington has too much leeway in approving loans. They seem to want every one to be approved by act of Congress. Well, I happen to know Norman Clapp, and there is no more dedicated, no more enlightened, no better informed executive in America today in business or in Government. Both the public interest and the interests of the rural electric cooperatives will be well served by this outstanding man.

And, of course, they say that the Government should not make loans to rural electric cooperatives—not at all, some say, and others say that, at least, the interest rate should be raised. They say the present program gives cooperatives an unfair advantage over private power companies—the same companies which long ago refused to serve anyone in the areas now served by the co-ops.

Congress gave the co-ops a favorable interest rate, it's true, in order to make the whole thing possible. In exchange, the co-ops were given heavy responsibilities. They had to serve everyone in their areas. They couldn't just pick the profitable customers. This led to high costs. Rural electric cooperatives have one-tenth the customer density along their lines and earn about one-fifteenth as much revenue per mile of line as private power companies. That is the very reason why private power companies decided it was not profitable—for them—to serve these areas. That is the very reason why we created an REA loan program at reasonable interest rates.

The private power companies complaining about REA competition are not suffering. Their profits are higher than ever before—because of an advancing economy.

But rural electric cooperatives should not become too discouraged at the attacks made on them. Many people see through the old slogans and the hidebound dogma.

As you know, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has opened an all-out assault on the REA program, saying it should be—no, not destroyed—just phased out.

But I have businessmen in my State who would rather phase out the chamber of commerce.

I received a telegram recently from the board of directors of the local chamber of commerce in Richland Center, Wis., which said "We believe that the economic well-being of this area can best be served by the continuation and completion of rural electrification, rather than by its elimination. We wish to make it known that the stand taken by the State and National chambers of commerce does not reflect the feeling of our local chamber of commerce, and that we actively support the activities of the REA program."

As you can see, not all businessmen wear blinders.

One businessman wrote that he was particularly angry at the chamber of commerce attack on REA because the local REA co-op was one of the most active members of the local chamber of commerce.

I also had a letter from an engineer in Milwaukee, our largest city, who told how an anti-REA petition was circulated in the office of the corporation for which he works.

"Please do not pay too much attention to the signatures," he wrote. "Under the eyes of the boss' son, they may not represent true opinion."

He went on to say, "Extending the benefits of electricity to the people who open up the remote areas of our country is one of the worthy uses of Federal funds."

In Big Rivers cooperative, you are putting this powerful tool to work for the development of your area. I understand that your $18 million REA loan will bring electricity to a vast area at a saving of $3,300,000 over 10 years. Instead of restricting power, as your private suppliers previously did, you plan to extend power.

In Wisconsin, farmers faced up to a similar decision back in 1937. Eventually 28 local systems joined together in Dairyland Power Cooperative, and it is now the largest cooperatively owned power system in the world. It has proven its worth. It provides the lowest net power costs available to rural systems in the State. It saves these systems millions of dollars annually in power costs from the rates quoted for wholesale supply when it was organized. Total kilowatt hours to be furnished by Dairyland this year to these systems is expected to reach a billion kilowatt hours. And the impact of Dairyland as a yardstick of practical rates will become even more important in the years ahead.

Here in Kentucky I am told that you need only look to the success of the East Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative as an example of what can be accomplished through your own generation. I understand East Kentucky fought for 4 long years through the courts to win its right to operate. It now has the lowest wholesale power costs in Kentucky outside the TVA area while its member cooperatives are building a substantial equity in this system.

I understand that your great project already has attracted a major new industry to the area—and that has been the story almost everywhere.

I am informed that the total power input in rural electric systems in Kentucky will double by 1970, and by 1975 the three cooperatives served by your new plant will need almost three times the power you needed in 1961.

Whether rural areas get this power they are demanding—at reasonable rates—will determine whether our country will grow and develop as it should, and whether our country will continue to expand as it must if America is to be strong.

We live in a strange economy today, where employment and unemployment increase at the same time; where many families reach new heights of prosperity and many others slip backward; where automation takes more jobs each day, and where some great areas of our country live in a state of perpetual depression.

We faced up to our problems in the thirties, and the REA was one of the tools we developed to work with. Our problems are just as great today, and they may be even more baffling. We cannot lay down our tools. We have just begun to work.

THE WRONG RACE WITH RUSSIA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the lead article in the August edition of the Reader's Digest magazine entitled "We're Running the Wrong Race With Russia," is a thought-provoking review of what the race to the moon may entail to the United States. Regardless of anyone's opinion, the article is well worth the examination of everyone. It was written by the magazine's authoritative military editor, Francis Vivian Drake. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in connection with this timely article, I think it is appropriate to call attention to an excellent and very informative study which had been prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee, of which my distinguished colleague is the chairman.

The policy committee staff study, entitled "A Matter of Priority," is an examination of the budget and benefits of the moonshot in relation to other national problems. No policy position is contained in this study; it merely stimulates thinking on the subject. I understand that this staff study, one of the first made in the Nation, has received wide attention and since its publication many articles have appeared which contain some of the same matters contained in the original paper. The study was prepared under the able direction of David S. Teeple, our policy committee staff director. I ask unanimous consent that the study be printed in the RECORD.

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

A MATTER OF PRIORITY

AN EXAMINATION OF THE BUDGET AND BENEFITS OF THE MOON SHOT IN RELATION TO OTHER NATIONAL PROBLEMS

(Prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, chairman, David S. Teeple, staff director, May 10, 1963)

INTRODUCTION

The history of mankind has been that of expanding horizons, from cave mouth to farmstead, until now we stand at the rim of the universe. It has been a long and tortuous development and few reasonable men seriously advocate a pulling back at this point in human development.

The question is not, then, whether man will ultimately reach the moon and beyond. The question is, rather, how shall it be done, and whether other aspects of human needs should be bypassed or overlooked in the one spasmodic effort to achieve a lunar landing at once.

Space exploration must and will come. But what priority should be applied to it in the total national effort? The decision of priorities must be made on the basis of overall benefit to the free world and not on the adolescent desire to beat the Russians in a space race.

For an American to set foot on the moon is a proper objective of national policy, but whether it justifies the major concentration of scientific talent to the exclusion of other endeavors is a matter open to debate.

No fruitful discussion can be held unless the emotional trappings, the verbal excesses are removed. A cold, careful examination is past due.

Our generation must ask itself—and answer—some basic, unpleasant questions:

Is it more important to have a man on the moon than to conquer cancer which will take the lives of 40 million Americans now living?

Is lunar exploration more important to mankind than freeing ourselves from the tragic chains of mental illness, which now accounts for one of every four American hospital beds?

Is a fistful of lunar dust meaningful to the 17 million Americans who, we are told, go to bed hungry each night?

Is a pathway to the moon more vital than a highway system devoid of the slaughter which now claims 40,000 lives annually?

Is seeing the other side of the moon more important than seeing our children free of leukemia?

Of what value are the charts of the moon to the 129 Americans now entombed in an uncharted ocean?

Is being there first more important than insuring an adequate water source for our great metropolitan centers?

Is applying our national intellect to a moon race more valid than educating our heirs so they can become useful, productive members of society?

Is putting a man on the moon more important than developing techniques for making use of our stored natural resources?

Is manned lunar flight of more value than bringing order to a world of emerging nations?

The United States has been committed to a race for the moon, partly at least due to our own emotional drive always to be first, always to be best in whatever we try. This race, for which the prize is perhaps a propaganda triumph over the Soviets will cost us up to $40 billion (estimates vary from day to day and scientist to scientist).

Top priority has been assigned to Project Apollo, our moon shot, designed to place three astronauts on the moon before the end of this decade. Priority decisions are political and are not made by the scientists and technicians.

For momentary transcendence over the Soviet Union we have pledged our wealth, national talent, and our honor.

IN SUPPORT OF MANNED LUNAR EXPLORATION

Those in favor of a crash program and an all-out immediate effort to place an American on the moon during this decade usually support their belief with four basic advantages to be gained. These are:

1. Military: It is maintained that the first nation to explore and "conquer" the moon will have a distinct military advantage. It is pointed out that missiles located on the moon would dominate the entire terrestrial globe. It is also pointed out that the moon would serve as a large stable observation post from which the "conquering" nation could observe freely and accurately all happenings on earth.

2. Propaganda: The proponents of speeded-up manned lunar exploration maintain that the propaganda advantage for the first nation placing one of its citizens on the moon would be tremendous and lasting. The United States, they say, cannot afford to allow any other country to obtain this advantage over us. The shock to the free world, they say, would be permanent and traumatic if the Soviets were to accomplish this manned exploration before the United States. By inference, they say that the same thing would be true of the Communist bloc should the United States be first.

3. Technological fallout: This phase describes the side-effect benefits to science and humanity through the experiments and the research necessary to place a man or men on the moon. These side effects, the proponents maintain, involve all fields of scientific endeavor, medicine, communications, radiation, astronomy, etc. For example, they point out, the communications system which will be necessary to maintain contact between our lunar explorers and earth will greatly enhance the on-earth communications network. The facts which we learn in this research will ultimately benefit the homeowner who wants to telephone the grocery store.

4. Scientific advantage: This is perhaps the most important of the arguments by the proponents of a crash lunar race. The immediate data brought back by our space travelers is not the essential scientific gain. It is pointed out that earth's atmosphere so interferes with light rays that our astronomers are seriously handicapped in their efforts to study the universe around us. There is no atmosphere on the moon and therefore the astronomers could set up the kind of observatory which would enable human eyes to penetrate many millions of light years beyond our present limitation. This, proponents say, would enable mankind to unlock many more of the doors which have barred us from knowing and understanding what has been going on and is going on in the far reaches of outer space. This, they say, obviously would permit us to make even further gains in exploring space and new worlds.

IN OPPOSITION TO A CRASH PROGRAM

There is a body of American and European scientific thought which discounts the four basic arguments as reasons for a crash program to place an American, or for that matter a Soviet, citizen on the moon. Their arguments generally run like this:

1. Military: Scientists point out that a missile placed on the moon and aimed at an earth target is 240,000 miles away. It is, they say, infinitely more difficult to place a warhead on target and any slight miscalculation could be disastrous. These scientists also say that the cost of such a missile is approximately a thousand times more than a missile located on earth. As for observation, astronomers who oppose the crash moon exploration program say that 240,000 miles of space makes the kind of observation necessary for military surveillance very difficult, even impossible.

Another significant and perhaps imperative consideration is the effect upon our national defense program caused by the diversion of electronic and missile experts to the far outer space probes.

Many maintain it is essential that the U.S. produce and stockpile the most efficient and reliable system of intercontinental ballistic missiles to guarantee the security of the United States and the free world from any conceivable aggressive move.

At the present time this has not been accomplished to the satisfaction of many military experts.

Intrinsic prudence, according to some, demands that we concentrate on the development of families of missiles operating in the suborbital and orbital areas rather than to devote such a large proportion of our effort to lunar shots.

To allow the Soviet Union to dominate the atmosphere 100 miles above the earth's surface while we seek to put a man on the moon could be, in the opinion of many, a fatal error.

2. Propaganda: Opponents of the crash program concede that there would be momentary advantage to whichever nation first lands a manned spacecraft on the moon. However, they note that after the Alan Shepard suborbital flight, there was only a temporary exhilaration in the United States; and this same held true for the John Glenn orbital flight. World reaction, they say,

soon cooled off after both the Soviet triumphs and the American exploits. This orbiting of the earth, they point out, has become practically routine. The same reaction, they say, will prevail after the first enthusiasm engendered by a landing on the moon. They feel it is hardly worth $40 billion to get a few weeks of headlines.

3. Technological fallout: Opponents of the crash program maintain that this is highly overrated. Dr. Philip H. Abelson, editor of Science magazine, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in an April 19 editorial had this to say: "The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has sought examples of technological fallout in its program. To date, those cited have not been impressive. The problems of space are different from the earthly tax-paying economy."

Others in the scientific field have contended that whatever fallout occurs is more than offset by the tremendous raid on the scientists and technicians being made in the name of Project Apollo. A group of scientists is quoted in hearings before the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences (transcript of hearings, Apr. 24, 1963, p. 26) as saying that if NASA's program is carried out "at least 60 percent of the men in the physical sciences will be working as Government employees for NASA." This point was argued and NASA spokesmen conceded the figure would be between 7 and 10 percent. Even this lower figure, scientists say, may cripple efforts in other vital fields of research.

4. Scientific advantage: Here, even opponents of the crash program concede, lies the only major benefit to be achieved. However, they point out that, as does Mr. Polycarp Kusch, Nobel laureate in physics at Columbia University, "instrument exploration is almost certainly more effective and cheaper." Instruments are more accurate than humans, and are more sensitive to light, heat, and cold than would be a spaceman in his insulated, pressurized suit. Dr. Kusch adds: "I'd rather see us explore space in a more temperate and well-thought-out way."

5. Lack of order: Opponents to our crash program point out that in our exploration of outer space we must be careful not to make the same mistake that apparently has been made in the development of atomic power. In this field, instead of proceeding in a scientific orderly fashion by constructing and testing various types of atomic reactors, we hastily began to install in populated areas uneconomic and perhaps hazardous reactors just so we could brag that we were producing electricity through atomic fission. The billions of dollars thus far expended in this area undoubtedly would have vastly enriched our knowledge of reactor technology and perhaps even produced a safe economical product (which we do not now have) if more orderly scientific procedures had been used.

Summing up, opponents to a $20 to $40 billion crash lunar program maintain that the arguments for such a program are either specious or not important. They do say that eventually man, if he follows an orderly and logical course, will reach the moon. However, they contend that there is no hurry and that it would be a lot less costly, and far greater values would accrue to mankind, if we take it easy and try to accomplish our ultimate purpose step by step. We have by no means exhausted the scientific gains to be made from orbital flights and space platforms. Crash program opponents suggest that instead of putting all of our wealth into Project Apollo we concentrate on developing an orderly approach to space exploration and try to assimilate some of the scientific data which we have already acquired through such projects as Mariner II.

In connection with Mariner II the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has admitted to the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee that most of the scientific data acquired has not been distributed. As far as the general public is concerned, all we know now with greater certainty about Venus, that we didn't know a year ago, is that Venus is hot. A great deal of valuable information was sent back to earth by the spacecraft but only NASA scientists have had access to this information to date.

Scientists who oppose the lunar exploration race also make the point that five Ranger shots at the moon by the United States have failed. Their contention is that only second-rate technicians have been used for the Ranger program because all of the top, good scientists have been put on Project Apollo.

To date NASA has spent approximately $8 billion. Over $4 billion has been spent on the Apollo project, much of it devoted to building a rocket, the Saturn series, which at best is not as good as a 6-year-old Russian rocket which first put a sputnik in orbit.

By the end of fiscal year 1964, NASA will have spent $8.6 billion on Apollo and we will still be a long way from the moon. NASA administrators maintain total cost of Apollo will be about $20 billion. They say that the heavy construction costs are in the past and that a great deal of basic research—very expensive research—has already been done. NASA's budget has doubled each year under the Kennedy administration, from $1.8 billion in fiscal 1962 to $5.7 billion in fiscal 1964. NASA's budget is now fourth largest for the Federal Government, trailing only those for Defense, Treasury, and Agriculture.

This $5.7 billion figure represents one-twentieth of our total Federal budget. In other words, of every $100 our Government spends for all purposes, $5.75 goes for the moon race.

NASA's 1964 budget exceeds by over $1 billion the total Federal budget for 1933 ($4.5 billion) and exceeds by $500 million the total receipts of our Government in 1940 ($5.1 billion).

Of each year's budget, approximately $3.9 billion will be spent for Apollo. It is hard, administrators say, to see how this money can physicaly be spent. Scientists, they say, will be sitting on one another's laps.

NASA concedes that there may be some duplication between what it is trying to accomplish and what the Department of Defense is doing. It also concedes that there has not been adequate communication between the two agencies. For instance, medical test centers for astronomers are being operated by Defense and new ones will be constructed by NASA. The Senate committee was puzzled as to why one such center couldn't do for both.

It was also brought out in hearings in late April that NASA plans to build its own navy. The agency told the committee it needed three communications ships at a cost of $30 million each located at strategic points around the globe to track and contact the Apollo astronauts on their long day's journey to the moon. The Senators asked agency spokesmen if they had ever considered contacting the Department of Defense to see if perhaps some of our surplus naval vessels might not be adequate for the job. Subsequently, a Defense Department spokesman told the committee that the Navy could provide five tracking ships completely adequate for the job at a total cost of $80 million. NASA will have its navy, a bigger one than originally planned but at a saving of $10 million to the taxpayer.

This example, according to both scientists and business administrators demonstrates the kind of waste which must be present in a vast, crash program of any kind, whether in space, oceanography, or in atomic energy.

Opponents of Apollo also contend that there is a serious danger that the pathway to the moon may become America's own Maginot Line.

PROBLEMS IN SEARCH OF A SOLUTION

As the world moves through the 20th century, new and perplexing problems have developed in every field of endeavor. On many of these we have been working for generations but have yet to find the answers.

The problems are not new, but have been complicated by an expanding and more mobile population. The shift from a predominantly rural to an urban society has brought with it new medical, technical, and social problems to both the urban centers and the abandoned rural areas. Increasing lifespan has introduced all the problems concerning the aged.

Many civic and scientific leaders feel that these problems have an equal right with moon travel to the best talent available in this country. It is their contention that without resolving these problems on earth, lunar exploration will have little ultimate meaning.

Unlike the ocean tides, the ebb and flow of human problems are not controlled by the moon and neither should be their solutions.

In outlining some of the basic problems of our civilization, no advocacy of large government spending programs is intended. However, within the framework of fiscal responsibility, these problems should, perhaps, be examined side by side with the moon shot program. It is felt by many scientists, among them most of the American Nobel Prize winners, that there are other areas as important to the future of the United States as a crash program of lunar exploration. Among the problems:

DISEASE

It has been estimated that 40 million Americans now alive will die of cancer. This disease is not new nor are its dangers unrecognized.

The fiscal 1964 Federal budget for cancer research totals $145 million. This is equivalent to the cost of four Saturn V rocket motors. Each of these motors will flame for 2 minutes and then be forever lost.

One of every four hospital beds in the United States is today occupied by someone who is mentally ill. Some few of them can today expect to return to a normal life and to take up once again their duties and responsibilities in society. Too few of them will ever become useful citizens again unless a first-rate program of research and development is pushed on a national level and pushed hard.

For fiscal 1964 mental health programs in the National Institutes of Health will receive $190 million. This is equivalent to the rocket motors alone for six Saturns to be used eventually to put three men on the moon.

Each year in the United States alone 900,000 persons die of heart diseases.

There are 10 million Americans now suffering from some form of heart disease.

The National Government through the National Heart Institute in 1964 will spend approximately $13 for each of these Americans to develop cures, new surgical techniques and new medicines. The fiscal 1964 budget for the National Heart Institute is $133 million, the equivalent of three or four Saturn rocket firings with a total useful life of 8 minutes.

Some scientists and medical men of sound reputation feel that far too many of our medical researchers are being channeled into a space medicine program devoting their undivided attention to developing safeguards

for a handful of astronauts while the medical sciences are not devoting enough time or talent to find solutions to diseases now killing or crippling millions of men, women, and children in our own country and even greater numbers in other parts of the world.

EDUCATION

During the decade in which we are concentrating our national wealth in getting three men to the moon, 7.5 million young Americans will enter society without a high school education and thus without the basic skills needed to become productive citizens with a secure future.

For these 7.5 million, the future will be a long struggle on the brink of economic and social disaster.

For these 7.5 million Americans the moon will only deepen the shadow in which they will walk.

Our Government's space race effort in fiscal 1964 will spend in 5 days the total proposed budget for vocational education of all types. While willing to spend $15 million daily on the space race, the Government has recommended a total vocational education budget of $73 million.

It is difficult for many educators and scientists to equate the hoped-for benefits to be gained from being first on the moon with the obvious benefits to human individuals and our Nation as a whole if these 7.5 million young people could be educated to take their place in society, to add to our economy, rather than be a burden on it. We either have to employ them, or through some social welfare program, provide for them.

NUCLEAR WASTE

Among the most serious problems facing us today is the one involving the question of what to do about the waste products of the world's nuclear programs.

As nuclear programs expand, the problem becomes more serious and the potential for disaster more pressing. We have stored in this country alone nuclear waste with a radioactive capacity approximately equal to 200 million grams of radium.

Scientists concerned with this problem point out that few top-quality scientists are assigned to the problem. In our society garbage disposal, although essential, is neither glamorous nor well paying.

In this particular case, however, such disposal is vital to civilization's future.

WATER RESOURCES

By the time, at decade's end, a moon traveler has reached his goal, many American urban centers will be in serious trouble. Some of our cities already face a serious water problem; for most of our major cities this problem will be of crisis proportions within a very few years. The problem is not uniquely American but affects most nations and cities of the world.

To meet this problem we may well have to turn to the seas around us to develop an economic and workable method of extracting potable water through a desalinization process. So far, every process developed either through Government research or by private enterprise has been far too costly.

Experts in the area estimate it will cost in the vicinity of $110 million for basic research by 1970. This is exclusive of actual equipment costs for cities facing water shortages.

One week of our moon race expense would cover a 5-year saline water development program—and possibly save our drought-confronted cities.

CONCLUSION

The problems outlined here have not gone unnoticed by the Kennedy administration. They are obviously of concern to the President and his top advisers.

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges has pointed out that the Federal Government spends more than $15 billion a year for research, of which more than three-quarters goes for defense and space work. He added: "The national research and development effort is not the incubator of demand and productivity increases that people think it is, or that the country needs for a growing, healthy economy."

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, the President's top science adviser, last August, told a House committee that "military research is pricing private research out of existence."

In his Economic Report to the Congress this past January, President Kennedy said: "The Federal Government is already the main source of financial support for research and development in the United States. The defense, space, and atomic energy activities of the country absorb about two-thirds of the trained people available for exploring our scientific and technical frontiers. * * * In the course of meeting specific challenges so brilliantly, we have paid a price by sharply limiting the scarce scientific and engineering resources available to the civilian sectors of the American economy."

This problem of where and how the total national scientific intellect should be utilized is one of serious proportions, both now and for the future.

Manifestly the ultimate responsibility for administrative decisions in the space program lies in the hands of the President of the United States. It is his duty to assert leadership in this area.

A decision must be made as to whether Project Apollo is vital to our national security or merely an excursion, however interesting, into space research.

If our vital security is not at stake, a less ambitious program may be logical and desirable. Greater emphasis might be placed on the multitude of human problems we face here on earth. Since our resources in dollars and manpower are not inexhaustible, the entire question becomes a matter of priority.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the August 1963 Reader's Digest]

WE'RE RUNNING THE WRONG RACE WITH RUSSIA

Some weeks ago in Washington, D.C., a number of prominent politicians were asked this question: "What, in your view, is the most urgent project facing the United States today?" Without hesitation each named the moon shot, costliest—perhaps $40 billion can pay for it—most dramatic and most complicated program ever to be waved along with so much support from Congress and the White House. Added one Congressman: "The prestige of pioneering that maiden voyage across outer space will be incalculable. Whatever the cost, we've got to beat the Russians to the moon."

The sincerity of these replies is not in question. What is sending shivers up the spines of topflight military advisers is the assumption (shared, due to the flamboyant publicity, by millions of U.S. citizens) that the nation which achieves the first moon landing will automatically become top dog.

This is wildly dangerous thinking. It is dangerous because it ignores the warning that our military have tried to drive home to civilian planners from the very first conception of a moon shoot; i.e., in lavishing our money and scientific brainpower on the effort to beat the Russians to the moon, we run the grave risk of losing the free world's battle for survival.

To understand why, we must understand the difference between inner space and outer space. These two zones relate quite differently to our security.

Outer space engulfs the limitless reaches of the universe, an infinite void in which billions of planets and celestial bodies spin rhythmically. Project Apollo is beamed at reaching the nearest of these bodies, the moon, 238,800 miles away—much more by the curved path spacecraft must take. A landing on its bleak and inhospitable surface will indeed bring fame to the nation which first accomplishes this feat, glory greater even than scaling Mt. Everest. It will be a triumph for man's indomitable spirit of adventure; but, from the very remoteness of the moon, it can have little or no military consequence.

Inner space is the term used to represent that belt 100 to 500 miles above us recently invaded by the astronauts and manmade satellites. Since the appearance 6 years ago of Sputnik I, at least 134 satellites have occupied inner space, and 57 of them are still in orbit, some Russian, more American. Whoever is first to dominate this critical area will from then on occupy the driver's seat in world affairs.

The reason is this: Before long, before any moon-landing can be achieved by either Russia or the United States, it will be possible to introduce into inner space armed satellites capable of extinguishing any country below in a matter of seconds. Marshal Sergei S. Biryuzov, commanding Russia's strategic rocket forces, promises categorically that Soviet rockets could be launched from satellites "at any desirable time and at any point in the satellite trajectory."

The danger to the free world lies in the profound difference in national objectives. The stated policy of the U.S. space program, as put forth by the President, is that it is "for peaceful purposes." To that end we have developed weather and communications satellites, and have kept our sights steadfastly on a moon adventure. The Russian effort, on the other hand, is first, last and unblushingly military. The Soviet Union is therefore racing to win inner space, the only element in which it is still unopposed; where, unlike land, air, on and beneath the sea, it is not confronted by formidable deterrence.

For 6 years Russian satellites have been designed with this goal in view. Four or five times larger than ours (astronauts can move around inside them), vostoks are built specifically for weight carrying. Already they can lift off, and orbit with loads much heavier than any we can carry. Already they have contrived a rendezvous between two vostoks, have shot an astronaut through 81 consecutive orbits and placed one directly above both our National Capital and our heartland.

If this is not sufficient to ring alarm bells, we have Khrushchev's warning that vostoks can "carry other freight than man. We will hold a sword of Damocles above the earth." If we remain high-mindedly wedded to our policy of peaceful purposes, our vast reservoir of native horsesense drugged with moonshine, he may well live to see his prophecy fulfilled.

What makes a reappraisal of our inner-space objectives of imperative concern is the fact that right now an atomic development of immense military significance is taking place. It is this:

The Russians have recently achieved an increase in the effectiveness of nuclear explosions so devastating that it dwarfs all previous records. Confirming this, our own atomic experts have warned that such stupendous forces, let loose above us from a satellite, could, in a few seconds, literally cremate a large part of the United States. There would be nothing left below, no man, beast, vegetation, buildings, nothing at all but the glare of white-hot cinders.

In face of such a dire threat, it must come as a stunning shock to all thoughtful Americans to learn that the United States has no top-priority programs beamed at preventing, anticipating, or deterring such a terrifying prospect. Our top priorities are all tied up with steamrollering through the moon shot. Many billions of public money, together with the rich cream of scientific talent, are lavished on an effort that could well be aborted in midstride by Soviet enterprise and realism.

There is a crying need for a reappraisal of our space aims, for more specific public information, especially since statements from those highly placed in Washington are so contradictory that they blur rather than clarify our understanding. Less than a year ago, for instance, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara declared that "attack from enemy satellites is not a very likely threat for the immediate future. At the present time we see no advantage to space-based systems."

On the other hand, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, tough-minded Chief of the U.S. Air Force, expressed a different view before the House Armed Services Committee: "the Russian space program is entirely military. I am sure that space systems will come."

Evidently small heed was paid to Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert's expressed dissatisfaction with "the tone and pace of our military space program," since 8 months later we find C. D. Perkins, former Deputy Air Force Secretary for Research and Development, complaining that "our military space programs are floundering badly."

Unlike Americans, the people of Russia have no such reasons for confusion. One of their leading strategists, Marshal V. D. Sokolovsky, has summed up the situation for them simply and concisely: "An important problem now is warfare with artificial earth satellites, which can be launched for diverse reasons, even as carriers of nuclear weapons."

How serious is this Russian threat?

First, their achievement of a vast increase in nuclear power, which could be directed against us via inner space, is technically feasible. Scientists tell us that given enough raw material there is no reason why bombs of unlimited power cannot be made. We have only to look at the record. The Hiroshima uranium bomb, which destroyed a city and caused 200,000 casualties, had a force of 20 kilotons—each kiloton equals 1,000 tons of TNT. Next came the hydrogen bomb, increasing the explosive factor of the Hiroshima weapon by 1,000 times—its power is reckoned in megatons, each equal to 1 million tons of TNT.

Now something even more sinister has occurred. In 1961 the Russians, violating the test moratorium, exploded a 55- to 60-megaton bomb. "You do not have 50- or 100-megaton bombs," exulted Khrushchev. "We have stronger than 100 megatons." (That is more than 5,000 times the strength of the Hiroshima bomb.)

Why, speculated the West, was this fantastically powerful bomb detonated? The answer came in a terrifying revelation by famed mathematician Dr. Donald G. Brennan, head of the Hudson Institute in Harmon-on-Hudson, N.Y., and associate of key atomic physicist, Dr. Herman Kahn.

Brennan said in part: The possibility of orbital weapons covers a great range. They could be aimed chiefly at the cities, in which case they would have relatively modest yields in the region of 1 megaton. "Another possibility that appears much more disturbing would involve placing in orbit a limited number of devices of very large yield, a few of 100 megatons or more, which could be detonated at orbital altitude rather than being brought down to earth. The thermal effect from such a high-yield device could set fire to a large fraction of the continent."

Air Force-Space Digest magazine, the highly informed voice of the Air Force, rammed home the same point: "It is possible to place very large-yield devices in orbit which have virtually instantaneous delivery time. Detonated at orbital altitude, such a weapon could set fire to a large part of the United States."

Atomic speedup has thus reached this frightening climax: an aggressor nation can orbit satellites carrying unimaginable power, which can be triggered simply by a remote radio key. Set off above our heartland, the explosion would generate heat as incandescent as the sun's—but with this difference: the heat would strike not from a source 93 million miles distant, but from merely 150 miles away, incinerating hundreds of thousands of square miles in a single flash without any possibility of warning. Precision of target aim is no longer a factor.

What are we going to do about it? Efforts to bring about an end to nuclear testing have been sabotaged consistently by the Soviet Union; so have Western efforts, initiated in 1960, to achieve the prohibition of all orbital weapons for mass destruction. Have we any alternative but to take the most immediate and realistic steps to protect the safety of the free world?

Here are the measures urged by military planners:

Perfect a method of detecting foreign satellites wherever they may appear. At present our ballistic missile early warning system (BMEWS) is tied to weapons that might show up in northern latitudes. We need a globe-girdling system, scanning all directions and sufficiently accurate to pinpoint a satellite so that we could send up a defensive vehicle to intercept it.

Pioneer inspector satellites, poised on launching pads and ready to lift off within minutes. Our moonshot experimental firings have been dependent on one big launching pad, Canaveral, and curtain-raising preliminaries there have required as many as 68 days. We must acquire the same hair-trigger, round-the-clock alertness that we have achieved with our nuclear bombers, missiles and submarines.

Place human observers in inner space. Despite radar systems, computers and other electronic miracles, science has still not come up with anything equal to the intelligence and judgment of a man. The Russians have already pointed the way to interception by bringing their vostoks so close together that the two astronauts could actually see each other. The next stage must include lock-on, perhaps by magnetic means, and physical inspection of the enemy satellite.

Achieve means of destroying, disarming or diverting a satellite if it is armed. In World War II British pilots pioneered a means of diverting London-heading V-1's, nudging the buzz-bombs with their wing tips to angle them away from the target into open country. To destroy a satellite would be infinitely more subtle and complicated, but scientists believe that they could be destroyed by electronics or radiation or even be directed back to their point of origin.

Coupled to all these precautions we must establish deterrence inside inner space, fortifying it with armed satellites of our own capable of confronting an aggressor with matching destructive force. Deterrent strength is the overwhelming reason our bombers and missiles have been able to preserve the peace despite incessant Soviet threat and belligerence.

Form a top-level space commission to redefine priorities and activate these measures so that defense comes before exploration.

It is futile to assume that the imagination-capturing moon program will aid us herein. Knowledge of tremendous value is being gained, but national defense against a hostile, racing Soviet Union has more urgent and exacting requirements than the peaceful exploration of space.

The urgent importance of an effective inner-space military program has aroused a storm of controversy in Washington. Representative ROBERT WILSON, chairman of the Republican advisory committee for space and aeronautics, has declared, "The administration's negligence in military space development is a disastrous course for the future of America," and his alarm is echoed by such noted Senators as BARRY GOLDWATER and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, both members of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Nor can their criticisms be dismissed as partisan politics; as much alarm or more is being voiced by Democratic leaders such as Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL (chairman of the same committee), Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, and Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, head of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

The warning of top military planners could hardly be more emphatic. Here is what two of the front rankers have to say: Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, Deputy Chief of Air Force Research and Development, which has the prime responsibility for keeping ahead of Russia: "The most lethal threat posed against the United States today is missiles through space. Space is no longer remote. We wish to operate both manned and unmanned systems in the near-earth environment. Our objectives include detection, tracking, inspecting and means of disabling hostile satellites."

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay: "We must not risk the danger of waiting for the enemy to demonstrate capability before we undertake development of our own. The visible threat requires a vigorous military program."

Luckily, we do not have to start from scratch. A military space program does exist. We also have a magnificent instrument in NASA, and we have the hard-won experience of our astronauts.

The greatest practical difficulty is cost. The price of accelerating the military occupation of inner space would be about a billion dollars this year, with more to follow. This is far less than NASA is spending on outer-space experimentation. A reallocation of funds in view of present dangers will undoubtedly be necessary.

The safety of our country and of the free world commands top priority, and no other project, however sensational, should be allowed to compromise security.

It is the duty of all Americans to ponder the words of Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of MIT and adviser to the White House, when he surveyed the advance of missile systems: "This is one race we dare not lose."

CONFLICT OF INTEREST—TFX INQUIRY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of today appears an editorial entitled "Conflict of Interest," which suggests that Navy Secretary Korth should have "been more sensitive about the possible reproaches of impropriety" in the TFX case and that "it would have been better, in this case, if Secretary Korth had passed this particular decision to a subordinate or a superior."

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

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 31, 1963]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The testimony given the TFX inquiry of the Senate Committee on Governmental Operations has not disclosed that Secretary of

the Navy Fred Korth would profit by the contract award to General Dynamics or that he would suffer any loss if the award were not made. That would seem to dispose of the conflict-of-interest matter, so far as the technicalities are concerned.

In the conduct of Government officials, however, there are matters of impropriety that do not ascend to the level of conflict of interest. In this case, one cannot help but wish that the Navy Secretary had been more sensitive about the possible reproaches of impropriety. He knew that the bank of which he had been the president had made a loan to General Dynamics. And he knew that he still held stock in the bank. This implies no direct financial interest in the rise or fall of General Dynamics. It is inconceivable that he would have been governed in a matter where the Defense Department interest was so large by a personal consideration in which private interest was so indirect and so relatively remote and small.

The Government cannot hope to recruit men of large affairs to handle its major departments and enterprises without resorting to the world of private business where managerial capacity of this kind is to be found. It is wise to begin with the premise and to start with the assumption that such men will have to deal, frequently, with matters that touch their past commercial affiliations, their present private interests, or their future business prospects. In these cases, the individual officeholders ought to regard that even remote connection as the occasion for disqualification. It would have been better, in this case, if Secretary Korth had passed this particular decision to a subordinate or a superior.

FRENCH-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Sioux City Journal of July 31, 1963, appeared an editorial entitled "A Fence in Need of Mending," which draws attention to the fact that France is our oldest ally; that Mr. de Gaulle's intransigence which has made its appearance on several occasions in the past year or two, is not without some reason; and that it would behoove our Government to seek a way out of difficulties presently existing between the two countries. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Sioux City Journal, July 31, 1963]

A FENCE IN NEED OF MENDING

Although Washington naturally does not appreciate President de Gaulle's refusal to join the test ban treaty, his remarks on that subject make a good deal of sense. And the tone of his press conference was anything but truculent or anti-American.

On the contrary, the general dwelt at some length on the historic Franco-American ties, reaffirmed France's determination to be at the side of the United States if war should come, and expressed sympathy for such current U.S. problems as the balance-of-payments deficit. All this hardly conforms to the picture, sometimes painted by officials in this country, of a man almost impossible to deal with and seemingly bent on weakening the Western alliance.

As for the test ban, the French President said it has France's approval, especially if it turns out to be a starting point for broader agreements. By itself, however, the agreement among the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union changes nothing about the threat of nuclear war; the two nuclear superpowers' capacity to annihilate the world remains undiminished. In such circumstances, General de Gaulle believes it is in France's interest to continue its own nuclear weapons development.

That position seems to us neither illogical nor unduly skeptical. Indeed, skepticism about Soviet intentions is even more essential here, if this Nation is to avoid the fateful pitfalls of past dealings with the Kremlin.

The French position also seems to us one which the U.S. Government can gracefully live with. It is unfair and insulting to compare it, as some are doing, with the homicidal belligerence of the Red Chinese; they reject the test ban for the opposite reason, because it might possibly reduce East-West tensions and the likelihood of war.

In all the bickering with France, United States diplomacy has by no means been free of fault; sometimes it has seemed to go out of its way to aggravate the difficulties. Now would be an appropriate time, while we seek a more peaceful relationship with a self-declared enemy, to work for a better understanding with our oldest ally.

LITTLE SIOUX RIVER FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, my county of Woodbury, Iowa, is the leading county in the State of Iowa when it comes to soil conservation work, and certainly one of the leading counties in the entire Nation. The county has several watersheds on which soil and water conservation work has been done. One of those exists on the Little Sioux River in the vicinity of Anthon, Iowa.

An example of how this has benefited the community and surrounding territory is set forth in an editorial published in the Anthon Herald on June 5, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that this splendid editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMMENT

(By Violet Lundquist)

Flood control and preventive medicine have much in common. When either one is completely effective, nothing happens. Unfortunately, there is nothing dramatic about a community enjoying an entire summer without one case of polio for example. Even here in Anthon we tend to forget that a decade ago every family lived in terror throughout the summer due to this dread disease. The fortunate ones were those who were only afraid. Some families felt the full cruel force of the disease itself.

This past Saturday evening the rainfall in Anthon totaled 6¾ inches. Although water may have washed into a few basements, no flooding occurred in town.

What a similar downpour would have done to the town 10 years ago, prior to the watershed work, isn't hard to imagine. Muddy waters from the inadequate drainage ditch would have spilled over onto the streets, into basements and possibly onto buildings and houses. The ditch itself would have become so clogged with silt that another cleanout would have been imperative, although the town was limited by law on the amount of money it could expend for this purpose.

For the benefit of more recent arrivals in Anthon I can report that it took much effort, time and money to convince all groups concerned that Federal funds should be expended on the Anthon watershed to hold the fast-running water back in the hills. It was a cause which some of us brought to officials on the district level, to the State, to the regional office in Milwaukee, and even to our Nation's Capital.

We cited examples of the ruinous floods of 1951, we showed pictures of it, we described the adverse effect of such flash floods on the future of Anthon, we told of the wholehearted cooperation of the farmers within the Anthon watershed to do their part.

We were jubilant when we saw the effect of the first hard rain after the water-retaining structures had been constructed. The ditch did not run even half full. Nor was there any silt deposited in the bed of the ditch.

We were so pleased, so happy, so grateful that the Little Sioux River flood control program's efforts in Anthon had been so successful. We thought we would always remember how terrible it had been before the watershed was constructed.

Alas, we forget. We tend to take hard-won blessings for granted. More recent settlers here are not even aware of the constant flood threat which used to hang over Anthon.

Wouldn't it be worthwhile for each of us to take a brief look again at the structures west of Anthon which retard the runoff water from the hills so they can proceed into the drainage ditch in unhurried fashion?

Those water-retaining devices, plus the terraces on the upland acres, stand as sentinels keeping watch over us, our homes and businesses down here in the valley.

THE GREAT GRAIN ROBBERY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Mason City Globe-Gazette appeared a lead editorial entitled "The Great Grain Robbery." The editorial comments on the disclosures which took place on the floor of the Senate recently, on the part of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE GREAT GRAIN ROBBERY

The loss of 24 million bushels of grain somewhere between the United States and Austria is being treated as casually as a raid in a watermelon patch.

The grain was valued at $32 million. That should count for something.

And it took 3 years to find out the grain was gone. That should provide a conversational kernel.

After all, the celebrated Brink's armored car robbery of 1950 involved a measly $1,200,000 and it got lots of international attention.

Just what did happen to the grain?

Well, nobody seems to know for sure. More than a year ago it was discovered by an agricultural attaché in Austria that only 16 million bushels of grain had reached that country between 1959 and 1962, while 40 million bushels supposedly had been shipped.

This triggered a quiet investigation that didn't get into the open until Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, made a speech about it recently.

Iowa's Senator JACK MILLER also was interested. He sent a letter of inquiry by special messenger to the Agriculture Department on June 4, but still hadn't received an answer a month later.

"So far the silence has been deafening," reported MILLER, wryly.

There has been some small intelligence. Seven Austrian grain importers are awaiting trial on charges of mislabeling or diverting the grain to other countries.

The State Department says no American official is to blame—and the United States did get bartered goods in return.

The Agriculture Department adds that it intends to make sure such shipments reach their destinations in the future.

This is nice.

But it doesn't answer questions that should be answered.

How can such massive shipments disappear and the loss remain undiscovered for such a long period of time?

What officials in the Agriculture Department or the State Department, or both, are responsible for grain barter transactions?

What do these officials say about the incredible heist?

Surely the American taxpayer has a right to hear the explanation rather than a brief dismissal on the grounds that no Americans are involved.

Senator WILLIAMS wants a Senate investigation. It should be ordered. The Agriculture Department investigation, supposedly still in progress, hasn't told much as yet.

COMMON MARKET IMPORT RESTRICTIONS ON U.S. POULTRY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President at long last the Kennedy administration appears to be moving to take action as the result of the Common Market's refusal to lower import restrictions on U.S. poultry. It is too bad that the administration did not "leak" this intent sooner because it could have had a bearing on discussions which took place and are taking place in Europe. I would like to remind Senators that on February 21 of this year, I, along with several other Members of Congress, became so alarmed over the developments that we dispatched a telegram to the President in which we urged that immediate action be taken to contact the Council of Ministers of the European Common Market to make clear that Common Market gate prices, supplemental levies, and variable levies placed on U.S. poultry products were highly discriminatory and would freeze out our poultry export trade to Common Market nations. We also urged further that unless this action was rescinded we would take retaliatory action in line with the policy on this point clearly set forth in the trade expansion bill passed in the last session of Congress.

On March 14, I took the floor of the Senate to again warn that the discriminatory action against our poultry exports would destroy a $50 million annual poultry export business unless this Administration took prompt retaliatory action. I suggested that failure of the administration to act would be an open invitation to the Common Market to take similar action against beef and other agricultural exports from this country.

I only hope that the "may curb" headlines in today's newspapers, reflecting possibly Administration action, will be translated into actuality. I ask unanimous consent that two articles bearing on this matter—one from the New York Times, entitled "United States Will Counter Common Market on a Tariff Rise," and the other from the Wall Street Journal, entitled "White House May Curb Trade Concessions to Common Market as Retaliatory Move"—be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, July 31, 1963]

UNITED STATES WILL COUNTER COMMON MARKET ON A TARIFF RISE—READY TO START LEGAL STEPS TOWARD RETALIATORY ACTION ON POULTRY IMPORTS—WASHINGTON REBUFFED—CALL FOR REVERSAL OF POLICY HURTING SALES TO GERMANS TURNED DOWN BY BLOC

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, July 30.—The United States is nearly ready to initiate retaliatory action against the European Economic Community for the tariff increases that have blocked almost all exports of American poultry to West Germany.

Government officials indicated that preliminary legal steps would be taken in the next few days.

The decision to act was made today, officials said, after it became clear that the European Economic Community, or Common Market, would not reverse its earlier policy on the tariff on chickens, which is regarded here as a test case for all U.S. agricultural exports to the Common Market.

The Council of Ministers of the Common Market rejected the U.S. request for a reversal of the policy at a meeting in Brussels today.

LOSS PUT AT $46 MILLION

Retaliation would come after a series of legal steps required under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). It would take the form of a tariff or other measures that would exclude from the United States imports from the Common Market area equal in value to the exports of American chickens that have been excluded from the Common Market. The United States says that the loss runs to $46 million a year.

The members of the Common Market are France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

Because some of these countries never did import much American chicken, the recent tariff changes had important consequences only in the case of West Germany. There the effect has been to make American chickens more expensive than those raised anywhere inside the Common Market.

MEASURES UNDECIDED

The precise form U.S. retaliation would take has apparently not yet been decided. Officials stressed, however, that they would take care to follow to the letter the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in any moves they made.

There is only an outside chance that the United States might not go ahead with retaliatory action, officials said. That would occur if the Council of Ministers were to make a firm promise that it would resolve the problem in a short period of time.

The Council instructed the Common Market's Executive Commission to produce a solution by September, but the United States regards this move as inadequate because the Commission has said that it could not conduct meaningful negotiations with the United States without specific new instructions from the Council, the top governing body of the Common Market.

FEARS RAISED IN UNITED STATES

The poultry issue has raised widespread fears in this country that a number of other U.S. farm products might, in the future, be excluded from the Common Market. The question figured importantly in hearings today before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Committee members closely questioned W. Michael Blumenthal on the problem before voting to approve his nomination as deputy to Christian A. Herter, President Kennedy's special representative for trade negotiations.

Three Democratic Senators who generally support the administration's policy expressed the hope that the United States would insist that the Common Market be left open to American farm products. The three were J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, the chairman; JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Senator SPARKMAN expressed the view that the United States must let the Common Market know "in no uncertain terms that we are prepared to retaliate—that we will retaliate." He asked Mr. Blumenthal whether he agreed with that position and Mr. Blumenthal said that he did.

President Kennedy named today a second deputy to Mr. Herter, William Matson Roth, whose job it will be to assemble information from American industry on the tariff concessions it would like to get from the Common Market in the "Kennedy round" and those it is willing to see the United States give to the Common Market.

Mr. Roth, a San Franciscan, is a member of the board of the Matson Navigation Co., chairman of the board of the Pacific National Life Assurance Co., and a director of a number of other concerns.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 31, 1963]

WHITE HOUSE MAY CURB TRADE CONCESSIONS TO COMMON MARKET AS RETALIATORY MOVE

WASHINGTON.—Kennedy administration officials are moving toward withdrawing some trade concessions as a way of retaliating against the European Common Market's refusal to lower import bars on U.S. poultry.

A key U.S. policymaker said the White House would announce its intentions "in a matter of days."

The administration views the poultry argument as a test of the Common Market's determination to pursue protectionism in agriculture. U.S. exports of poultry to the Common Market totaled $50 million last year, but annual U.S. sales of $400 million altogether in wheat, livestock feeds and poultry are threatened by the six nations' tariff policies.

The discussion of retaliatory action results from the Common Market's rejection of a proposal to lower its poultry tariffs to 10.8 cents a pound from the current 13.5 cents. The rejection is being interpreted here as a sign that the other Common Market members are likely to yield to French President de Gaulle's demand for farm policies that would make the six-nation economic union self-sufficient in grain and meat production.

At his press conference Monday in Paris, General de Gaulle declared.

DISSENSION AMONG MARKET MEMBERS

"It is not worth talking of the European Economic Community if it must be understood that Europe does not obtain its food essentially thanks to its own agricultural products, which can be largely sufficient."

"We gave them until the end of July to come up with a solution to the poultry problem and they didn't do it," a high ranking administration advisor complained. In Congress, Chairman FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said, "If they refuse to take our agricultural products, I don't see how we can possibly avoid retaliation."

The poultry furor points up dissension among Common Market members over agricultural matters. A West German government spokesman, for one, pointedly disagreed with Mr. de Gaulle's proposals. He said, "In matters of European cooperation, the interest of everyone should be considered. The idea of autarchy is not in the Common Market treaty."

Autarchy means economic self-sufficiency. The high-tariff policies required for such self-sufficiency are the antithesis of the freer trade policies enunciated in the 1957 Treaty of Rome, which created the Common Market, made up of West Germany, Italy, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg.

THIRTY DAYS' NOTICE REQUIRED

A retaliation list of imported commodities, both industrial and agricultural, is being prepared by the staff of Christian Herter, the President's chief trade negotiator. It is understood the list includes French wines, German trucks and chemicals from various Common Market lands.

White House advisers emphasized, however, that any trade concessions would be withdrawn only after consultation with domestic industries that might be affected and only after all other probable effects had thoroughly been considered. The concessions that would be withdrawn were granted over the years by the United States under the terms of the 50-nation General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which went into effect in 1948.

Under GATT procedures President Kennedy need only give signatory nations 30 days' notice to withdraw a trade concession. It is understood U.S. policymakers aren't inclined to give the Europeans a chance to reconsider, or to ask merely for compensation from the Common Market for damages suffered as a result of the higher tariff on poultry.

"Whatever we do," explained a Presidential adviser, "we have to remember that under GATT we have to withdraw concessions not only to Common Market nations but to all other GATT countries as well." He said this meant the United States would try to avoid retaliatory measures that might unduly hurt nations outside the Common Market. Thus concessions might be removed on motor vehicles whose description would fit only the German-made trucks.

The United States has been pressing the Common Market to leave the door open to further negotiations on poultry tariffs since August 1, when West Germany, under Common Market tariff policies, abruptly raised duties to about 13.5 cents a pound from 5 cents a pound. West Germany is the principal market for U.S. exports of chicken and turkey.

As a direct result, exports of broilers, the chief poultry commodity sold abroad by the United States, are sagging sharply. Broiler exports fell to 50 million pounds in the January–June period, far below the 107 million pounds exported in the like 1962 months. West Germany usually buys 54 percent of all U.S. poultry exports, but no country-by-country breakdown of exports in the 1963 first half is available yet.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under the previous order, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Friday, August 2, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 31, 1963:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Eugene P. Foley, of Minnesota, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term expiring June 30, 1967.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

James I. Loeb, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea.

Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., U.S. Navy, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

Claude G. Ross, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Central African Republic.

Howard Rex Cottam, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Kuwait.

Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vietnam.

Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Burundi.

W. Michael Blumenthal, of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Dr. Walter Adams, of Michigan, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for a term of 3 years expiring May 11, 1966, and until a successor is appointed and has qualified.

Dr. Mabel M. Smythe, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for a term of 3 years expiring May 11, 1966, and until a successor is appointed and has qualified.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning Francis O. Allen, of Pennsylvania, to be a consul general of the United States of America, and ending Jacob Snyder, of Maryland, to be a consul of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 24, 1963.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 31, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Nahum 1: 7: *The Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble, and He knoweth them that trust in Him.*

Most merciful and gracious God, by whose bountiful providence we are surrounded and sustained, grant that daily we may put our trust in Thy presence and power which will make us equal to every task and responsibility.

May all the nations of the earth be united by the bonds of concord and cooperation in bringing to fulfillment and fruition those noble moral and spiritual values and aspirations which Thou hast planted within the soul of humanity.

Manifest Thy grace and favor to our President, our Speaker, and our Members of Congress as they seek to solve the difficult economic, political, and social problems, and may they be assured that universal peace is not an idle dream but a state of blessedness which Thou hast divinely inspired and ordained.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday 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. 1642. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6016. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. FONG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3872) entitled "An act to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CLARK, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. JAVITS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

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

There was no objection.

GIRLS NATION

Mr. HECHLER. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to use this occasion to call attention to the tremendous contribution which the program of Girls Nation makes to the development of citizenship among our young people.

This program, which brings to Washington, D.C., two outstanding young women from each State in the Union and gives them experience in parliamentary procedure and the principles of citizenship, deserves the highest commendation.

I want to congratulate the representatives of Girls Nation who have been chosen to spend this week in Washington, D.C. The great State of West Virginia sent two outstanding representatives—Miss Jodell Deem, of Parkersburg, W. Va., who has been chosen as secretary of state, and Miss Ruann Ernst, of Beckley, W. Va., who has been elected majority leader. I extend my best wishes to these outstanding young women as they visit the Nation's Capitol.

DEMOCRATIC VICTORY IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in his column of last Monday Fulton Lewis, Jr., wrote:

> President Kennedy, admittedly fearful that his popularity has badly slipped in recent months, will get his first real clue tomorrow night.

He was referring to the special election in Pennsylvania to fill the House vacancy caused by the death of our beloved colleague, Francis E. Walter.

Now we have the clue which came as a surprise and disappointment to Fulton Lewis. If it was a popularity contest, President Kennedy emerged stronger than ever. Yesterday the voters in Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District elected the Democratic candidate, FRED ROONEY.

It was a most significant victory because the odds favored the Republican candidate who ran with the blessing of Gov. William Scranton with big money support from the ultraright wing elements from all over the Nation.

As Fulton Lewis said, Democrat ROONEY pledged himself to the support of the administration. He repeatedly boasts that President Kennedy has endorsed his candidacy. Republicans made foreign policy a major issue and charged the administration with what they call a "do nothing policy."

In a special election, in a close district, timed to favor the Republican candidate, the victory for ROONEY and President Kennedy is most significant. It should also be a clue to Members of Congress who oppose the administration's program to meet the needs of our people and our country.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 107]

Ashley	Griffin	Quillen
Blatnik	Hansen	Rains
Buckley	Healey	Robison
Celler	Hébert	Shelley
Clausen, Don H.	Holifield	Sheppard
Cramer	Johnson, Calif.	Shipley
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Iowa
Duncan	Kee	Snyder
Evins	Macdonald	Taft
Flynt	Martin, Mass.	Teague, Tex.
Fraser	Miller, N.Y.	Willis
Gavin	Moore	Winstead
Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, Ill.	
	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 395 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS—PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE CLAIMS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 453 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill, H.R. 5207, to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the conference report are hereby waived.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, those Members who were listening to the reading of the resolution know that it provides for the consideration of and waives all points of order against the conference report on the Foreign Service buildings and Philippine war damage claims bill. This is an extremely complicated legislative situation with a long history. I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] so that he may explain the details.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Service buildings authorization passed this body almost unanimously, went over to the other body and in the other body there was added an amendment which affected the Philippine war damage claims bill. As you know, the Philippine war damage claims bill was once considered by this House. I led the opposition to it. The House voted it down. Later the House reconsidered its action in another bill with some safeguards in it, and passed it.

Subsequent to the passage of the bill by the House an investigation was had by the Senate that brought out that two former members of the Philippine War Damage Commission had been responsible for selling this idea to the Congress. They said in their correspondence, which was subpenaed by the Senate, that there was no real enthusiasm for any further damage payments either here or in the Philippines.

I think it is important to bear in mind that we already, more than 10 years ago, paid 52.5 percent of each and every claim for war damage in the Philippines. I mean we appropriated $400 million, which covered the claims to the extent of 52.5 percent of each claim. In addition to that, every claim of under $500 has been paid in full.

It was said on the floor of the House at the time both these bills were up that there was an implied responsibility on the part of this Government to pay these claims up to 75 percent, and the $73 million which was appropriated was that.

We went to conference with the Senate. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee sat in the conference for the most part with a pocketful of proxies and we had to negotiate with him. They wanted to give the whole $73 million to the Philippine Government. The House conferees took the position that we should pay the small claims, that we should make some allowance to the small claims and revert the balance to the U.S. Treasury, a position which I thoroughly supported. As a matter of fact, if I had my will, I would see none of the money go to anybody except back to the United States, but that we could not do.

So the reason we are asking to waive points of order is because, frankly, in order to get agreement we had to go beyond the scope of the legislation before the conferees. In a thumbnail sketch, this is what we did. We said every claimant who had earlier been paid 52.5 percent of his claim can claim an additional amount up to a maximum of $25,000. This will take care of all but 287 of the total of thousands of claims.

We then said that, if the conference report is accepted, the difference between $73 million and what would have been paid shall revert to the U.S. Treasury. The Foreign Claims' Settlement Commission shall certify what that amount should have been. We got that much of a concession from the other body. Then we said the difference—and there is disagreement about how much this will be—shall be paid into a special fund to be administered by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines for the purpose of furthering educational exchange and other educational programs of mutual advantage to the United States, and the Republic of the Philippines.

Let me make the position the House is in clear. If we turn down this move the present law stands, and the big claimants who hired these lobbyists and who promised to pay them millions of dollars will get all the money and they will be able to pay the lobbyists. If we adopt

the conference report, everybody will get at least $25,000 if they have that much coming. The difference will be the amount they have coming. I have a letter from an American who was in prison who has $1,032 approved. That person will get the full amount. If there is a real demand to help the Philippines, you can look at any literature about the Philippines you want to and you will find that one of their paramount problems is lack of educational facilities.

If it is our purpose to help them, what better thing could you do with this money than to take it away from the brewery and gold mining companies and the others who hired these lobbyists and put it in a fund which will really help the Philippines?

Let me just read some of this correspondence that was uncovered by the Investigating Committee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations which brought this about and which caused this rider to be added on the buildings bill.

Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Delgado who were former members of the Philippine War Damage Commission, and they are the lobbyists involved, had this correspondence, and I would just like to read what Mr. Delgado in the Philippines wrote to Mr. O'Donnell in Washington. I am not going to read it all, but I want to read enough to give you an idea of what was going on. This was in December 1952.

He says:

Your letter of December 23, 1952, was duly received and have noted its contents with great interest. I believe you are quite right in your appraisal of the situation there—

Meaning here in Washington—

but I am afraid that the enthusiasm on the part of interested parties and the Government here—

Meaning in the Philippines—

has cooled off.

Nothing has been done and no one seems to be interested enough to take the initiative in having some action by the Government on the matter of additional war damage compensation. However, I am today writing to Mr. Lino Gutierrez, president of the Private Claimants Association, and other interested parties on the subject. In addition, in the broadcast which I am scheduled to make on the 18th of this month over the station, DEBB, I will discuss the subject in an effort to arouse enthusiasm and start the ball rolling.

Start the ball rolling for what? Start the ball rolling to get 73 million more dollars from the Treasury of the United States.

Then we have a letter dated February 9, 1952, addressed by Mr. O'Donnell to Mr. Delgado. I will read you a paragraph of that letter. He says he is unsuccessful in securing the 120,000 names of the claimants—I will just tell you briefly what the big part of the letter says—to solicit all these people to represent:

But significantly he says "In connection with the war damage claimants, I discussed this matter thoroughly with Ambassador Romulo, who feels that if the final 22½ percent is to be realized, it can be accomplished, if at all, from this Congress."

That was way back in 1952. He added:

I know that the Ambassador would give us unqualified support in such an endeavor.

Now get this—

Needless to say, I—

Meaning Mr. O'Donnell, the former Commissioner—

would like to make a good Philippine connection on a retainer basis since I am confident I could do a good job.

And what a good job he did—$73 million worth.

I know that you will keep me in mind if any opportunities should present themselves.

Well, they kept up their correspondence. They did not quit easily.

In 1954 this is what Mr. O'Donnell said to Mr. Delgado:

Insofar as the administration is concerned, the spotlight is now being put on the Far East rather than Europe. Considering Magsaysay's popularity here, it would be my recommendation at this time that you work toward Magsaysay making a request upon our Government for this 22½ percent which has been promised as a matter of law.

It had not been promised at all—it was not even implied—but they use this language:

All of those actions together with our work here, can keep this proposed legislation in the limelight and ready to move at the appropriate time.

The appropriate time turned out to be 8 years later.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. There has been an aroma from this $73 million claims bill. From the time it was first considered here, it seemed to us, to some of us at least, that everything was not as it appears on the surface. The letter that the gentleman has just read, over the signature of Mr. O'Donnell, is further confirmation of that.

There are some of us here today who were opposed to this thing from the start, but who find ourselves in quite a predicament. I do not see how today someone is going to be able to convince me that I ought to vote for this bill. I can see some virtue in it in that perhaps O'Donnell and the rest of these people will be cut out. But I am not sure about that—that perhaps they will not find some way by which to sneak in and get some money out of it as it is now set up.

Mr. HAYS. Let me say to the gentleman that I am in exactly the same boat as he is. He and I opposed the bill on the floor, as I remember. But unless this conference report is adopted, in my opinion, certainly unless something is done affirmatively, the money will go to the claimants that these two people were working for. It is not a question of voting for or against the Philippines. It is not this simple. It is a question of voting for this rule in order to consider legislation which was beyond the scope of the conferees and taking away the bulk of the money from the big claimants and from the fellows who hired these lawyers.

As I said at the time this bill was under consideration, "gentlemen, if you take away the sugar the flies will leave automatically." Obviously, if you cut down the claims of $100,000, $200,000, $500,000, to $25,000 they will not have much money to pay Mr. Delgado and Mr. O'Donnell. Further than that, we put a specific prohibition, for whatever it is worth, in the law to prevent these two gentlemen from collecting anything.

So I would say to the gentleman from Iowa while this will not cure the situation it will make it less malodorous.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I say to the gentleman that I am in the same position as the gentleman from Ohio. I voted against the original bill both times. The gentleman who is now in the well of the House made a splendid fight here to try to alert the Congress of the United States to the fact that we do not owe one dime to the Philippines. The Congress upheld him in that position the first time, as I recall, but now here is the situation as I see it: The Congress, through probably misinformation or through being misled—and I say that advisedly—is now in a position where it has appropriated $73 million to go to these various claimants over there. The gentleman and his committee now are trying to reduce the figure or the amounts which will go to some of these claimants so that the balance, if any is left after that, and after they get through paying off, will go to the Philippine Government to be used for educational purposes. In other words, we have now given away $73 million. There is no hope of saving that. But we can, to some extent, control the expenditure of the money that is left. In either event, the taxpayers of the United States are now stuck with a total of $73 million, regardless of how we vote on this conference report.

Mr. HAYS. I say to the gentleman that the gentleman is right. If we do not act affirmatively today the $73 million is going to go to pay the big brewery over there, the IXL gold mining company, and others of that ilk who hired these lobbyists to build up a case for something that did not exist. Or, do you want to give the small claimants the small amount and do something which I think might turn out to be constructive and useful with the balance?

If this rule is adopted and this conference report is adopted everyone will get everything that is coming to them which the War Damage Commission said was coming to them. I do not like to say "was coming to them" because I do not believe that is the case. That will be true with the exception of 287 big corporations.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear that all of the churches involved, all of the religious orders involved have already been paid in full.

Let me also make it clear that all of the people with $500 claims or less have been paid in full. Let me point out to the Members of the House that a man

with a $100,000 claim, or a corporation, has already received $52,500 of that claim, and under this bill will get up to a maximum of $25,000 more.

In the case of the $100,000 claim, he would actually get $23,000 more, because there is another limitation in the present law of 75 percent of the total claim. So the fellow with the claim of $100,000, or under, would be paid in full, and the money is being taken away from the big corporations who hired Mr. Delgado and the other gentleman to build up this thing in order to sell it to the Congress and to get us to give them the money.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. How can we control funds over $25,000? If we can do that, why can we not retroactively control 100 percent of the claims?

Mr. HAYS. We are going to control everything over $25,000 by not giving it to them. They do not get it.

Mr. PELLY. Why can we not do that with 100 percent?

Mr. HAYS. We cannot because the Senate would not buy it. If I had my druthers, I would druther not give anybody anything. I try to do the best I can. But we cannot do that.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I think that the House here owes the gentleman in the well of the House a deep sense of appreciation for what he has done here today. He tried to alert the House on what is going on in connection with this particular thing. I do not think that we owe the people of the Philippines or anybody else one dime. I think the gentleman agrees with me on that. He is now trying to do the best he can when the Congress has been misled into appropriating $73 million of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. HAYS. In my view I am trying to correct to the best of my ability a bad situation.

If there are any questions about exactly what this proposed conference report does, I will be glad to answer them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate deeply the remarks made by my very able colleague from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] as to the contents of H.R. 5207, as amended by the other body. I, too, joined him in opposition to the original bill granting funds in payment of certain Philippine war claims and war damages when it came before the House some time ago.

However, the issue we have before us at the present moment is not as to whether the conference report on H.R. 5207, carrying the Philippine claims settlement as an amendment, is to be approved, but, rather, the question before the House at the moment is whether this body shall adopt House Resolution 453 which, if approved by a majority of this body, provides for taking up the conference report and for its debate and a final vote upon it.

The first vote in this body will come on the question whether or not the House of Representatives wants to change its position again, once more march up the hill bravely, with drums beating and flags flying, to say to the U.S. Senate, if you please, the other body, that it cannot add to House measures, when they reach that body, amendments that would not be germane if offered in the House, that do not deal at all with the subject contained in the original House bill, as it cleared this body, and sending it back here and thus forcing and compelling the House of Representatives, as has been done so many times in the past, to accept the judgment, the desires, and the wishes of the other body, or, as it happens to be in this particular case, primarily the wishes and desires of one individual Member of the other body, as the gentleman who just preceded me has stated, sitting in conference committee with a pocketful of proxies, and saying, in an arrogant way, "House of Representatives, you do what I tell you to do. You pass the kind of legislation I want. You accept the amendments whether they are germane or not, that I add to your House bill, whether they deal with the same subject you discussed and legislated in the House or not. You accept, you take it. I am jamming it down your throats, or there will be no legislation."

So we are faced with the issue here today of whether we will again furl our flag, drag it down through the dust, and beat a hasty retreat down the hill once more, or whether we will stand up and say to the other body that we are going to protect our own prerogatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional minute.

We are going to protect our own rights. We can exercise our own judgment as we please on the basic legislation we pass in the House. We can amend it, we can change it, so long as the amendments that we offer are germane, but we cannot permit anyone to write new law that is not germane to any bill we pass in the House, and then expect us docilely to take dictation from such a body. The House passed on this particular subject once before.

The House, this body, turned this proposal down once and it was sent to the Rules Committee. The objection was made and this is the old, old story, if you please, of adding, in new language something that has nothing to do with the original bill that passed the House, H.R. 5207, which amended the Foreign Service Building Act of 1926.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The same thing is true of the Philippines war claim's provisions. Here, they were making an appropriation, for another matter entirely, absolutely not germane, and in an effort to protect the rules of this body and the rights of this body, the House of Representatives, in its wisdom supported the position of those who oppose sending this matter to conference. Then at the last minute, under pressure, this resolution was brought out, so now you can vote as you see fit. You can decide for yourselves whether or not you want to adopt it. As for me, I am not for adopting this resolution. I am not for marching up that hill with my flags flying, and then trooping back down in retreat once more just because somebody says that is what I am supposed to do.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I certainly respect my colleague from Ohio and his right to have his own opinion, but I think it would be fair to point out that if we had docilely accepted what the Senate put in we would not be here asking to waive points of order. We rewrote the language the way the House conferees wanted it and went beyond the scope of what is before us, and that is why we are here asking to have it waived.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will not yield further so as hastily to reply and say that in the end you have adopted an amendment in your conference committee, which the Senate added, and which was not at all germane to the bill. You should never have agreed to do so.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. Does not the gentleman from Ohio in the well now recall it was stated to the Rules Committee if the Committee on Foreign Affairs really wanted to do it now, this minute, in the way they should, they could bring out another bill, and there is nothing here to preclude that action at all. This seems to be an action they could take if they feel it is more convenient.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. They can do so in 24 hours, and the Rules Committee would clear it immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and hope that we may discuss this on the basis of the prerogatives of the House of Representatives as well as what is best for the Nation.

I congratulate my distinguished friend from Ohio, [Mr. HAYS], on the statement he made. It was fair and accurate. I know his position. I joined with him on the original Philippines war claims bill in a debate to defeat that bill. I was opposed to the second bill which passed. After it had passed the House it came before my Subcommittee on Appropriations to appropriate $73 million to pay these war damage claims. I voted for that and supported it in the House. But the appropriation was for the payment of war damage claims, not for the creation of an educational fund in the Philippines.

May I point out one additional vote that has not been mentioned here today, on this same subject, whether or not we should pay the lobbyists their commissions. This came on the supplemental appropriations bill. I happen to be the ranking member of the committee that submitted that report. The distin-

guished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] brought the report to the House and there was a provision that none of the funds should be used for the payment of any money to any of the lobbyists who had worked on these claims. I voted for that amendment which the Senate had attached. But I say to you that the House voted against it. Now they say that we should throw out all the rules in the book in order to satisfy a few men. This House voted against it by a vote of 168 to 207, on May 14, 1963.

Now, it could have been done. You could have put this limitation in under the rules of the House. And you could do it today if the great Committee on Foreign Affairs would bring out a bill with this same language.

Now, let us see what is being done. The Constitution of the United States provides that appropriations shall originate in the House of Representatives, and shall be made in the House of Representatives, not in a conference committee with the Senate. By the adoption of this conference report you will be permitting the Senate of the United States to originate appropriations in a conference committee.

Under rule 21, section 4, it is provided:

Legislation that directs funds previously appropriated to be used for a purpose not specified in the original appropriation was held to be an appropriation in contravention of this provision (2147, vol. VII, Commission's Precedents).

In the conference report there is set forth the text of the proposed bill and in section 3c thereof it says, and I quote:

Any balance of the appropriation made pursuant to section 8 remaining after the payment is authorized by the first section of this act has been made and after any administrative expenses incurred by the Commission in connection with such payments have been paid shall be paid into a special fund in the U.S. Treasury to be used for the purpose of furthering educational exchange and other educational programs to the mutual advantage of the Republic of the Philippines and the United States in such manner as the Presidents of those two Republics shall from time to time determine.

This language makes an indefinite appropriation for the purposes of furthering the educational exchange programs. Such a proposition was not in the bill as it passed the House nor was it in the bill as it was amended in and passed by the Senate. Therefore the bill as proposed in the conference report goes beyond the scope of either the House or Senate version.

Furthermore, even if the Senate amendment had proposed an appropriation for such purpose, it would not be in order to incorporate such proposal in the conference report because of the provisions of paragraph 2 of rule XX of the House rules. Rule XX says, and I quote:

No amendment of the Senate to a general appropriation bill which would be in violation of the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI, if said amendment had originated in the House, nor any amendment of the Senate providing for an appropriation upon any bill other than the general appropriation bill, shall be agreed to by the managers on the part of the House unless specific authority to agree to such amendment shall be first given by the House by a separate vote on every such amendment.

Of course the House did not first give to its managers specific authority to agree to such an amendment. It could not have done so because the Senate amendment did not make such a proposal. The proposal of this appropriation for the additional purpose of promoting educational exchange originated in the conference room and not in either body.

The action contemplated in providing funds for the educational activities concerned is clearly an "appropriation" and there is a precedent clearly dealing with this very proposition. In volume VII of Cannon's Precedents, paragraph 1466, it says:

A proposition to make an appropriation payable from funds already appropriated was held not to be in order on an appropriation bill. The payment from a fund already appropriated of a sum which otherwise would be charged against the Treasury was held not to be a retrenchment of expenditure.

So here you have the Senate in conference appropriating for a purpose not in the original appropriation bill, to create a $30 million fund. For what? Let me read to you what the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate said this $30 million was going to be used for, that would be set up in this bill. Here is what he said:

This special fund is to be used for educational exchanges and other educational programs to be established by agreement between the Presidents of the United States and the Philippines.

To avoid any misapprehension on the score that use of this special fund for educational purposes would not assist the Philippines in its program of economic rehabilitation and development, I would like to devote some time to this provision of the amendment. The special fund would be available not only for educational exchange but for other educational programs in the mutual interest of the Philippines and the United States.

For the record, I wish to make clear that it is our intent that these other educational programs should be broadly conceived, imaginative in scope, and where feasible, linked to the purposes of the original Philippine claims legislation. There are many uses for the special fund, such as increased school construction, assistance to teachers' salaries, providing training, salaries, and equipment for community development specialists, and to provide support for the youth movement which has a high educational and training quotient to it. The fund could be drawn on to support training of vocational and specialists in other fields and for agricultural extension work among farmers.

Listen to this. Those of you who oppose Federal aid to education and those of you who are for Federal aid to education, mark you well this, that it is stated in here that this $30 million in the Philippines can be used for the construction of schoolhouses, the payment of teachers, vocational training, all of the other features of aid to education. This is $30 million, and your worldwide educational program, which you have passed in this House worldwide, is $42 million. But here in one area you are going to set up a $30 million fund of the American taxpayers' money.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. If this does not pass, $1 million of it will go to build an extension of a brewery. What we are doing is taking it away from them and saying you can use it for some more beneficial purpose.

Mr. BOW. I know the distinguished gentleman from Ohio was opposed to this bill originally, but it is a remarkable thing to see the change that has taken place. When we defeated the original bill what happened? Why, the great Foreign Affairs Committee of the House wrote new legislation. The committee wrote a bill that they passed that came out of the great Foreign Affairs Committee, and practically the entire report which I hold in my hand is made up of editorials spanking the House for having defeated the Philippines bill. The editorials have headlines like this: "Repay Your Friends." "Mistreating the Philippines." "Dishonor or Just Debt." "Not Aid, Just Debt." And on through this report. This was legislation by editorial comment. But the bill passed after we once defeated it, after we found it was wrong. Now in order to correct that bad legislation you come in and throw out all the rules of the book.

Why do we not legislate by rule if we are to be a responsible legislative body, not by expediency? The Foreign Affairs Committee that was able to bring out this bill and to pass it for $73 million with a report by editorial, if we defeat this rule, that committee could come out tomorrow with a bill containing the same provisions we had in the supplemental act which the House defeated, containing the same provisions that are in this conference report, and you could pass it in the House.

I am not pleading here at all for any lobbyists. I will vote for a bill, I will sponsor it, I will do anything to bring it out, as I did on the supplemental to prevent such payments. What I am pleading for here is the integrity of the House of Representatives. You are violating the rules of a conference, going beyond the item sent to it for conference. This is one reason. One of the rules you are voting against is the rule that provides for appropriations going to the Appropriations Committee, not on legislation.

The other is that a Senate amendment which is not germane to the original House bill should come into the House and be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, where it could be debated and where you could have a full opportunity to consider it. Let me say to you that neither the House of Representatives nor the Senate has ever had this legislation before it except on a conference report. The bill passed by the Senate for the $73 million and the bill written in the House, neither one is in this conference report.

This is completely new legislation. It is completely new legislation written in conference. Are we going to abdicate

the prerogatives of the House of Representatives to a few men from the other body who sit in conference and change the law? Is this House going to take the position that we will waive this point of order and that we will waive our rules and legislate on the basis of expediency rather than on the time-tested rules of this great parliamentary body?

Let me say to you, in looking over the rules and studying the rules on this, I opened the front page of the "Rules of Procedure of the House of Representatives" and I found a very interesting quotation on the first leaf of that book. If I may, we will quote Shakespeare because it is in the "Rules of Procedure of the House of Representatives." In these Rules of Procedure, they go to the "Merchant of Venice":

Bassanio says to Portia:

And I do beseech you wrest once the law to your authority; to do a great right, do a little wrong.

But Portia was a brilliant woman and she gave good advice.

She said:

It must not be; * * * 'twill be recorded for a precedent, and many an error by the same example will rush into the state.

I believe that is just as true as it applies today on the basis of the rules of procedure of this House as at the time when it was first written. We, to do a great right and do a little wrong of this type are establishing a precedent today which will be recorded as a precedent and many an error by the same example may rush in to affect the state.

I hope the House will defeat this rule—I sincerely hope it will defeat this rule.

Let me say this one thing further: There is a procedure by which this conference report could have come up. If a point of order had been made against it, it would be proper to move to suspend the rules and pass the conference report. That would have taken a two-thirds vote, but that is the regular way by which this should have been done and not by throwing our rules completely to the wind and delegating our authority to a conference committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say that I am in agreement with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio in opposing this rule waiving all points of order. This huge fund would be set up without any hearings at all by the proper committees of the House and Senate and would increase the present program for educational exchange with the Philippines from the amount of about $600,000 a year to about $30 million a year. Is that correct?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. This unorthodox procedure would increase the so-called Fulbright program from $600,000 a year to $30 million a year, and would also include the payment of teachers' salaries—which is something we do not even do in our own country—with Federal funds. I am going to join with the gentleman in voting against the granting of this rule.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from New York.

May I say, in setting up this fund for our friends in the Philippines for $30 million, and as I say, worldwide it is $42 million, then what is the next friendly country going to say? They will say, "Look what you did for the Philippines; we need $30 million, too." So it will go on down the line.

I have heard it said that there has been some objection—propaganda against the foreign aid program. This is a part of it; $30 million. We can withhold this. We can bring in a bill from the Committee on Foreign Affairs limiting claims to $25,000 and cutting out anything that is to go to the lobbyists and then let us send the rest of it, as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] so properly said—let us put the rest of it in the Treasury of the United States.

Can we add this to our national debt of $308 billion? Can we afford this when we are paying close to $20,000 a minute in interest on our national debt? Remember further, we are going to have to borrow this $30 million; remember that.

Let me say to you in closing, this bill provides that we pay the Philippines on the basis of 2 pesos to the dollar. I think you will find, although I have not checked it, but not long ago or at least a few days ago the rate of exchange was 4 pesos to the dollar.

So what you are doing in this is you have set up in this bill a payment of 2 pesos to the dollar. It is actually 4. So what you are doing is doubling it. Therefore, let us not fool ourselves in the thought that we are saving money. Let us defeat the rule and protect the integrity of this great House of Representatives.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the conference report.

Regardless of what may be said about procedural matters here, the fact remains that we are talking about specific recommendations. The question is not whether we are trying to save $73 million. That money has been authorized and appropriated.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying under this procedure here today, as has been said, to set some guidelines, to write some protective words into this legislation, to indicate our distrust of, our distaste for improper lobbying activities that have taken place.

Mr. Speaker, these are the things we are trying to do. These are the things which the Members of the House will be voting for if we adopt the rule and the conference report.

It has been inferred here that the conferees on the part of the House meekly gave in and acquiesced in the demands of those of the other body. That is certainly not the case. This was a hard, tough conference, and what has come forth is what we believe—those of us who were conferees—to be the best solution possible.

In voting upon this rule and in voting upon the adoption of the conference report the question is this: Do you want to write restrictions into this legislation against improper lobbying? Do you want to use this money, which is already appropriated, in the proper way? If you do, then vote for the rule and for the conference report.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here as a traditional foe of paying one dime to any claimant in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment a year ago would have restricted the amount that any claimant could receive, after my first amendment a year ago was defeated that would pay this money to the Government of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House know my position since that time, through memorandums which have been sent to their respective offices. But I would like to say this in connection with the baring of our souls in relation to the Senate of the United States that it was the House that was deceived by the lobbyists and not the Senate. It was the Senate that took it upon itself to conduct the hearings and to investigate abuses under the act, and not the House of Representatives. And, finally it has been the Senate which has insisted upon paying this money over to the Government of the Philippine Islands, which is exactly in accordance with what President Eisenhower agreed to do when he was President of the United States. And that is exactly what the Secretary of State in this administration wanted to do, until the House twisted the arm of the Secretary of State who forced the Senate to recede from their position and go back to giving this money directly to the claimants.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has now given us this opportunity to straighten our own house. Under the former bill when it came up under an appropriation act we receded from the position of the conferees and I agreed with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] that this measure should come on an authorizing bill rather than an appropriation bill.

Today you have that before you. This bill is an authorizing bill. Now he objects to the fact we are appropriating $30 million under an authorizing bill. When it was before this body he objected that it was an authorization under an appropriation bill. You cannot have it both ways. There is no chance that this bill will come back to this body unless we pass this legislation now. It is not the House that has taken the lead in correcting this situation, it is the Senate, and we should not miss this opportunity or the $73 million will most assuredly be paid out by direction of one man if he so orders should we defeat this resolution at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, after many months of negotiations, House-Senate conferees have finally reported agreement con-

cerning the Philippine war damage claims bill. This compromise is a reasonable one. The obligations of the United States are fulfilled; while the specter of large windfalls for lobbyists is removed.

All Congressmen hold in reverence the rules and traditions of the House. These rules and traditions, developed over the years, provide orderly methods for conducting the business of this great body.

The other body has rules which differ from ours. I believe our rules as they apply to germaneness of legislation and debate are far superior. Our rules clearly label legislation under consideration by the House. We do not subscribe to the method of tacking on major legislation to minor bills. I believe our position is in the best interest of the Nation. The Rules Committee, to its everlasting credit, has recently taken steps to prevent the recurrence of a situation of this type.

This should be the last time that the House, except in an emergency, should have to consider legislation that is not germane in form.

May I respectfully suggest to my colleagues that the matter of form is secondary in considering the matter before us today. This is probably the last chance we will have to correct legislation that is obviously wrong. By approving House Resolution 453, we can give legislative evidence that the House holds honor and principle above all else.

Failure to act favorably on this resolution will only aid and comfort those who are trying to undermine our democratic institutions through charges of payola and inaction. I am sure I do not need to remind my colleagues that the pace of this session of Congress has caused comment throughout the land.

What are we today being asked to approve?

The conference report on H.R. 5207 limits payments to individual claimants to a maximum of $25,000. This provision goes a long way toward assuring that no lobbyists will receive a windfall arising out of acts of Congress. This is probably the most important point agreed to by the House-Senate conferees, because it meets the principal fear expressed by those who opposed payment to individual claimants—a fear which reached national proportions as the activities of lobbyists were exposed.

PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP ENHANCED

By adoption of the House-Senate conference report friendly Philippine-American relations will be maintained. The report provides for amounts over the authorized $25,000 to individual claimants be reserved in a special fund in the U.S. Treasury for educational purposes. The conferees have provided for a special fund in the U.S. Treasury to further educational exchanges and other educational programs of mutual advantage to the Philippine Republic and the United States. This fund would be created by depositing all sums over the $25,000 authorized for individual claimants with the U.S. Treasury until agreement as to their use is made by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines.

Moreover, under this fund many high impact projects could be given educational and technical backup. For instance, a Philippine Institute of Land Reform might be created to provide technicians and specialists for agricultural progress in the Philippines. To a large extent the Philippines is a showcase for American-style democracy. If the Philippine economy shows greater progress than those of countries under dictatorships, of one form or another, then the attraction of the uncommitted nations for freedom will be all the greater.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the commonsense of the House will overcome procedural roadblocks however well intentioned, and that this resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] say that the House had been lax and that by this procedure the Senate is straightening out the House; straightening out our affairs.

Let me say to the gentleman as others have well said before me—the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW]—there has been nothing to prevent the House Committee on Foreign Affairs from bringing out a bill that would meet the objections of many Members of the House to the procedure that is here being attempted.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Does the gentleman now speaking to us think that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives would ever reconsider a bill to do what the gentleman wants to have done?

Mr. GROSS. It is not a question of reconsideration. It is a question of bringing out a bill that would meet the objections that have been raised and extricate the House from the position of being used as a doormat by the other body. If you vote for this, you should hold your nose when you do, knowing that you have swept the rules of the House completely under the rug.

Mr. BARRY. There are times when you are already in the fire with both your feet and in order to take them out you have to grab hold of something. This is a way of our grabbing hold. If this fails, I would like to ask the gentleman if he can assure this body that he will see to it that a bill comes out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives?

Mr. GROSS. Let me say that there is no valid reason why a bill could not have been brought out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs long ago to properly and fairly meet this situation.

Mr. BARRY. Why was it not brought out?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman was on the committee at the time the original hearings, if they can be called hearings, were held on this bill. I was not.

Mr. BARRY. I have had a bill in the Committee on Foreign Affairs to do just exactly what the gentleman wants done; to do exactly what the original agreement of August 5, 1959, provided, but there has been no attention paid to that bill, there has been no attention paid to any companion bills, and the gentleman should know that.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman agrees there is no reason why a bill could not have been brought out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to rectify the sorry situation that now exists.

Mr. BARRY. If the gentleman had the necessary votes in the committee this would have been possible—however, since the gentleman knows that no bill has been considered by the committee even though several have been introduced it should be obvious to him that now and only now is there an opportunity to correct this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree, as others have stated that there was a hard and tough conference with the Senate. This is not the bill approved by the House. It is a product of the Senate, being rammed down our throats as a rider to another bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to sustain the rules of the House, and vote down the pending resolution waiving points of order.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot pretend to be expert on this subject. I am not on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I could not give you a detailed chronology of all the events that have taken place, but I paid a good deal of attention to what was said in the Committee on Rules when the rule was requested, and have also listened with great care to this debate. It seems to me from the comment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], and that of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], that the people who have been most heavily involved in this matter, men who have been opposed to the whole $73 million being expended, feel that this is the most practical way in which we can best solve the problem. Now one thing I do know a little bit about is the rules of the House.

We have had many a fine-spun argument about how we are destroying the rules of the House. The procedure under which we are acting is provided in the rules of the House so it is impossible for us to be destroying the rules of the House. It seems to me that the best way for all of us to improve an extremely bad situation is to vote for this rule.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I will be delighted to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Missouri on what he has said in this regard. We are operating under a special rule which has come from the Committee on Rules, which is standard procedure in this House day after day. I think the House is entitled to consider this proposition on the merits. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the rule and the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I think one thing ought to be cleared up. I am sure my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], made the statement inadvertently, because he was honest and fair in his presentation of his point of view, but he said that this would be paid at the rate of 2 pesos to the dollar. The going rate is approximately 4 pesos to the dollar. I would like to read from the report, and this is what the law provides:

Payments authorized under this act shall be made in U.S. dollars or in Philippine pesos at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Either in dollars or in pesos.

If paid in pesos the payments shall be made at the free market rate of exchange.

Whatever that is, on the given day of payment.

Of course, section 5 of the act passed last year refers to the awards being based on the rate of 2 pesos to the dollar. Since those awards were made by the old Commission, the peso has been devalued, and in fairness it was necessary to provide for payment at the new rate which is approximately 4 to the dollar.

If the gentleman will yield further, I would just like to point out again that in spite of the heat of the argument that has been made on both sides, Mr. GROSS, my friend, across from whom I sit in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and sometimes we agree and sometimes we disagree, has said that he did not think the House conferees bargained in a tough fashion.

I do not violate any of the rules of the House, but it was put up to one of the Senate conferees before we got an agreement, that if they agreed to this language which the House proposed and which we are bringing back to you, that the Philippines would not like it, and he said, "Blank," a four-lettered word beginning with H, "With the Philippines? I couldn't care less after dealing with the House conferees." So I think he thought we were tough, and we were, and we did uphold the House position. But I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that when the House dealt with this problem last year we were ignorant of these letters which I quoted, from these two men who are former Philippine War Damage Claims Commissioners, about their plans to milk the taxpayers, and collect big fees for doing it.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] put in the RECORD a long history of this, if you have taken the trouble to read it, of these machinations and negotiations between two former War Claims Commissioners to get this paid. I say to you that this is the only chance I know of that we are going to have to rectify, partially at least, something that I think we would not have done if the whole complete situation and facts had been before us.

I have had many Members come to me privately and say, "I was with you when we beat this the first time; what position am I in now?" I think they are in the same position I am in, trying to salvage whatever we can from a bad situation. My friend says that he wants to protect his rights as a member of the Appropriations Committee. If I may express an opinion, maybe he goes a little beyond that in this case. He talks about appropriating money. We are not appropriating anything. The money has been appropriated by those very gentlemen, and by the House, to the claimants. All we propose to do, if we can get this conference report called up, is to take away part of those appropriations, put some of it back in the Treasury and keep some of it for the President of the United States to decide what to do with it. And if he never decides to do anything it will always stay in the Treasury.

So it is not a question of appropriation, it is a question of saving something.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman, briefly.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman read from the report of the committee. I should like to read from the law itself, what it says about pesos.

SEC. 5. (a) Each award made under this Act shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury in terms of United States currency on the basis of the rate of exchange (that is P/2 equals $1) which was applied in the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, for payment out of sums appropriated pursuant to section 8 of this Act.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. The argument that this rule is brought up in violation of the Rules of the House is an erroneous one. This rule is brought up in accordance with the Rules of the House.

We are faced with a very difficult and practical situation. Unless this conference report is agreed to, the bill is on the statute books with $73 million appropriated and the Commission has got to make the payments in accordance with the law.

The conferees on the part of the House, in my opinion, did a very excellent job under most trying circumstances. This bill in substance represents the viewpoint of the House and not the viewpoint of the other body. I hope the rule will be adopted and that the conference report will be agreed to.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 234, nays 166, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—234

Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Aspinall
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Carey
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Herlong
Holland
Horton
Hull
Ichord
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Landrum
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Secrest
Selden
Shelley
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—166

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dowdy
Findley
Fino
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Grant
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hemphill
Henderson
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Knox
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McLoskey

McMillan	Pool	Skubitz
Mahon	Quie	Snyder
Marsh	Reid, Ill.	Steed
Martin, Calif.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Stinson
Martin, Nebr.	Rich	Talcott
Michel	Riehlman	Taylor
Milliken	Rivers, S.C.	Tollefson
Minshall	Rooney	Tuck
Montoya	Roudebush	Utt
Morton	Rumsfeld	Van Pelt
Mosher	St. George	Watson
Natcher	Saylor	Weaver
Nelsen	Schadeberg	Westland
Norblad	Schenck	Wharton
O'Konski	Schneebeli	Whitener
Ostertag	Schweiker	Whitten
Pelly	Schwengel	Williams
Pilcher	Scott	Wilson, Bob
Pillion	Short	Wilson, Ind.
Pirnie	Sikes	Wyman
Poff	Siler	Younger

NOT VOTING—32

Ashmore	Hagen, Calif.	Quillen
Belcher	Hawkins	Robison
Blatnik	Holifield	Senner
Buckley	Johnson, Calif.	Sheppard
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Iowa
Cramer	Kee	Taft
Daddario	Leggett	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Macdonald	Thompson, La.
Evins	Miller, N.Y.	Thornberry
Flynt	Moore	Winstead
Griffin	O'Brien, Ill.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Belcher for, with Mr. Robison against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Moore against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. Evins with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Ashmore.

Mr. Hagen of California with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Senner.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. HULL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. FULTON, HARSHA, COLLIER, and MAHON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS—PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE CLAIMS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 497)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 3. (a) The first Section of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73,000,000 for that purpose', approved August 30, 1962 (50 App. U.S.C. 1751–1785 note; Public Law 87–616), is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the second sentence thereof a comma and the following: 'or $25,000, whichever is the lesser'.

"(b) Section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the first sentence therein the letter '(a)'; by striking the word 'section' in the last two sentences therein and inserting the word 'subsection'; and by adding the following new subsection:

"'(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), no sum shall be paid by any claimant directly or indirectly to, or received or accepted by, any former commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission or their assigns, or any person employed by or associated with any such former commissioner or employee in connection with the preparation, filing, allowance, or collection of any claim under this Act, as compensation on account of services rendered or as reimbursement on account of expenses incurred in connection with any application filed under this Act. Whoever, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, makes a payment in violation of the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year or both. Whoever, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, receives or accepts a payment in violation of this subsection, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years or both. Whoever, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, receives or accepts a payment in violation of this subsection, shall forfeit to the Government of the United States a sum equal to three times the amount of such payment, and the Commission shall take action to recover such sum from the person receiving the payment.'

"(c) Section 5(a) of such Act is amended by striking out the next to the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Any balance of the appropriation made pursuant to section 8 remaining after the payments authorized by the first section of this Act have been made and after any administrative expenses incurred by the Commission in connection with such payments have been paid shall be paid into a special fund in the United States Treasury to be used for the purpose of furthering educational exchange and other educational programs to the mutual advantage of the Republic of the Philippines and the United States in such manner as the Presidents of those two Republics shall from time to time determine. There shall be withheld from the payment authorized by the preceding sentence a sum equal to the difference between $73,000,000 (less administrative expenses) and the total amount which would have been paid to the claimants under the provisions of P.L. 87–616, which sum shall revert to the general funds in the United States Treasury. The acceptance by any claimant of a payment under this Act shall be considered to be in full satisfaction and final settlement of all claims of such claimant arising out of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WAYNE L. HAYS,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
EDNA F. KELLY,
E. ROSS ADAIR,
WM. MAILLIARD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

SENATE AMENDMENT

The Senate amendment added at the end of the House bill a new section 3 amending existing law (the act entitled "An act to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73,000,000 for that purpose", approved August 30, 1962 (Public Law 87–616)), to provide for a lump-sum payment (not to exceed $73,000,000) by the Government of the United States to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines of the balance of awards for war damage compensation heretofore made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of title I of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, upon receipt by the Secretary of State of assurances satisfactory to him that such payment would be received in full satisfaction of all claims arising out of such awards and that no part of such payment would be paid, directly or indirectly, to any former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission as compensation for services rendered as agent or attorney in connection with any such claim. The Senate amendment also provided for the transfer to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines of all documents (other than internal documents of any agency of the United States) currently held by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission relating to unpaid claims arising out of war damages in the Philippines.

EXISTING LAW (PUBLIC LAW 87–616)

Under existing law (Public Law 87–616), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is required to provide for payment to individual claimants of the balance of awards for Philippine war damage compensation. In addition to appropriate administrative provisions included to facilitate the task of the Commission, existing law provides that the balance of any appropriations made to pay the balance of such awards (after payment of all approved claims) shall revert to the U.S. Treasury, and prohibits any payment of remuneration for services rendered to any claimant which exceeds 5 percent of the amount paid to the claimant on account of his application. Any agreement to the

contrary is declared to be unlawful and, in addition to a penalty of $5,000 or imprisonment for one year (or both) which is applicable to any violation of such prohibition by anyone subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is required to take action to recover any payment made in violation of such prohibition. The sum of $73,000,000 was appropriated by title V of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963, for the payment of the balance of awards for Philippine war damages.

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

The committee of conference agreed to a modification of the Senate amendment which retains the approach adopted by existing law of making payments of the balance of awards for Philippine war damages directly to individual claimants through the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and amends existing law to include the following new provisions:

1. Notwithstanding the maximum amount of any payment to which a claimant otherwise would have been eligible to receive under Public Law 87-616, as originally enacted, no payment in excess of $25,000 will be made to any claimant under the conference agreement.

2. The conference agreement continues the prohibition in existing law against payment or receipt of an amount in excess of 5 percent of any claim as remuneration for services rendered in connection therewith, together with the penalties applicable thereto. In addition, however, the conference agreement specifically provides that no former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission or their assigns, and no person associated with any such Commissioner or employee in connection with any claim filed under Public Law 87-616, will be eligible to receive any remuneration whatever in connection with any such claim. Anyone who pays remuneration in violation of this prohibition will be subject to a fine of $5,000 or imprisonment for one year, or both. Anyone who receives remuneration in violation of such prohibition will be subject to a fine of $5,000 or imprisonment for five years, or both, and, in addition, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission will be required to take action to recover from anyone receiving such remuneration an amount equal to three times the amount of remuneration received. These penalties will be applicable to any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

3. The acceptance by any claimant of a payment under the provisions of Public Law 87-616 will be considered to be in full satisfaction and final settlement of all claims of such claimant arising out of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission.

4. After payment of all approved claims, and administrative expenses incurred in connection therewith, the balance of sums appropriated pursuant to Public Law 87-616 will be placed in a special fund in the U.S. Treasury to be used for the purpose of furthering educational exchange and other educational programs to the mutual advantage of the Republic of the Philippines and the United States, except that there shall be withheld from such special fund a sum equal to the difference between $73,000,000 (less administrative expenses) and the total amount which, except for the $25,000 maximum payment permitted under the conference agreement, would have been paid to claimants who file applications under Public Law 87-616, which sum will revert to the general fund of the U.S. Treasury. The effect of this change in existing law is to provide that the amounts in excess of $25,000 originally authorized to be paid to claimants will be reserved for the special fund for educational purposes, and to assure that the funds which would have reverted to the Treasury under Public Law 87-616, as originally enacted, would still revert to the Treasury.

WAYNE L. HAYS,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
EDNA F. KELLY,
E. ROSS ADAIR,
WM. S. MAILLIARD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to take the time of the House to rehash all these arguments. The Rules Committee was most generous in giving us on the committee of conference time to explain what the committee of conference did.

I merely point out again that if we do not take this action, if we do not accept this conference report, the money will be paid to the claimants. The big claimants who hired these lobbyists will get their funds and will pay the lobbyists. As I said before, I was against this whole thing. I think this is the best we can do to solve it. I really think this will be far better than letting the existing law stay in effect and in force.

I realize that some people are against waiving points of order. That is perfectly all right. Everyone has a right to his own opinion. But now that that has been settled, and I was prepared to accept it if it went the other way, I hope the House will consider the conference report on its merits. I think the House confereees have gotten their viewpoint across that the small claimants will be paid, that the people who have claims of $25,000 or less will be paid in full, and those who have larger claims will get at least $25,000. I think the balance of the money will be put to use as stipulated.

I do not propose to take any more time. I will try to answer any questions, but I shall not attempt to drag this out.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and yield 5 minutes to the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I, too, urge the House to adopt this conference report. It ought to be said again, I think, that the $73 million about which we are talking here has been authorized and appropriated. By this action we are laying down certain guidelines with respect to it. We are setting up certain safeguards. These safeguards relate to the disposition of funds already appropriated. These funds will be divided into three categories: First, the funds which will go to pay the claimants and which will be subject to an individual ceiling of $25,000; second, those which will revert to the Treasury of the United States; and third, those which will be saved as a result of the application of the $25,000 ceiling and which will constitute the scholarship fund.

I would say further that by adopting this report you are writing a criminal penalty against those who give or take bribes in this connection, and I am sure that is the thing which the Members of this House want to do. This is the best solution, in my opinion, of a very difficult situation. I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to commend the chairman of the House conferees for his determined effort to sustain the position of the House on this legislation.

As all of my colleagues know, as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have certain responsibility for legislation affecting that area of the world. Legislation dealing with the Philippine war damage claims falls into that category. My only interest in the measure before us today is to see to it that the intent of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, an act approved before I was elected to the Congress and finalized by the 1962 amendments, be carried out as efficiently, as economically, and as honestly as possible.

I believe that the conference report works in that direction and has real merit. It upholds the principle of direct payments to claimants approved by the Congress in 1946 and again last year. It inhibits potential abuses by limiting the amount of individual payments to $25,000 and by placing stiff penalties for violations of the proposed restrictions on lobbyists and those who would attempt to secure improper profit under this program. And it conforms to the intent of the 1946 law by promoting the rehabilitation and economic development of the Philippine Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely happy with the provision of the conference report which sets up the special educational fund. I would much rather see all of the money saved by the $25,000 limitation revert to the Treasury of the United States. However, the Senate conferees were adamant on this point and we had to accept this compromise or come back to the House without any agreement.

Even with this reservation, I strongly support the conference report. I believe that a vote for the conference report is a vote reiterating our desire to discharge our obligation to the Filipino claimants, and a vote to curtail abuses. A vote against the conference report will point in the opposite direction. Such a vote can be interpreted as indicating that this body is not interested in curtailing abuses. Let there be no mistake about it. A failure to adopt the conference report can possibly permit certain individuals whose activities have been exposed recently to profit unduly from this program.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the Foreign Service buildings—Philippine war damage claims legislation.

As we all know, the basic issue dealt with in this report goes back to 1946.

The Congress at that time decided to pay certain war damage claims directly to individual claimants in the Philippines. In 1962, we passed legislation to pay off the balance outstanding on these claims. This legislation is on the statute books today. The conference report modifies it in three important respects:

First, it limits the payments to $25,000.

Second, it imposes stiff penalties on anyone who will pay any fee in conjunction with these claims to former members and employees of the Philippine War Damage Commission—and penalties on those accepting such fees; and

Third, it puts aside the funds which will be saved by the application of the $25,000 limit into a special fund to be used for educational purposes in the Philippines.

I am not entirely happy with this conference report. I accept the $25,000 limitation and the penalties imposed on lobbyists. At the same time, I would much prefer to see the savings resulting from the application of the $25,000 maximum revert to the Treasury of the United States.

As the chairman of the House conferees has explained, however, it was impossible for us to obtain this concession from the other body. We have held meeting after meeting, and we insisted on the House position. In the end, however, faced with a complete deadlock, we accept this compromise.

I believe that from an overall view, the compromise contained in the conference report is a good one. The limitations and the penalties can be applied and the money which will be put into the special fund will be used for a purpose directly connected to the intent of the original 1946 act. There is no better way to promote the economic development of a nation than by improving its education.

For these reasons I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I do, however, urge that the House Committee on Rules report the rule referred to by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] which would prevent future action by the other body to attach to bills passed by the House amendments which are not germane to bills passed by the House of Representatives and sent to them for action.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

IT IS TIME WE RESTRICTED THE REA A BIT

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a bill, H.R. 5065, proposing that borrowing from the Government by rural electrification cooperatives must be at the rate of interest that the Government itself has to pay for money in the open market, instead of at the 2-percent rate that the REA co-ops now pay under a law which was passed by the Congress nearly 20 years ago.

No one questions the good work that the Rural Electrification Administration has done in the past. It has brought electric power and light to rural areas all over the United States. But it is a well-known fact that 98 percent of its appointed job is now finished—that only about 2 percent of our rural areas remain in darkness.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the REA cooperatives continue to be a terrific drain upon the Treasury as they expand their field of operation into generation and transmission activities and into suburban areas, often in direct competition with established taxpaying utilities.

And this expansion is with 2-percent money, because an old law says so, even when the Government itself must pay 4 percent in the open market. It is estimated that, because of this rate-of-interest preference, the REA's have profited by an extra $240 million and the taxpayers are out of pocket to the tune of nearly a quarter of a billion dollars.

This should not be, and my original bill, H.R. 5065, sought to correct the situation.

Somewhat to my surprise, Mr. Speaker, a tremendous interest has developed in the matter. Other bills have been introduced in the House and in the Senate. One of them, S. 1926, introduced by Senator LAUSCHE of Ohio—with the cosponsorship of Senator BENNETT of Utah—appears to me to cover the whole matter far more adequately than my first bill.

I therefore today introduce a bill duplicating Senator LAUSCHE's proposed amendment of the Rural Electrification Act.

The bill, too, will eliminate the 2-percent rate of borrowing and require the REA's to pay the same rate paid by the Government on its borrowings.

It will further require the REA's to confine their activities to the rural areas, as was provided in the act of 1936.

It is obvious that adoption of this proposal will save money for the Government—and, therefore, for all taxpayers. It will continue to provide for the extension of electric power and light into those rural areas that have not yet been serviced, but it will, I hope, end a growing and quite needless competition with and duplication of existing generation and transmission facilities.

Public funds will be saved, Mr. Speaker, if the Congress will act on the matter at the present session.

TFX WARPLANE CONTRACT

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, there has been much conversation of late about the unusual factors behind the decision on the multimillion-dollar TFX warplane contract.

In the July 24 issue of the Washington Evening Star there appeared a most disturbing article concerning Navy Secretary Fred Korth's actions before the Senate committee investigating the TFX contract.

Korth stated that he very much resented being asked by a member of this committee, namely Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, what safeguards he might have taken to avoid any conflict of interest. In light of the fact that Secretary Korth was the president and is currently a stockholder of the Continental Bank in Fort Worth which approved a loan of several hundred thousand dollars to General Dynamics who was awarded this contract, I think the Senator's question was most pertinent.

Also I think it is interesting to note that only last week our distinguished colleague from Iowa, Representative GROSS, brought to the attention of this House some most shocking facts concerning Secretary Korth's personal involvement in the background of General Dynamics and the awarding of this contract to them. Because of Korth's unethical practices and personal involvement, GROSS stated that he should be fired.

The record of the Senate committee reveals that this summer Secretary Korth stated:

> I am aware that public confidence in our public processes demands not only impartiality, but also the appearance of impartiality. Conscious that my home is in Fort Worth and recognizing the minor part that the Navy has in the total procurement, I therefore deliberately refrained from taking a lead role in reaching the decision and consciously viewed the two proposals with complete objectivity.

If Secretary Korth wanted to retain public confidence in the governmental processes, he should have:

First. Divorced himself completely from the TFX decision because of the close relationship with General Dynamics.

Second. Told the Senate committee of his stock ownership in the Fort Worth bank which has a large amount of money tied up in the future of General Dynamics, the TFX contract holder, instead of making the misleading statement that he was "conscious that my home is in Fort Worth."

Third. Instituted safeguards to assure that defense contracts are awarded impartially.

The entire TFX affair has many complex ramifications. Even so, one thing is clear—there were conflicts of interest, and the public is entitled to have safeguards in decisionmaking to protect the integrity of the governmental processes. It is proper for Congress to inquire into safeguards being instituted to assure the honesty and integrity of not only the system but also the men administering it. Navy Secretary Fred Korth was completely off base when he suggested otherwise.

In view of these many inconsistencies and the ultimate awarding of the TFX contract to General Dynamics, I think that the article that appeared in the Washington Evening Star is most timely and should be brought to the attention of each Member of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I ask that this article be included in the RECORD today.

KORTH ANGRILY DEFENDS HONESTY IN TFX AWARD

Navy Secretary Fred Korth angrily told Senate investigators he will resign if they find reason to challenge the integrity of his role in the TFX warplane contract award.

And he fired back at Senator MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota: "I resent, sir, even your asking me what safeguards I might have taken to be an honest man."

Mr. Korth testified he is a former president and still a stockholder of a Fort Worth, Tex., bank which loaned money to the General Dynamics Corp., the company which won the TFX contract. He agreed also he is a friend of several of the firm's past and present top officials.

NOT INFLUENCED, HE INSISTS

But he denied that the loan, made shortly before he became Navy Secretary, was any reason for him to disqualify himself from participating in the subsequent negotiations in which General Dynamics won the TFX contract.

He also swore there was no influence involved in his recommendation that General Dynamics should get the contract despite military evaluations that a rival design and proposal by the Boeing Co. promised a better, cheaper version of the TFX (tactical fighter, experimental) plane.

He told the Senate Investigations Subcommittee he had discussed the TFX project privately with officials of both General Dynamics and Boeing, but added:

"I certainly hope it is clear—certainly I intend for it to be clear—that there was no, repeat no, influence of any character exerted on me by any of the individuals who called upon me, or by any group who called upon me."

ON STAND 8 DAYS

Winding up 8 days of testimony, he renewed his insistence that the contract was awarded on merit alone. The subcommittee made public a censored transcript of the last of his testimony today.

"I am a man of integrity," Mr. Korth blazed out in one heated exchange with Senator MUNDT, who had asked about the ethical standards the Secretary had used in the negotiations.

"If you find, or this committee finds that I am not, certainly you should so recommend to the President, and I will promptly hand in my resignation," Mr. Korth declared.

The Secretary testified he was president of Continental National Bank of Fort Worth when the bank loaned money to General Dynamics not long before Mr. Korth's appointment to his Pentagon post. No specific date was mentioned and the subcommittee left out of its public transcript the amount of the loan, which Mr. Korth said was less than $600,000. He said he still owns stock in the bank.

General Dynamics' Fort Worth division is to perform much of the TFX contract, with the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. of Bethpage, N.Y., as its chief subcontractor.

Senator MUNDT referred to Mr. Korth's business interest in Fort Worth, and his role in negotiating a big Fort Worth contract.

"I don't say it is impossible but I think it would stagger a Solomon to look objectively at a contract that meant as much to your community as this one would," Senator MUNDT said. He asked Mr. Korth to state "what safeguards you surrounded yourself with to be sure that you were actually acting objectively."

Persons who were in the room said Mr. Korth clearly showed anger as he replied: "Senator MUNDT, it didn't stagger me at all because I knew that I had a responsibility in taking an oath to my Government to discharge my responsibilities in a fair, impartial, and proper manner.

"I resent, sir, even your asking me what safeguards I might have taken to be an honest man," Mr. Korth added.

LAKE ASHLEY, UTAH

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to name the lake created by the Flaming Gorge Dam in northeastern Utah, Ashley Lake. This name was selected as the most appropriate after much research and consulting with various people in Utah.

The name Ashley would be a tribute to the great explorer and fur trader, William Henry Ashley, who played a significant part in opening up the West. It was Ashley who first made the trip down the Green River through the Flaming Gorge, a feat that few since have succeeded in accomplishing. It has been navigated less than half a dozen times, and usually with specially constructed craft, while he descended its turbulent waters in buffalo-skin boats. In his diary, Ashley reported:

> We passed along between these massy walls, which to a great degree excluded from us the rays of heaven and presented a surface as impassable as their body was impregnable, and I was forcibly struck with the gloom which spread over the countenances of my men. They seemed to anticipate (and not far distant, too) a dreadful termination of our voyage; and I must confess that I partook in some degree of what I supposed to be their feelings, for things around us had truly an awesome appearance.

A study of Ashley's life shows him to be a courageous explorer, and a Congressman who proved himself to be an active champion of western measures.

The beauty surrounding Utah's new lake is truly a sight to behold. The majestic mountains surrounding the lake provide, by their brilliant red canyons, the name by which the dam is known—Flaming Gorge. I firmly believe that the name Congress chooses for this outstanding scenic attraction should be worthy of its magnificence. To my knowledge, the only name which meets this standard is Ashley. If I may, as a Utahan, be permitted to paraphrase—Ashley was a man to match our mountains.

This would also correspond with action taken on that other great structure of the upper Colorado River project—Glen Canyon Dam. The 180-mile-long lake behind Glen Canyon Dam is named Powell Lake after John Wesley Powell, the first man to navigate the Colorado through Glen Canyon.

FAIR SHARE LAW

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 14, 1960—Public Law 86-648—the so-called fair share law, enabling the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees, the Attorney General is directed to forward to the Congress every 6 months a report on administrative operations authorized under that law.

In view of the continuous interest of my colleagues in the House and for their information, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point the Sixth Semiannual Report of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization covering the operations from January 1 to June 30, 1963, together with a summary covering the preceding five semiannual periods.

Detailed case reports on each person paroled into the United States are in the custody of the Committee on the Judiciary and are available for inspection by any Member of the House at the office of Subcommittee No. 1 at 327 Cannon Building.

The report which is addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives is as follows:

JULY 25, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Refuge operations under the act of July 14, 1960, as amended by the act of June 28, 1962, were continued in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Lebanon during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1963. This was the 6-month period of operations under the act. Based upon report of the Secretary of State as to the number of refugee escapees who during the preceding 6-month period availed themselves of resettlement opportunities offered by other nations, the number authorized by statutory fair share during the period covered by this report was 1,923. During the period, 1,954 refugees registered under the act, and 1,649 were found qualified for parole.

Including the period ending June 30, 1963, the total number of refugee escapees authorized by statutory fair share totaled 20,898.

The total number of refugees who had registered since the beginning of the program exceeded this number by only 2,868. Statistics for the program are tabulated below:

	1st through 5th periods	6th period	Total
Authorized by statutory fair share	18,975	1,923	20,898
Pending beginning of period		457	
Registered during period	21,812	1,954	23,766
Total registered (pending plus received)	21,812	3,411	
Found qualified for parole	[1] 12,918	1,649	14,567
Rejected or otherwise closed	[1] 8,437	559	8,996
Pending end of period	457	203	

[1] During the 6th period, 1,108 cases, previously reported as found qualified for parole, were closed because the applicants had taken advantage of resettlement in other countries, had abandoned or withdrawn their applications, or for other reasons. Accordingly, the number previously reported as "found qualified for parole" has been reduced by this number, and the number previously reported as "rejected or otherwise closed" has been increased by a like number.

Section 2(b) of the act provides for a numerical limitation of 500 difficult-to-resettle cases. Necessary assurances having been received, 344 refugees have been approved under this section as difficult to resettle and have been referred to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration for transportation. An additional 20 have been referred to the voluntary agencies for documentation under this section.

Assurances of housing and employment having been received, a total of 13,354 refugees, including the 344 approved under section 2(b) of the act, have been referred to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration for transportation to the United States. As of June 30, 1963, a total of 11,823 had arrived in the United States, as follows:

Country of flight	During 1st 5 periods	During 6th period	Total
Albania	371	12	383
Bulgaria	173	8	181
Czechoslovakia	12	1	13
East Germany	4	1	5
Estonia	14	0	14
Hungary	1,149	74	1,223
Iraq	6	6	12
Jordan	0	2	2
Latvia	66	1	67
Lithuania	39	0	39
Poland	824	47	871
Rumania	1,793	303	2,096
Syrian Arab Republic	39	1	40
Turkey	7	1	8
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	1,797	561	2,358
U.S.S.R.	87	3	90
Yugoslavia	3,941	480	4,421
Total	10,322	1,501	11,823

Continuation of established screening procedures resulted in the rejection of 364 applicants during the period, on the following grounds:

Ineligible	187
Security risks	17
Criminal	10
Medical rejects	2
Immorality	1
Undesirability	28
Split families (spouses and children left behind in country of origin)	19
Firmly settled	38
Spouses and children of above principals	62
Total	364

Registrations of applicants in the various countries, since the beginning of the program, have been as follows:

Country	In camp	Out of camp	Total
Austria	905	2,049	2,954
Belgium		1,480	1,480
France		7,760	7,760
Germany	593	2,977	3,570
Greece	840	229	1,069
Italy	3,464	887	4,351
Lebanon		2,582	2,582
Total	5,802	17,964	23,766

During the sixth period, registrations of refugees were as follows:

Camp residents	460
Out-of-camp residents	1,494
Total	1,954

The following number of aliens, who have been in the United States for at least 2 years after their parole as refugee-escapees, have been inspected and examined for admission, and accorded the status of permanent residents under section 4 of the act:

During 5th period	242
During 6th period	1,520
Total	1,762

In compliance with the provisions of section 2(a) of the act, detailed reports on individuals paroled into this country are attached.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND F. FARRELL,
Commissioner.

FOREIGN AID ATTACK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is important that the Members of this body note what appears to be the beginning of a massive propaganda campaign against the concept of foreign aid. Such a campaign could, if successful even in part, seriously cripple the efforts of the United States to maintain and improve its influence and position in world affairs.

On Wednesday, July 24, each Member of the Congress received a copy of a Reader's Digest magazine article, reprinted in advance of its actual publication. It was accompanied by a letter advising us to read the article and be guided thereby. If someone wanted to cripple the foreign aid bill, this article could not have been distributed at a better time.

This article is a clever collection of distortion, half-truth and innuendo.

It takes quotations out of context. It quotes unsubstantiated charges in such a way as to present them as facts. It omits vital aspects of a foreign policy question, twisting the situation to such lengths that a course of action soundly based on foreign policy considerations appears ridiculous. It is an excellent hatchet job. Its implication is that we who support this program, including four Presidents, are either dupes or fools.

Next to our Defense Establishment, foreign aid is the single best tool of our Government in its efforts to fortify our national security. It is vital in our efforts to bring peace and stability in a troubled world, to influence other nations toward a course of independence and freedom, and in some places, in truth, to fight the very cold war battle that this article accuses us of shirking.

I would like to compare this article with President Eisenhower's own most recent statement on foreign aid, made in an article in the Saturday Evening Post, in which he advocated reductions in the Federal budget in almost every area of Government activity. The sole exception to his demands for spending cuts—the sole exception—was this matter of foreign aid.

This is what General Eisenhower said:

Finally, a few words about the most misunderstood and controversial of all Federal expenditures—foreign aid. Never has there been any question in my mind as to the necessity of a program of economic and military aid to keep the free nations of the world from being overrun by the Communists. It is that simple. Such a program, if well-run and kept within the limits we can afford, offers the United States one of its best bargains in national security.

Unfortunately, foreign aid has suffered through its history from political maneuvering and lack of stability. Congressmen seeking reelection have found it a handy issue to kick around. They go back home and stir up voters with speeches saying, "You can be sure I'm not going to vote to give your money to Timbuktu when you good people so badly need more schools and hospitals." Because of this and other political factors, foreign aid never has been planned or administered on a long-range basis, although we know the Communist threat is going to be with us for a long time to come. Back in 1953, we inherited a foreign aid budget of $7.6 billion and we cut expenditures to a more reasonable $4.8 billion, hoping to build a steady-going program. But we never were able to get Congress to assure the program the continuity in funds and personnel that is absolutely necessary if this important work is to attract and hold experienced, dedicated people.

That is why I agree with the recommendations of the Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. The Clay report follows the guidelines of rule of reason that I have been talking about. It recognizes that we should not increase the burden of foreign aid at this time but should strengthen the program in areas where our purposes are best served while phasing it out in areas where it is not effective. I applaud the administration for accepting the terms of the report and hope that Congress will act favorably on it.

A reading of this article, entitled "Let's Stop Sending U.S. Dollars To Aid Our Enemies," shows that much of its attack is directed at the food-for-peace program. It states that sales of food under title I of Public Law 480 are not sales, and proceeds from there to denounce these sales as foreign aid without regard for humanitarian, political, or economic reasons for these sales. It completely ignores any mention of the advantage to the United States of disposing, in a productive way, of the vast

stocks of farm surpluses which we are storing at great expense to the taxpayers.

I will not attempt to argue this article's attacks point by point, but those familiar with the foreign aid program can see at a glance a few glaring examples of the biased technique used.

It quotes, for example, a single sentence from a long essay on foreign aid by Dr. Hans Morgenthau of the University of Chicago. That sentence was: "The United States has yet to develop an intelligible theory of foreign aid." It followed this sentence with unrelated quotes from others which lead the reader to think that Dr. Morgenthau was advocating abolition of foreign aid. That is not the case. Dr. Morgenthau was advocating his own theory of foreign aid, a theory which involved greater recognition of the political uses of aid as against economic uses; his air was to strengthen, not destroy, the program.

The article describes the Clay committee, whose report has formed the basis for much of this year's opposition to foreign aid, as a "proaid" group.

This is hardly an objective description of a committee comprised chiefly of conservative businessmen whose views on aid have been opposed by most of the traditional supporters of foreign aid.

Again, in discussing the controversial and undecided Bokaro steel mill proposal for India, the article states that the project was investigated by "150 technicians, appointed by AID." These 150 technicians were officials or contractors of the United States Steel Corp., operating under contract, which is significantly different. Even the United States Steel conclusion was distorted. The article said the "technicians" were "unable to prove that the venture is feasible," whereas the facts are that United States Steel did find that the venture was feasible, without recommending whether it should be done.

Another clear instance of exaggeration involved the discussion of the expropriation of American interests in Ceylon. The article indicated that the U.S. Government timorously delayed 6 months in enforcing the Hickenlooper amendment in Ceylon, whereas the fact is that the law provides for a 6-month period during which negotiations for settlement of expropriation claims are to take place.

The article talks about "aid" to Algeria, and charges that this promotes socialism. It does not mention that this aid was food relief to starving people, administered by U.S. charitable agencies. Nor does it mention that, perhaps as a result of this aid communism has been outlawed in Algeria.

There are dozens more of these examples.

Perhaps the most amazing aspect of this article is its conclusion. After lambasting the use of foreign aid funds by the U.S. Government, and claiming that all of this has helped our enemies, it ends up by advocating that we turn over to international banks and organizations the administration of this program.

This is a course of action in which many sincere people believe. But it is not a logical outgrowth of the earlier attacks on the program, unless the aid opponents take the position that international organizations are better able and more determined to protect the security of the United States than is the U.S. Government itself. And, consistently inconsistent though this article may be, I do not think they meant to go that far.

No one can argue against the right of the magazine to print this discussion of foreign aid, although I believe a good case can be made against the writer's objectivity.

I do not suppose we should object, either, to the magazine tossing premature reprints of the article on our desks in an attempt to influence legislation. They have to build readership.

I do suggest, however, that in the interest of fair reporting, Reader's Digest subscribers should have an opportunity to hear the other side of the case, perhaps from Secretary of State Rusk or AID Administrator David Bell.

I look forward to this possibility.

PETITION FOR THE 24TH AMENDMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House now knows by correspondence from me and statements I have made on the floor that I have Discharge Petition No. 3 at the desk and have asked Members to sign it, in order to bring before this House legislation that would amend the Constitution to permit prayer in public schools and public places, in an attempt to preserve the spiritual heritage of this Nation as exemplified in "In God we trust," and in the Pledge of Allegiance the expression "under God."

I am asking the Members to sign that petition. We have quite a number now and we are getting more every day. I shall include in the RECORD an article from the Catholic Free Press, the official paper of the diocese of Worcester, Mass., from which I am going to read a short excerpt. This article expresses the reason why we should bring a resolution to the floor and why we should adopt such an amendment.

This article reads in part:

> We hope, therefore, that the sponsors of "prayer amendment" resolutions in the House will give serious consideration to the proposal of Representative FRANK J. BECKER, Republican, of New York, that they meet and agree on the language of one resolution and then support a discharge petition to bring it to the floor of the House for debate.

That is all I am attempting to do, bring this to the floor of the House. I am sure it would be adopted so that it would be submitted to the people of this country to help preserve our spiritual heritage that we so badly need at this time.

The article follows:

> TWENTY-FOURTH AMENDMENT
>
> It would seem that the only way to stem the tide which threatens to banish any reference to God from American public life is the passage of an amendment to the Constitution clarifying the first amendment. It would also seem, however, that any amendment designed to state in unequivocal terms our belief in man's reliance upon God, while at the same time safeguarding the individual's right to his own religious belief—or disbelief—must be precisely worded lest the cure be more disastrous than the disease. Similarly, it would seem that any campaign designed to secure passage of such an amendment must be well coordinated, lest its failure be decisive.
>
> We are not anxious to see the Constitution become a patchwork, amended each time a grievance cannot be resolved to everyone's satisfaction by the Supreme Court of the land in this instance, however, the implications of the high court's recent pronouncements on the relationship between church and State are so patently contrary to the intent of the Founding Fathers that a clarification by the people seems in order. For that reason we applaud the activity of the newly formed Citizens for Public Prayer in Rutland and other similar groups across the country whose aim it is to assure that America continues to hold a revered place for God in public life.
>
> We applaud also the gesture of the several Senators and Congressmen who have filed resolutions in the Congress requesting that a "prayer amendment" be made to the Constitution. Past experience should have revealed, however, that some of those resolutions may have been filed simply as a gesture to placate indignant constituents back home, with the congressional sponsors caring little or not at all whether their proposals ever are acted upon. It should also be obvious that the congressional committee charged with the responsibility of clearing one of the more than two score resolutions for general debate, could decide as has happened before—that it would be politically more prudent to sidetrack them all.
>
> We hope, therefore, that the sponsors of "prayer amendment" resolutions in the House will give serious consideration to the proposal of Representative FRANK J. BECKER, Republican of New York, that they meet and agree on the language of one resolution and then support a discharge petition to bring it to the floor of the House for debate. Proponents of a "prayer amendment" are all agreed on one basic principle—that the Founding Fathers never intended to identify the separation of church and state with the separation of God from the state. Fragmentation among these proponents however, could result in inaction on the floor of Congress and frustration among members of groups like the Citizens for Public Prayer who are ready to work for the protection of our religious heritage "back home."

SOUTH AFRICA'S STATUS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak for a moment on the subject of South Africa's status in the United Nations. Of late the climate of opinion on this subject has become hot and with justice. There has been no indication

that South Africa intends even in the distant future to alter her policy of apartheid even when the attention of the whole world is focused on this matter of equality and discrimination.

At the ILO Conference from which I have recently returned, at which no less than 102 nations were represented, a resolution was passed on June 21 which invalidated the credentials of the South African workers' delegates. It was also decided that the Secretary General of the International Labor Organization, Mr. David A. Morse, should go to New York to consult with the Secretary General of the United Nations on the grave concern expressed by the ILO and its governing body on the subject of apartheid and the problems posed by South Africa's continued membership in the United Nations.

Proposals that were earlier brought before the governing body of the International Labor Conference for consideration were that all diplomatic relations with South Africa be broken off, that all ports be closed to South African ships and all airports closed to South African planes, and that South African goods be completely boycotted. And may I add that these proposals were embodied in a resolution passed in the United Nations last year, though the implementation of these measures was left up to the discretion of the member states. Some of these measures I am sure sound extreme to you. I have called them to your attention to emphasize the proportions and urgency which this matter of apartheid has assumed in the minds of other nations and to emphasize the need for a firm position on the part of the United States.

The Communists have played up their support of African freedom, and there are many stronger non-Communist organizations who now eagerly look to the West for encouragement in their struggle against oppression. Up until this point, and to the advantage of the Communists, these non-Communist groups have not had the encouragement they desire and deserve. In Angola, for instance, Holden Roberto, who is anti-Communist, has recently come to power, and the Pan-Africanist Congress, also anti-Communist, and other anti-Communist groups seek the reassurance which only a strong position on the part of the United States can give them.

I wish to make it clear that I understand and appreciate Governor Stevenson's reluctance to use the extreme measure of expulsion against the South Africans. But I believe there is an important alternative to expulsion, that is, the suspension of South Africa from the United Nations and the expression of strong sanctions. I do not believe that suspension would have the disruptive effects of expulsion, and at the same time, this measure would demonstrate to the Africans who seek freedom that we are sincere in our concern—that we consider the South African policy of apartheid to be dangerous, intolerable, and deserving of our immediate action. Delay or weakness in this matter will cost us much in the way of international prestige, and discredit the steps we ourselves are taking to remove the stain of discrimination from our society. The Africans who have lived for too long already under the injustices of colonialism must have a way to distinguish us from those who are tolerant of the evil in their land, and must be able to look to friends other than the Communists, who, of course, exploit every such situation.

REVISION AND MODERNIZATION OF OUR IMMIGRATION LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with others of my colleagues who have indicated their support of the President's program to revise and modernize our immigration laws.

The President's proposals are a much-needed substitute for the discriminatory statute now in force. The enactment of this legislation, will effectively eliminate one of the most abusive laws now resting heavily on the conscience of this country.

The key to these proposals is the elimination of immigration quotas based on national origins. Not only are these quotas discriminatory; they are also arbitrary and obsolete. The 1920 census figures on which they are predicated no longer reflect a valid image of the ethnic composition of this country's population.

Since 1957 I have been presenting legislation that would eliminate these national quotas by replacing them with a system that would discriminate against no individual because of his country of birth. This system would provide, without respect to nationality, for the immigration of people possessing skills needed by this country, of individuals whose close relatives are U.S. citizens, and of refugees who have been suddenly uprooted from their native lands. The enactment of this legislation will undoubtedly have a salutary effect on this country, for, by facilitating the entry of highly skilled individuals, by reuniting families, and by assisting refugees, we can only strengthen the fabric of our already diverse and talented population.

The President's proposals embody, to a large degree, those ideas which I have advocated since I first entered the Congress. Consequently, I am delighted at the prospect that these proposals now carry the influence of the President behind them. I am certain the country is prepared to accept them and I sincerely hope that our citizens will make known their wishes to their Representatives in Congress in order that the President's legislation may meet with early favor.

Because of my belief in the overwhelming necessity and desirability of this legislation, I am proud to count myself as one of the numerous Members who have introduced the President's bill.

SALE OF WARPLANES TO REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Department of State is considering approving the sale of warplanes manufactured in the United States to the Republic of South Africa. On June 14, 1963, the story was reported by Laurence Barrett in the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I have protested this proposed sale to the Secretary of State. The Department of State has acknowledged that the matter is under active consideration at this time.

I believe that the sale of these planes to the Republic of South Africa would be unconscionable. Approval of an export license by the Department of State would mean in effect that the United States is supporting the racist government of Verwoerd. Documentary proof is not required to show that the South African Government is dedicated to the policy of apartheid—strict segregation of the races. In implementing its apartheid policy, the Government has engaged in some of the most repressive measures ever undertaken by any government against its own population. To the other countries of Africa the Republic of South Africa is synonymous with colonialism. To all the world this Government is synonymous with racial fascism.

It is inconceivable to me that there can be any question concerning this sale. However, it is suggested that these planes might be designed for purposes of defense against external attack and possible aggression by the Sino-Soviet bloc. I suppose that it is possible that the Sino-Soviet bloc someday may attack South Africa. But the greater possibility is that the human beings who are so ruthlessly repressed by their government will revolt. If this happens, and the proposed sale is approved, military aircraft manufactured in the United States will be used to suppress the revolution for freedom in South Africa.

At a time when we are struggling to protect and advance freedom at home and abroad, it would be ironical to approve the sale of warplanes to the dictatorial government of South Africa. I urge the Department of State to deny an export license for these planes.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the article from the New York Herald-Tribune and an exchange of correspondence between my office and the Department of State:

SOUTH AFRICA WANTS TO BUY OUR JETS—BUT

(By Laurence Barrett)

WASHINGTON.—South Africa is shopping for warplanes in the United States and for 3 months the State Department has been trying to decide whether to say yea or nay.

In view of South Africa's policy of rigid racial segregation and white supremacy, the indications are that the answer will be no. The State Department insists that no final decision has been made. However, reports reaching here from South Africa indicate that the government there believes the deal is dead.

The State Department fears that the planes might be used someday to intimidate or actually combat South African Negroes. Aside from the moral question involved, employment of made-in-U.S.A. planes used for this purpose would be a heavy blow to U.S. relations with the nonwhite nations of the world. It would also add to the administration's already great racial problems at home.

Three different planes are on the South Africans' shopping list. Each could be used for antiguerrilla operations.

Naturally, the State Department does not wish to reject perhaps tens of millions of dollars of sales. With the country spending more abroad for all purposes than it takes in from foreign countries, Federal agencies have a firm policy to encourage sales of American goods.

The sales of most kinds of armaments by private interests here to foreign countries requires the approval of the State Department. This takes the form of an export license that is issued when a transaction is about to be consummated.

In practice, a company that has an arms sale in prospect asks the State Department's munitions control division at an early stage for an informal go-ahead.

This the Grumman Co., of Bethpage, Long Island, did in March. The plane involved is the A-6A Intruder, a new craft that will soon be deployed on American aircraft carriers. The plane can be used on land. It is a subsonic, low-level, all-weather fighter-bomber that can handle both conventional and nuclear weapons.

More recently, Douglas Aircraft was approached for A-4D Skyhawks, a present mainstay of the attack carrier force. Also, North America has asked the State Department what it thinks about selling T-28 Trojans to South Africa.

In all three cases, it is understood, it was the South African Government that initiated the discussions with the American companies.

The Skyhawk is similar in some respects to the A-6A except that it is not an all-weather craft. Although both are jet powered, they are able to perform low-level maneuvers at relatively slow speeds.

The T-28 is a World War II type plane that has been used for training purposes here. However, it can be rigged for combat. Today it is being used to bomb and strafe Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam.

Last year the State Department approved the sale of seven C-130 noncombat transport planes to South Africa. It could not be ascertained whether earlier requests for combat planes were rejected.

Relations between the two countries have been strained. The United States has joined other countries in condemning apartheid—the South African euphenism for white supremacy—and South Africa has rejected such statements as improper interference with its domestic affairs.

Just yesterday the State Department ordered its Embassy in South Africa to hold its July 4 reception on an integrated basis. In Pretoria, the U.S. Embassy announced it would hold two Independence Day receptions. One in the morning for leaders of the South African Government and the diplomatic corps will be for whites only, while a reception later in the day for Americans in Pretoria and for other guests will be on an integrated basis. The State Department order obviously was dictated by the administration's concern for racial equality rather than by normal diplomatic practice. Normally, embassies observe the host country's rules, at least in public.

Despite the friction, South Africa is an anti-Communist nation which, in cold war terms, is considered part of the Western bloc. But there are no specific military agreements between the two countries and there does not appear to be any external threat to South African security.

JULY 10, 1963.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have recently read newspaper reports concerning South Africa's desire to purchase warplanes in the United States. I understand that the Department of State is considering whether to permit such purchases. In light of South Africa's deplorable apartheid policy, I believe it would be highly inadvisable for the United States to sanction the sales of warplanes to South Africa.

I would appreciate it if a report on this matter were sent to me.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. RYAN,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RYAN: Thank you for your letter of July 10 regarding the purchase of military aircraft by the Republic of South Africa.

The Department of State has had inquiries from various U.S. aircraft manufacturers asking for permission to discuss the possible sale of their products with representatives of the South African Government. These requests are under review and no final decision has been made. You may be assured that your views and those of others who have written to the Department on this subject will be given full consideration.

The policy of the U.S. Government toward South Africa has been to consider, and not to refuse outright, proposed exports of types of equipment designed essentially for purposes of defense against external attack and, particularly, those items which could strengthen defenses against possible aggression by the Sino-Soviet bloc. Applications for the export of weapons or equipment for use by the police or other security units for the enforcement of apartheid are denied.

If I can be of further assistance to you in this matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

WHO'S ANTIBUSINESS

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, more than once the suggestion has been made that the Kennedy administration is not sensitive to the needs of American business enterprise and is not responsive to the advice of the executives who manage this segment of the U.S. economy.

This opinion, in my view, is completely without foundation. Regardless, however, of the soundness of this judgment generally, there is one specific example where the contrary has been true. In the field of taxation, the administration has sponsored successfully two measures which have proved beneficial to U.S. business and which have provided increased funds for investment.

The first was the accelerated schedule of depreciation allowances which was prepared and put into effect by the Treasury Department, itself. These provided faster writeoffs of capital investment and therefore required less taxes and freed more corporate funds for other purposes.

The other measure was a legislative one. It was the investment tax credit which was passed into law in the 87th Congress. This provision permits a subtraction of up to 7 percent of the cost of new equipment from the company income tax bill.

We have not heard very much of the benefits of this provision. The companies have not trumpeted the news from the housetops by any means, yet a perusal of the annual reports of companies which pass across the desk of every Congressman shows that the benefits of this provision have been widespread and substantial.

Several companies in my district have recorded the beneficial effects of this governmental policy in their annual statements. One of these is a long established manufacturer of machinery in Ansonia, Conn. Under the tax revision, this company was able to save $300,000 in taxes, a figure that represents nearly 25 percent of the net income of the company. It chose to treat these reductions as deferred tax liabilities to be spread out over the estimated life of the assets.

A brass manufacturing concern in my home town benefited measurably from the new tax laws. In 1962, its 160th year of operation, it showed net earnings of $3.1 million. This amount excludes $616,375 that were saved due to the new tax adjustments and will appear on the balance sheet as net income in future years.

Elsewhere in Connecticut, a prominent hardware factory noted in its 1962 annual report that income tax benefits under the new 1962 guidelines amounted to $389,000, while under provisions of the Revenue Act of 1962, the company and its domestic subsidiaries obtained an investment credit of $94,000 against income taxes payable for the year 1962.

These savings have been realized in corporations all over the country. The annual report of the United States Steel Corp. shows that $44 million was added to the wear and exhaustion account in the year 1962, while the investment credit resulted in a reduction in Federal income tax of $8.2 million.

Sylvia Porter, the well-known economist and columnist, described the results of these investment incentives in a recent newspaper column as follows:

> The fact is that the investment incentives given by Congress and the Treasury in 1962 to spur business spending on plants and equipment have substantially boosted this vital type of spending. Businessmen report a full $1 billion of the increase in their spending scheduled for 1963 and 1964 is a direct result of the new tax credit and liberalized depreciation rules, and plant-equipment spending in the final quarter of 1963 is slated to run 8½ percent ahead of this spending in the same months of uncertainty about its direction.

The New York Times on July 10, 1963, carried an article which indicated that corporations during 1962 reaped a cash benefit of $2.3 billion from the investment tax credit and revision of depreciation rules:

TAX WRITEOFFS MATCH FORECAST—CORPORATIONS IN 1962 GAINED $2.3 BILLION ON INVESTMENT CREDIT AND DEPRECIATION—U.S. ESTIMATE ACCURATE—SAVINGS ALMOST EXACTLY WHAT TREASURY PREDICTED A YEAR AGO, STUDY INDICATES

WASHINGTON, July 9.—Corporations reaped a cash benefit totaling $2,300 million last year from the investment tax credit and revision of depreciation rules.

The tax saving was almost exactly what the Treasury predicted a year ago, when the investment credit was still pending in Congress and the revision of depreciation rules was first announced. For the investment credit, the tax saving was slightly larger than the Treasury's forecast.

Figures on the benefits to corporations from the two tax changes were made public today by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges. They are based on a Commerce Department study of corporate tax returns.

ALLOWANCES UP A BILLION

The study showed that total corporate depreciation allowances increased by $4,100 million in 1962, compared with those taken in the preceding year. Of this amount, the Department said, $2,400 million was attributable directly to the use of the new and shorter depreciable lives permitted under the revised rules.

The tax saving resulting from the extra depreciation charges was $1,250 million.

Use of the 7-percent tax credit by corporations in 1962 resulted in tax savings of a little more than $1 billion.

The new depreciation guidelines were used the most by large corporations, the study found. For manufacturing companies with assets of $100 million or more, the increase in depreciation writeoffs amounted to 18 percent. For medium-sized companies, the increase was 15 percent, and for corporations with assets of less than $10 million, only 7 percent.

HOW IT WORKS

More rapid depreciation of equipment brings tax savings to business because depreciation allowances are deducted from taxable income. Faster depreciation means larger deductions in any given year.

Transportation, manufacturing, and mining industries showed the greatest increases in their depreciation allowances, compared with 1916—17 percent for transportation and 14 percent for the other two.

Among manufacturing industries, only aircraft companies showed no appreciable increase in depreciation deductions as a result of the new depreciation guidelines. The primary metals, paper, chemicals and stone, clay, and glass products industries were heavy users of the new shorter depreciable lives.

The new depreciation rules affected least the public utility and commercial group of industries, the bulk of whose capital investment is in buildings. The liberalized depreciation standards applied only to machinery and equipment, and not to buildings.

FIFTY-FIVE PERCENT SWITCHED

Overall, companies accounting for 55 percent of total depreciation charges switched to use of the new depreciation guidelines.

Industries that made the least use of the new guidelines made the most use of the investment credit.

Companies in the communications, public utility, trade, and service industries each reaped tax savings of more than $150 million from the investment credit. The taxes of transportation firms were reduced by $100 million as a result of the credit.

For all manufacturing and mining companies, the tax benefits realized from the credit totaled $500 million.

The Commerce Department study covered only corporate businesses. Earlier Treasury estimates indicated that savings to unincorporated business would amount to $200 million from the credit and $250 million from the depreciation revision.

It should be noted that the amount that the corporations saved because of the newly introduced investment credit was larger than the Treasury Department's prediction of a year ago, while the overall tax saving was exactly what the Treasury had predicted when the investment credit legislation was still pending before this body.

I am very happy about these developments and I am pleased that the legislative and executive branches of our Government have cooperated so successfully to provide a stimulus to business investment which will produce more jobs and benefit our economy generally.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this body the remarkable work and achievements of the National Institute of Dental Research, which recently observed the 15th anniversary of its establishment. Since its creation by the U.S. Congress in 1948, the Institute has assumed leadership for dental research that has widely influenced the great contribution of dental science to the conquest of disease. This favorable trend has brought not only important advances in clinical dentistry but has added significantly to our basic biological knowledge. The traditional separation of dental research from the total body of the biological sciences is changing and the Institute today is not only carrying on research in disease-oriented programs but has expanded its interest into fundamental areas of knowledge which have applicability to all disease problems.

Refinement of research techniques, particularly in connection with the Institute's large colony of germ-free animals and in such fields as biochemistry, genetics, and crystallography have had broad effectiveness in the basic sciences. Important work in enzyme chemistry, X-ray diffraction, and the crystal structure of mineralized tissues have provided to scientists throughout the world fundamental data and advanced concepts underlying many kinds of pathologic situations.

At the same time, the Dental Institute, in pursuing its mission to study the origins, prevention, and treatment of oral diseases, has given us new knowledge of the mechanisms of tooth decay, periodontal disease, malocclusion, cleft palate, and reconstructive techniques.

It is less than 100 years since the first American dental school was admitted to membership in the university family. For almost all that century the dental schools discharged their teaching and service obligations most creditably, but their research activities were limited and relatively ineffective. It was not until the Dental Institute's grants programs provided the dental schools with resources and impetus that the American dental schools began to fulfill their long-neglected research objectives.

The critical manpower situation in the dental profession has been highlighted in many reports. It is to the credit of the Dental Institute that this acute problem—the necessity of increasing the number of dental teachers and researchers—has been more widely understood and that steps have been taken to cope with it.

Prior to 1940, there were only 20 persons in all the history of the United States who held both the D.D.S. and Ph. D. degrees. In the decade from 1940 to 1950, 27 more such persons were added.

In contrast, at the present time, the National Institute of Dental Research is today providing training opportunities for 177 persons, 67 of them seeking the Ph. D. in addition to the D.D.S.

There has now evolved what is essentially a partnership between Government and the university, between the Dental Institute and the dental schools, and this relationship has become one of mutual interdependence and mutual productivity.

This partnership has produced a revolution in dental practice and a vastly improved level of dental health in our population. The development of fluoridation of community water supplies has reduced tooth decay in children by two-thirds in those communities where it has been put into effect. Dental Institute scientists have shown that this protection by fluoride lasts into adult life.

Other research with germ-free animals has proved that tooth decay is in animals a transmissible and infectious disease, caused by a strain of streptococcus. This discovery has tremendous implications for future treatment, since knowledge about bacterial disease and its control is well advanced. The same kind of research is being carried on now in the causes of periodontal disease, major cause of loss of teeth in adult life.

These are just a few examples of the outstanding work being done by the National Institute of Dental Research and by the non-Federal research institutions taking part in its programs. I am confident that the National Institute of Dental Research will achieve even greater success in the years ahead.

THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM FOR THE COMING FISCAL YEAR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be considering the foreign aid program for the coming fiscal year.

The Alliance for Progress is of great interest and significance to us all, for it holds great promise. I think it would be good for us to know what some of the beneficiaries of the Alliance think of the program. For example, one of the outstanding newspapers of Latin America, La Prensa of Lima, Peru, had this to say:

[From the La Prensa, Lima, Peru, July 4, 1963]

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(By Manuel Aguirre Roca)

The misunderstandings about the Alliance for Progress are, in good part due to prejudice. Since the development of Latin American countries depends in great part upon the United States, and as the Alliance for Progress project was announced by President Kennedy himself, a conclusion was unduly reached that the Alliance for Progress was a massive aid program, offering money and equipment from the United States to the underdeveloped countries of that part of the globe.

There have been previous U.S. programs of bilateral aid, such as point IV, and, in a less strict economic sense, the good neighbor policy, through which Latin American countries received assistance from Uncle Sam for their progress.

All this contributes to confuse the new and unique aspect of the Alliance for Progress, making it difficult to comprehend.

The first thing that must be done, I believe, to understand the meaning of the Alliance is to throw overboard all prefabricated ideas. Let us therefore discard them and understand that the Alliance for Progress is not a program of assistance offered by the United States to the Latin American countries. It is not a flow of dollars in a unilateral sense, or in any other sense.

For this reason the repeated criticism "the gringos are fooling us with the Alliance, because in reality they give us very little" lacks truth. They have not offered us a deluge of dollars or equipment, so we cannot accuse them of idle boasting.

What is, then, the Alliance?

It is a commitment contracted by all countries of the hemisphere, through which each country offers to undertake development efforts, according to political and economic criteria and following a minimum pace.

Let us imagine a family going through a bad economic period. Let us imagine that one day the members of the family get together and agree to solve their grave problems through the persistent and rational effort of each. This is the Alliance. We see therefore that it is a promise between all the members of the Latin American family, or, as said very wisely by Manuel Seoane Corrales in a TV interview, an authentic honor pact between the countries, and not a program of foreign aid.

There then would be two principal ideas in the Alliance: (a) a development commitment entered upon by each of the member countries, and (b) the acceptance of uniform and well-defined political and economic rules to which the method or modus operandi of development should be subjected.

Which are these rules? This is a most interesting point, since its study will allow us to X-ray the prevailing political and economic thinking of the continent and, at the same time find out which members of the Alliance comply or not with the solemn promise of Punta del Este.

The fundamental economic rule, as seen in the Charter of Punta del Este consists in "maintaining price stability, avoiding inflation and deflation with its consequences of social losses and bad distribution of resources." This rule is complemented by the development plans which each country must submit, in order to achieve the concrete objectives chronologically programed by the Alliance.

The Alliance stipulates that its members shall formulate development plans in which will be observed "the basic orientation of a fiscal and monetary policy to achieve the program with price stability."

In conclusion, the Alliance for Progress is a development commitment entered into by the countries of the continent, who promise to promote price stability and anti-inflationary techniques through the elaboration of plans which would be based on these same principles of stability. This means that the Alliance condemns subsidy methods, exchange controls, inflation, and, finally, state domination of private enterprise (estatismo) and points out the importance of private enterprise.

TESTIMONY OF UNDER SECRETARY OF LABOR JOHN F. HENNING ON THE DESIRABILITY OF EXTENDING PUBLIC LAW 78 IN ITS PRESENT FORM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Senate Subcommitte on Migratory Labor heard testimony from Under Secretary of Labor, John F. Henning, on the desirability of extending Public Law 78 in its present form. Secretary Henning said that an extension of Public Law 78 without amendments to protect our own workers would be "unthinkable."

Secretary Henning testified that the bracero program most certainly has an adverse effect on the domestic labor market. I quote:

The availability of a large supply of alien workers has created an anomalous situation in our agricultural labor market seriously interferring with the free interplay of supply and demand. The certification which permits the admission of any alien workers into the United States for temporary employment must essentially be conditioned upon a shortage of available domestic labor. It is axiomatic that in such a normal labor shortage situation the bidding for available domestic labor would produce more competitive job offers. In these circumstances we could generally expect better terms and conditions of employment than would prevail in labor surplus areas.

With an inexhaustible supply of alien workers at our very borders we find, conversely, that the terms and conditions of employment offered domestic workers not only remain static but in many cases are less favorable than those offered domestic workers in areas where no alien workers are employed. We find, further, the incredible situation where alien workers are offered better terms and conditions of employment than are afforded our own agricultural workers competing for the same jobs. The simple fact is that under the present system an employer can refuse to offer to domestic workers the same terms and conditions that he is required to offer alien workers. If the domestic worker refuses to accept the job at less favorable terms, the employer is permitted to bring in Mexican workers who are then afforded the very terms and conditions which were denied to our own workers.

We realize all the unemployed cannot be used in agricultural activities. At the same time, we must exercise every caution to assure that qualified domestic workers are given preference for all available job opportunities. That this has not been the case is highlighted by the fact that in the State of California in 1962, 127,000 Mexican workers were contracted and recontracted. During this same period there were an estimated annual average of 395,000 domestic workers unemployed in that State. In Arizona, 16,906 Mexicans were contracted while 23,900 domestic workers were unemployed. In the State of Arkansas, 12,410 Mexicans were contracted; 42,400 domestic workers were unemployed. Texas used 36,289 Mexican workers while 174,600 domestic workers were unemployed.

NORTHEAST AIRLINES

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, amid the flurry of concern and indignation generated by the Civil Aeronautics Board's decision to remove Northeast Airlines from their most profitable New York-Miami run, there appear to be only two parties expressing jubilation. These are the two competitors in that run, Eastern and National Airlines who can expect millions in additional revenue if the Northeast service is discontinued.

The fact, as pointed out by the two dissenters on the CAB, that Northeast has worked hard for the past 7 years to develop good service on the Florida route seems to have been forgotten by the three members who voted to decapitate the airline. Northeast's entry into the market has caused noticeable improvements in the service of all three—proving one of the greatest advantages of healthy competition. Now, these improvements may well be lost, stated the dissenters.

Because of its profits from the New York to Florida run, Northeast has borne the burden of unsubsidized service to many New England communities, saving the Federal Treasury $15 million, while similar services have been subsidized in many areas of the country. The Board will now give subsidies to support the New England routes and take away their only profitable long-haul run.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to see how this best serves the public interest. To remove a company from a competitive market where its very presence has improved the services offered the public, thus obliging it to operate its other essential runs at a loss, is no public service. But to expect the same taxpaying public which suffers from that curtailment of service to pick up the tab for the losses is actually a public disservice to everyone except the jubilant rivals, Eastern and National Airlines.

Two additional facts make the CAB's decision even less understandable. Their recent policy has been to get the smaller, regional airlines off subsidies. That was its major reason for giving Northeast the New York-Miami run in the first place. Second, their decision came after the Hughes Tool Co. assumed airlines debts amounting to $23 million, thus giving Northeast hopes of operating once again on a solvent basis.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant that the major and most vigorous arguments for the removal of Northeast Airlines from the Florida run came from National and Eastern Airlines. They claim that the route cannot support 3 airlines—yet 2 other comparable routes each support 4 carriers and 12 others are serviced by 3 carriers each.

Eastern Airlines has attributed much of its financial distress to Northeast's competition. Yet Northeast, despite its troubles with the New England routes has managed to make the Florida route a profitable one and has increased its services, compelling the others to do likewise. This, Mr. Speaker, is the heart and soul of our system of free enterprise and competition—that rivals for the same market will strive to improve services and costs to the benefit of the public. If Eastern cannot stand up to the competition provided by Northeast and operate at a profit, why should the more successful Northeast be the one to lose the franchise? Can it be that the CAB is trying to salve its conscience for turning down Eastern's application to merge with American several weeks ago?

Mr. Speaker, the decision of the CAB should be scrutinized more carefully to determine why the arguments of two competitors should persuade the board to act in such direct opposition to the public interest.

MIGRANT LABOR PROGRAMS ARE EXPENSIVE AND WASTEFUL

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, some Members of Congress have dismissed the tragic crisis to small agricultural towns caused by the discontinuance of the bracero program by saying in effect "we hope to get Federal aid to promote a migrant system for furnishing the necessary supplemental farm labor."

Before such a plan is promulgated, the cruel sociological and emotional consequences should be understood.

The cost of any such program would be enormous and wasteful. But even if every agricultural area were provided with free public family housing and if equipped with community theaters, parks, libraries, swimming pools, and so forth—and even if the Federal Government generously built, supplied and staffed the necessary schools, jails, hospitals and public service facilities, the nomadic life of following the crops—living 2 months here, 3 months there and then migrating to some other place—would be unimaginably unhealthful and disruptive. The movement of the migrant families, no matter how handsomely housed and provisioned, will be detrimental to the educational, social and economic welfare of each community through which they pass as well as to the migrant family.

It is highly doubtful that teachers, doctors, welfare technicians, or governmental officials could be induced to follow the migrant family from harvest to harvest. Logically these technicians—and their families—should not be exempt from the nomadic life, if the poor farm laborer—and his family—is required to migrate with the crops.

Another suggestion that the farm laborer family should stay in some rural community all year, even though only 1 to 5 months farm employment is available nearby, is irrational and not practicable. Farm labor skills are the least interchangeable with skills required in other industries. The skills are among the lowest of any industry.

No one with a higher skill will work on a row crop—primarily because an unemployed skilled worker need not accept farm work, at any wage, to claim generous unemployment compensation. Row crop work is onerous and available only when work in other industries is also at or near annual peaks.

Few communities can support an unemployed family for the 6 to 11 months' period during which crops do not grow and there is no farm work.

Is there a community, town, city, or county in America which could provide facilities to support, house, feed, and care for an influx of 20 to 200 percent more unemployed than its normal population for 3 to 9 months of the year? I trust no Member of Congress desires to force this predicament and this imposition on any other community.

I trust that each Member of Congress will consider thoroughly the chaotic consequences such a program would create in his own district before he votes to impose it upon another district.

We need solutions for our problems—not just more problems. The bracero program was an effective, humanitarian, moral, economical solution.

THE TERRIBLE TRUTH

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the fast moving events of the past several weeks are full of fearful foreboding for the American people and the free world. There is more convincing evidence daily that President Kennedy, in his dangerous flirtation with Khrushchev, for whatever reason, is failing to protect the security of the United States.

His proposed test ban treaty, the weakening of our defense potential, the cowering before Communist aggression, and the constant appeals for peace, peace at any price, are putting this Nation in grave peril and strengthening the world position of Soviet Russia and international communism.

America must be awakened to the danger which the President is creating through lack of leadership, lack of courage to face the problems of this day. If we cannot save the United States from the follies of the Kennedy administration until the people have had an opportunity to express themselves, we may find it necessary to take other measures to prevent an incompetent administration from destroying us before the next election.

This morning I attended a briefing on the test ban treaty, given by Averell Harriman for Members of the House. Whatever fears I had were strengthened by the thoroughly innocuous statements of the Assistant Secretary of State who admitted that all scientific facts are ignored as relatively unimportant in the anxiety of the administration to reach a political agreement with the Soviet Union on a test ban.

What will the test ban mean to the United States? At this point I would like to include an excerpt from the Newsgram page of the August 5 issue of U.S. News & World Report:

> Nuclear test ban does not mean disarmament. Nuclear weapons still will be the weapons of future war. Weapon testing will not come to a full stop.
>
> Tests will continue underground. France will go on testing in the air. Red China will test in the air, too, if and when she gets the bomb.
>
> Test ban of 1958, not in treaty form, was broken by Russia in 1960. Test ban at that time was used by Reds to prepare for 1960 tests. New agreement, once approved, can be ended on 3 months' notice—a loophole for cheating.
>
> Test agreement, now being entered into, favors Russia. Russia, behind in smaller nuclear weapons, can catch up by testing underground. United States behind in bigger weapons and in an antimissile missile, will be hindered in her effort to catch up by the bar against testing in the atmosphere.
>
> United States, even before the new agreement, was slowing her pace in the arms race, hoping that Soviet Russia would follow the U.S. example.
>
> Just bear this in mind: As long as Russia is a closed country, ruled by a dictatorship, possessed of weapons capable of destroying United States, there can be no real disarmament, no real end to the arms race without great danger.
>
> Test agreement, actually can serve a political purpose. In United States it can help in a 1964 campaign based on theme of "peace and prosperity." In Russia it can calm war

fears and help keep the people quiet and contented.

Mr. Speaker, in view of that indictment of the treaty, and remembering the dire warnings of Dr. Teller that there is every evidence the Russians are ahead of us in the development of nuclear weapons, and that we cannot develop an antimissile missile without testing in the atmosphere, should we not demand of the President to answer the question, What earthly good can be accomplished by this treaty?

Coupled with the dangers to U.S. security involved in the test ban treaty, I would like to point to two articles in the same issue of U.S. News & World Report which indicate how far we have already gone and how much further we are planning to go in abandoning our military strength and in unilaterally disarming. Incidentally, the statements made in these articles can be backed up by the testimony of Secretary of Defense McNamara and other spokesmen from the Pentagon in hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on Department of Defense Appropriations for fiscal year 1964. Apparently we are abandoning many of our present weapons systems, if they are provocative. We are abandoning our military superiority, reducing the United States to a position of assured equality. This compounds the existing danger of no new weapons systems. In the area of military strength, standing still is going backward as the enemy updates his equipment.

These articles, which I include at this point as a part of these remarks, show that the United States under President Kennedy's leadership, may be giving up in the arms race, and that we are courting disaster in pursuing present Pentagon policies.

IS UNITED STATES GIVING UP IN THE ARMS RACE?

(United States has already started disarming, on its own, and at a fast clip. Bases are being dismantled, bombers scrapped, new weapons cut back or shelved. Project to build a U.S. arsenal of overwhelming superiority has been abandoned. It's official policy—based on this theory: "The more we arm the less secure we get.")

A major upheaval in U.S. defenses is now taking place.

A vast and varied arsenal of strategic weapons, planned by the Eisenhower administration, is being in large part canceled out or dismantled. A new and nonprovocative kind of arsenal is being emphasized in its place.

The official record shows the following:

Bombers are being sent to the scrap heap. Thor and Jupiter missiles are being removed from bases in Europe. Navy carriers are headed for a cutback. Some big bases overseas are being closed.

Funds for future weapons, moreover, have been reduced or eliminated—as in the cases of the RS-70 bomber and the Skybolt missile. Future production of nuclear materials is to be slowed. Nuclear arms are being frozen at their present stage of development through a partial test ban just worked out with Russia.

The Kennedy administration, responsible for the drastic change, sees this change as vital and necessary, and is convinced it will not endanger security. The United States, it is claimed, is entering a period of unavoidable nuclear stalemate requiring new strategy. As described by some administration officials, the strategy has a theme: "The more we arm the less secure we get."

QUALMS FROM HISTORY

Many authorities in the Military Establishment, who now are silenced, think the new strategy adds up to a type of intentional and one-sided disarmament.

They point back to the 1920's, following World War I, and to the late 1940's, following World War II. In 1922 the United States entered into an agreement to limit navies, only to have Japan violate that agreement. United States decided, even so, that "disarmament by example" on its part would lead others to disarm.

Events then led toward World War II. After World War II, the United States again disarmed—this time without any agreement.

The Korean war followed when Communists decided the United States was too weak to resist aggression.

Military authorities now express concern that the United States may be repeating the mistakes of the past—endangering its own security in pursuit of a fancy slogan. Heads of U.S. armed services simply do not buy the slogan, "The more we arm the less secure we get."

Instead, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, often with unanimity, have opposed almost all of the arms cutbacks now being put into effect. Opposition is beginning to build in Congress as well.

CRITICS' POINT: WHY SWITCH TO A NUCLEAR STALEMATE?

Concern, in large measure, comes down to this:

Why abandon known superiority over Russia to settle for a nuclear stalemate—or less? Is it safe to rely only on missiles for long-term defense? Is enough stress being placed on future weapons to prevent a technological Pearl Harbor? In short, is the Nation being imperiled by quick-look decisions?

Behind the concern is a set of facts, now fully emerging, of the changes being made in the Eisenhower strategy that was designed to carry this country through the decade of the 1960's.

General Eisenhower, in a succession of eight defense budgets totaling $315 billion, started building a shield of overwhelming strategic power. Bombers were produced by the many hundreds, and others were rushed to the drawing boards. More than 1,300 long-range missiles were provided for to complement the bomber force.

Money was provided for work on missile-firing submarines and bomber-launched missiles. Funds were invested in research on nuclear planes, antimissile missiles and neutron bombs.

Many avenues of research were opened. Money was placed where experts thought it would do most good. Some of this money was shown to be wasted. Other investments returned immense dividends.

The result, overall, was to be an unrivaled array of U.S. strategic power, assuring nuclear superiority at all costs. A full look at the arsenal planned during the Eisenhower years is shown in the table following this article.

Mr. Kennedy's view of strategy differs sharply from that of his predecessor. General Eisenhower, it is charged by present officials, overemphasized nuclear warfare and badly neglected conventional forces. The idea now is to reduce the U.S. potential for "overkill" with nuclear weapons, and to beef up nonnuclear forces.

WHERE UNITED STATES HAS CUT BACK NUCLEAR WEAPONS SYSTEMS

Radical cutbacks, as a result, have been put into effect where nuclear weapons systems are concerned. What the record shows:

B-47 bomber: Already cut back from 1,100 to 650. Will be down to 300 by next summer, entirely abandoned by 1966. Power of the B-47 bomb load is more than 10 megatons; this is equal to more than 10 million tons of TNT.

B-52 bomber: Production has halted despite congressional desire to continue, and the operational fleet was frozen at 630 planes. Some models will be scrapped inside 5 years; others presumably can be kept flying a few years after that. In the latest model, the H-series, the B-52 will carry more than 50 megatons over a 10,000-mile range.

B-58 bomber: The production line was shut down last autumn—also over congressional opposition—after about 80 planes were earmarked for combat-type duty. This plane carries a 15-megaton load at supersonic speeds.

RS-70 bomber: Planned by the Air Force as bomber of the 1970's, but held up in development stage. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and many Members of Congress went to see it in production, but chances are slim.

Thor missile: Four bases in England, with 60 medium-range missiles capable of reaching into Russia, were ordered dismantled shortly after Soviet Russia withdrew its missiles from Cuba.

Jupiter missile: Bases in Italy and Turkey, with a total of 45 missiles, were ordered abandoned. They had just become operational at a cost of $555 million.

Skybolt missiles: Designed to extend the life of the bomber force well into the 1970's, this project was killed, although Britain, which was to share the missile, protested strongly.

Nike-Zeus "missile killer": Army requests to put this antimissile missile around U.S. cities were refused, over strong protests from Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The project has been scrapped in the search for a substitute.

Military satellites: The Midas "spy satellite" was killed after a decision that 15 extra minutes' warning of missile attack was not worth the millions still required to perfect it. Numerous other military space projects have been abandoned or delayed.

Navy carriers: Signs point to a cut of as much as one-third in the Navy's fleet of 15 attack carriers. Construction is being delayed on an additional new carrier authorized by Congress last year.

Oversea bases: Flying bases in England, Morocco, Spain, France, Guam, and elsewhere have been or will be shut down. Prospects are for further withdrawals from overseas, possibly involving 1 of the 2 Army divisions in Korea and some 50,000 men in Europe.

Atomic production: The aim is to shut down half of the Nation's 14 major plants manufacturing nuclear materials for weapons. The administration feels that the present stockpile is bigger than any demand it can foresee.

Nuclear test ban: The United States alone took the initiative in suspending atmospheric tests in June as evidence of good faith before formal test ban talks with Russia. Military requests to continue testing were set aside.

VIEWS OF MILITARY LEADERS—WORRIES ABOUT FUTURE

What does this add up to?

Testimony released after closed-door hearings of Congress tells one part of the story. Worry about the future U.S. military position is being expressed on a scale not equaled in recent years.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, challenged Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara on the new strategy. He disclosed also that he had appealed directly to Mr. Kennedy—to no avail—after almost $5 billion were cut from the original Air Force budget.

Service rivalries were set aside by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in opposing cuts by the administration's top civilians in the Pentagon.

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Army Chief of Staff, told Congress that he had recommended continuing both the Air Force's RS–70 and the Skybolt. He was not "horse trading" with the Air Force in giving this support, he said. These were "purely military judgments."

Adm. George W. Anderson, then Chief of Naval Operations, supported Air Force programs and the Army's Nike-Zeus. He favored extending the life of bombers, he explained, because of doubts about the reliability of missiles.

It was General LeMay who came forward with the most emphasis. He disclosed that the budget as sent to Congress had been shorn by the administration of $321 million sought for 100 more Minuteman missiles, $543 million for the RS–70, and $454 million for the Skybolt.

This exchange then took place before the House Subcommittee on Defense Department Appropriations:

Representative GERALD R. FORD, Republican, of Michigan: "With the decision on the RS–70 and with the decision on Skybolt, with the decision in the Minuteman area, as you look down the road, General LeMay, to 1968 and years thereafter, do you feel our strategic posture will be as strong, relatively speaking, as it is today?"

General LEMAY: "You have to visualize what the threat is going to be at that time. At this moment, I would say no, and that is what worries me. * * * You cannot buy back time, Mr. Ford."

Representative FORD: "Do you accept the philosophy that mutual deterrence or nuclear stalemate is inevitable?"

General LEMAY: "No, I do not accept that philosophy at all.

"I think it is a dangerous philosophy to say: Well, a stalemate is going to exist, we cannot do anything about it; therefore we do nothing. If we accept mutual deterrence, this will, I think, inevitably lead to defeat."

A "MAGINOT" MENTALITY?

Main opposition of General LeMay and others to the cutback in U.S. strategic forces is this: An all-missile "stalemate force" is inflexible. It represents "dangerous Maginot Line thinking" that could leave the United States open to disaster if an enemy came up with an antimissile defense or dramatic, new offensive weapons.

Reliability of missiles, testimony makes clear, is far from proven. Accuracy is not up to standards originally set. The second table following this article gives an indication of today's missile reliability.

General LeMay insists that claims made in behalf of Soviet defenses against U.S. bombers are far overstated. Argument is made that manned-weapons systems will always be needed—in the air or in space. Dissatisfaction is expressed at cuts made in Air Force projects that look forward to possible space warfare.

All that is on the record, as released by committees of Congress.

Not on the record—censored from publication on "policy grounds"—is another side of the story.

This other side concerns what many top military men consider to be a "soft-headed philosophy" about relations with Russia: The idea that the United States can lead Russia to disarmament by first partially disarming itself, to set an example.

Military men in large numbers contend that President Kennedy and his chief aide for defense, Mr. McNamara, are "beguiled" by this philosophy.

THE "PEACE STRATEGISTS" AND THE "SPIRAL THEORY"

Just what is this philosophy—and whose is it?

One civilian witness before Congress described it in these words:

"An arms race is very much like an argument. The spiral will never turn downward until one party reduces its armaments, even by a small amount at first. In the main area of military spending, it would appear that the United States as the country with by far the greatest overkill capacity, has to be the first to take this step. Certainly, the party that is behind in the race is not likely to be the first to do so."

John T. McNaughton, General Counsel of the Department of Defense, and an arms-control expert, says that "arms control" measures need not necessarily be negotiated and based on formal treaties. He feels that arms control can be achieved by starting with "unilateral acts"—one country taking the lead.

Essentially the same view is shared by other top civilian advisers. Among them are several key members of Mr. McNamara's team of "whiz kids" at the Pentagon, as well as Jerome B. Wiesner, Presidential science adviser; Carl Kaysen, White House arms-control expert; and Walt Whitman Rostow, policy planner at the State Department. These men are sometimes called the "peace strategists."

Outside the Government, physicist Hans Bethe, of Cornell, is credited with being the most influential strategist for peace. Dr. Bethe plays a role of unofficial adviser similar to one played by Dr. Edward Teller—exponent of a "hard line" toward Russia—during the Eisenhower administration.

These men are described by military leaders as being extremely influential in altering national strategy.

"NONPROVOCATIVE" ARMS

"In 2 years," explains one military man, "there has emerged in this country a military philosophy developed by civilians that predicts a nuclear standoff—with both United States and Russia possessing absolute ability to destroy the other.

"Arms controllers think the risk of war can be lessened by making our forces 'nonprovocative.' Hardened missiles, to be used only in retaliation, are nonprovocative. But antimissiles are not to be pushed hard because they could only serve to provoke the arms race. Space weapons are very provocative. And bombers must be abandoned because they are good only as a 'first strike' weapon and are therefore extremely provocative.

"If this philosophy is pursued without restraint of any kind on the Russians, the result could be disastrous. You end up with the United States unilaterally disarming itself of everything except Minuteman and Polaris missiles in the strategic field. You assume a lasting stalemate, but this supposes that the Russians are standing still on antimissiles, giant warheads, space weapons. "This is the road to a second-class military posture in just a few years."

An expert on military affairs adds this note:

"The influence of civilian arms controllers has been tremendous and it accounts, in large part, for the defense-only nature of our strategic outlook, our depreciatory attitude toward any thought of winning and our attitude of resignation toward further increases in Russia's relative military position.

"We have a great force today—a superiority. But while enjoying this superiority we are making all kinds of decisions about the future that will reduce our firepower by a very wide percentage. In other words, we are deciding to get along without the vast firepower of bombers, but giving no serious effort to a next generation of weapons to make up the difference."

Civilian arms controllers, brought under fire, reply that they recognize there is a risk involved. But they consider the risk of a continuing arms race to be much greater. The arms race, in their view, can lead either to national bankruptcy or to a war of annihilation.

ADMINISTRATION'S POSITION: U.S. POWER IS GROWING

Secretary McNamara decries the charge that the United States is in any way weakening its defenses. He sees American power growing, not decreasing, in overall effectiveness.

It is a rapid increase in numbers of missiles that gives the administration confidence. As bombers are phased out, new missiles are coming in at the rate of one a day. More than $30 billion has gone into this missile force.

That picture in more detail—

Atlas: A force of 126 Atlas missiles is now in position, all within range of the Soviet heartland. They carry warheads of 4 to 8 megatons. Because some are "soft" and especially vulnerable, and none react instantaneously to firing orders, they will be replaced in another few years.

Titan: Now in "silos" in Western States are 54 Titan I missiles. By the end of the year 54 Titan II's will be added. Titans are America's mightiest missiles, with warheads of close to 20 megatons each. Outlook is for phasing out the slower reacting Titan I and retaining only the instant-firing Titan II.

Minuteman: A first wing of 150 solid-fueled Minutemen is installed in Montana, and others are now going into place in North and South Dakota. By 1966 the United States will possess 950 Minutemen in "hard" sites. The Air Force is asking for several hundred more.

Polaris: The program underway calls for a force of 41 Polaris-firing submarines. Already at sea are 10 of these, with 16 missiles each. By 1967—a total of 656 missiles, ready to be fired from deep under the sea. Advances in warhead technology have increased the punch of both Minuteman and Polaris to more than 1 megaton.

U.S. nuclear forces, it is held, will never lack the power to destroy Russia many times over. This is held true by Mr. McNamara even though the trend is away from bombers and missiles with a "big bang" to Minuteman and Polaris missiles with a relatively "small bang."

Secretary McNamara, at the same time, insists that the security of the United States depends on more than an arsenal of strategic weapons.

He wants a "flexible response" that will enable this country to stand up to a limited-war crisis without having to resort—at the first shot of a rifle—to all-out nuclear warfare.

In recent months, Mr. McNamara points out, there has been an increase of 60 percent in U.S. tactical nuclear forces in Western Europe; a 45 percent increase in combat-ready Army divisions; a 30 percent expansion of the number of Air Force tactical squadrons, and a 200-percent increase in guerrilla-type forces.

Military spending has gone from $41.5 billion in the last year of the Eisenhower administration to $51 billion for the fiscal year just starting.

Cutback of the RS–70, cancellation of Skybolt, withdrawal of bombers were made, administration officials say, not primarily because these weapons are "provocative" or have no usefulness—but because even a $51 billion budget won't buy everything that military men ask for.

A SOVIET THREAT: DANGER OF AN ARMS BREAKTHROUGH

A growing worry to military men is the danger that Russia may be moving faster than the United States toward breakthroughs to new weapons. The main areas of worry:

Antimissile defense: Russia is thought to be spending as much on defenses against missiles as on offensive missiles. At stake is the future effectiveness of virtually the entire U.S. strategic force, if Russia succeeds in perfecting a missile killer.

Superterror weapon: A single 100-megaton warhead dropped on New York would destroy practically everything for roughly 20 miles in all directions and create firestorms and fallout covering whole States. Heavyweight nuclear tests and rocket shots in the Pacific last Autumn indicate the Soviets are developing missiles to carry warheads of mammoth proportions.

THE BIG WORRY NOW—SHRINKING SUPERIORITY OF U.S. POWER

The Russians, it is conceded, already have the capability of orbiting and bringing down hydrogen bombs on targets. Experts say this is an inefficient way to wage war. Others maintain it is just a start—that there is no telling what types of new weapons are being worked on for as yet unknown military use by Soviet Russia.

The United States, by contrast, is described as going slow with weapons of the future that tend to appear speculative and costly. No new strategic-weapons system is under serious development at this time in the United States.

Stefan T. Possony, of Stanford's Hoover Institution, a leading authority on military affairs, claims that America's failure to modernize its weapons places the Nation in danger of a "nuclear and technological Pearl Harbor." Dr. Possony's view, shared by numbers of others, is given in detail in the article appearing immediately below.

Concern, over all, is growing rapidly at this time over the upheaval in U.S. defenses.

America's declining power in relation to Russia is the big worry now.

Another—for the future—is Red China's approaching status as an atomic power. That is just a matter of time. The prospect of a nuclear-armed and unrestrained Red China creates additional concern in a period when the United States appears to many to be cutting back, not beefing up, for danger ahead.

How America's nuclear arsenal is to be "streamlined"

	From this—as planned by the Eisenhower administration for the mid-1960's	To this—as planned by the Kennedy administration for the late 1960's
B-47 bombers	1,100.	0.
B-52 bombers	630.	0.
B-58 bombers	80.	0.
Thor missiles	60.	0.
Jupiter missiles	45.	0.
Atlas missiles	126.	0.
Titan missiles	126.	54.
Polaris missiles	464.	656.
Minuteman missiles	600.	950+.
Nuclear weapons and delivery systems equaling.	30 to 40 billion tons of TNT.	2 billion tons of TNT.

WHY MANY MILITARY MEN ARE CONCERNED

In addition to sharp cutback in available U.S. nuclear punch, there is this fact: No new strategic bomber, missile, or space-weapons system is now under serious development for the late 1960's.

MISSILES—MAINSTAY OF THE FUTURE: HOW RELIABLE ARE THEY?

Test record of long-range U.S. missiles

Missile	Total firings	Complete success	Rate of success (percent)
Atlas	181	130	71.8
Titan	80	56	70.0
Minuteman	48	34	70.8

Source: U.S. Air Force records, through July 18, 1963.

WHAT THE EXPERTS SAY[1]

Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations: "I have some doubts as to the reliability of the missiles in the period we are talking about. I do not have the same confidence in any of the missile systems as do some of the technicians who attest to the performance of the missiles."

* * * * *

Representative GERALD R. FORD, Republican of Michigan: "Has any one of these three missile systems been tested on site with operational crews, with a nuclear warhead?"

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff: "No."

Representative FORD: "Are any programed?"

General LeMay: "Not with a nuclear warhead. We tried to get authority during the last series of tests to fire an Atlas with a warhead. It was disapproved."

* * * * *

General LeMay:

"A missile is like an airplane. It has a propulsion unit, it has an airframe, and it has a guidance system, and so forth. We know from past experience how much work is necessary to go into an aircraft system to get it reliable enough to guarantee carrying out the mission. We know from thousands and thousands of sorties exactly what the reliability is.

"For instance, in an airplane we have an abort rate of less than 5 percent in carrying out combat missions. With the missile, we will never have the degree of experience that we have with the manned airplane."

* * * * *

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania:

"I am seriously concerned about this problem having to do with the percentage of reliability of all of the ICBM missiles, regardless of which generation.

"The average guy in the street is undoubtedly of the opinion that every missile we have, regardless of sophistication, degree, or generation, or name, is 100 percent operational and 100 percent reliable. This, of course, is not the case."

THE PENTAGON "COURTS DISASTER"

(By Dr. Stefan T. Possony, director of international political studies program, Hoover Institution, Stanford University)

It is being suggested in Washington that a technological plateau has been reached, which allegedly allows us to pause before we decide on acquiring new weapons systems.

Evidence on continuing and accelerating technological advances in the Soviet Union is pooh-poohed systematically or passed over in silence. It may be useful, therefore, to take a short look at some of the weapons which the Soviets seem to be developing in order to insure our "burial."

Chief Marshal of Aviation Konstantine Vershinin has reiterated frequently that, though the decisive role in war henceforth will be played by long-range missiles, no future military operations will be feasible without the participation of large numbers of aircraft. The main role in aviation, according to Vershinin, will be assigned to rocket-carrying bombers capable of striking not only stationary but also moving land and sea targets from a long stand-off range. The Soviet Badger and Bear bombers, which have been overflying our carriers, are known to be equipped with air-to-surface missiles.

Insofar as the Pentagon is concerned, it has canceled our long-range Skybolt missile and would like to kill the RS-70. Our B-52 bombers will be phased out in 1968. Without the RS-70, there will be no replacement.

Chief Marshal Vershinin also disclosed:

"The further perfecting of new types of aircraft is intended to increase their ceilings, speed and range. With this goal in mind, work is being done to create atomic engines."

One of Mr. McNamara's first acts as Secretary of Defense was to cancel the atomic jet engine.

Col. Gen. V. F. Tolubko, First Deputy Commander in Chief of Strategic Rocket Forces, disclosed (February 20, 1963) that the Soviet Union already possesses antimissile defense weapons.

Nevertheless, the Pentagon has put the quietus on the Nike-Zeus system and is now embarked on a substitute project, the Nike-X, which will take many years to complete, and which in the end might not be approved, either.

The well-known aircraft designer Artem Mikoyan predicted a "semicosmic" airplane, with variable-geometry wings, an extended range of several times 100,000 miles, and a speed of 6 to 8 mach.

The Pentagon is most anxious to kill our experimental orbital plane, the X-20 or Dyna-Soar, because it allegedly duplicates a NASA project.

We still are paying lip service to the ridiculous dogma that space is good only for peaceful purposes and we are deflecting most of our massive space budget away from using space as a medium to enhance the security of the United States.

The commander of the Soviet Union's Strategic Rocket Forces, Marshal S. S. Biryuzov, disclosed (Feb. 22, 1963) that it "has now become possible to launch, at a command from earth, rockets from a satellite, and this at any desirable time at any point in the satellite trajectory." Privately, Khrushchev has made a similar statement, although he declared that the first such device developed by the Soviets will not be put in operation because his scientists are working on a better model. The Cosmos series of Soviet-launched satellites—this is the type with which they carried out their first rendezvous experiment—may be related to this development.

Yet the Pentagon continues to insist that it makes no sense to place nuclear bombs into orbit. It even goes so far as to assert that, at the present time, there is no discernible military function in space, not even a need to defend the United States against nuclear weapons which the Soviets might launch from orbital vehicles.

It will be said that statements by Soviet marshals or even Khrushchev are nothing but "Communist propaganda." But experience has proved, time and time again, that the Soviets talk about new weapons systems only when they have such weapons under development. Perhaps the Soviets will prove unable soon to build a nuclear jet engine. Perhaps the semicosmic plane will appear only in 15 or 25 years. There is no question, however, that the orbital bomb is entirely feasible now. And there is no doubt that the Soviets have tested antimissiles and could be deploying them now as an antimissile defense system. Such an initial system might be relatively ineffective, but its propaganda effect would be enormous.

There are a number of additional facts which the Pentagon never disputed but which it is anxious to keep concealed. Colonel General Tolubko derisively compared the biggest American warheads installed in Titan with Soviet missile warheads "whose powers attain 100 megatons." Some skeptics may dispute that the Soviets have 100-megaton warheads now, but hardly any expert denies

[1] From hearings before the House Subcommittee on Defense Department Appropriations.

that their warhead capability is in the 50-megaton range and will reach the 100-megaton level in the future. General Tolubko is absolutely right: Yieldwise, U.S. warheads are limping behind Soviet warheads by one full order of magnitude.

Yet the Pentagon has announced no decision to correct this deadly deficiency.

Even more frightening is the fact that, according to Lieutenant General of the Air Force N. Sbytov, the Soviets possess a bomb with a yield of 160 megatons. This claim may be somewhat inflated as yet, but, to judge from the Soviet tests of 1961, such a bomb is fully within Soviet capabilities. Our biggest bombs have only about half the yield of the biggest devices tested by the Soviets, and they are smaller than several of the bombs which the Soviets tested during 1962.

As things stand today, the Soviets have tested twice as many high-yield devices as the United States. Hence they should be ahead of us in the technology of high-yield bombs and warheads. In March 1962, this was almost admitted by President Kennedy himself. But, there again, nothing is undertaken to correct the deficiency.

This policy of "no" decisions has been creating almost unmanageable problems for the United States. Under Mr. McNamara's administration, missiles with small rather than large warheads are preferred and bomber aircraft which carry the largest firepower are to be phased out.

By hook or crook we are abandoning the nuclear race.

The pattern has been that, with the exception of a minor beefing-up of our guerrilla capabilities, the ordering of a joint Air Force-Navy fighter, and the contracting of Titan III—not for a military space program but as a "building block," should such a program become necessary in the dim future—Mr. McNamara, during more than 2 years in office, has not authorized a single new weapon system. He is slowing down our technological progress deliberately.

If we allow the Soviets to acquire vastly superior nuclear firepower; if we confront a mixed Soviet strategic force, consisting of missiles as well as aircraft, with only missile force; if we do not have the missile defenses while the Soviets possess a capability to shoot down our missiles; and if the Soviets achieve military space capability against which we cannot defend ourselves and for which we have no offensive equipment—then there is no doubt that we would be defeated or could win only at the price of excessive American casualties.

The fact that we presently are investing in research and development 50 cents for every dollar we are spending on procurement means that we are financing many exploratory research programs. It does not mean that we are modernizing our decisive weapon systems.

Perhaps the philosophy of "the biggest bang for the buck" had its faults. But the present philosophy of "the least bangs for the most bucks" courts disaster. All things considered, it does not look as though, under the stewardship of Robert Strange McNamara, the United States is being equipped to forestall a nuclear and technological Pearl Harbor.

At the same time we are being told to celebrate the test ban treaty, we read Soviet statements of increased strength in their nuclear armed submarines and while we talk of a nonaggression pact American boys are being murdered by Communist aggressors in Korea in clear violation of a treaty.

Whatever aggression there is in the world is being encouraged, in most cases financed and directed by Moscow, and President Kennedy and Mr. Harriman tell us how grateful we should be because Khrushchev is smiling. He should be laughing out loud at our stupidity, at the complete naivete of our leaders. There is no profile of courage in the President's policies in dealing with the Communists; there is only weakness, indecision, fear and confusion which greatly increases the danger of war by miscalculation.

Mr. Harriman admitted at a congressional briefing that United States and Russian views are irreconcilable, that Russia wants the treaty and that we stand to lose nothing. Yet we gain nothing but whatever Khrushchev wants, as to keeping the agreement, since our goals are irreconcilable. We all know Communists have failed to keep 50 of the 53 agreements entered. We also know Mr. Harriman has been a party to many agreements that failed.

The only sure road to peace is in the strength of America and a determined policy which makes it clear that we have the means and the will to defend our freedom and President Kennedy is proving more and more that he is not competent to enunciate or carry out such a policy. Therefore, it is up to Congress to protect the American people against the inadequacies of the Kennedy administration by refusing to go along with policies which border on appeasement and to demand an end to secret deals with the Soviets or agreements dictated by Khrushchev and acceptable only to him.

As a final article I would like to include a UPI news item from the Dallas Morning News of July 29, regarding Soviet boasts of nuclear submarine strength.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, July 29, 1963]

SOVIET NAVAL LEADERS BOAST ABOUT NUCLEAR-ARMED SUBS

MOSCOW.—Top Soviet naval commanders Sunday said the Soviet fleet has been rebuilt around atomic-powered submarines armed with nuclear missiles that could obliterate any target in the world.

The statements came in navy day messages by Fleet Adm. Sergei Gorshkov and Vice Adm. M. Grishanov published in the official Soviet Communist Party newspaper Pravda and the official government publication, Izvestia, respectively.

Gorshkov said aircraft carriers were becoming obsolescent and vulnerable to Russian naval rockets. He derided Western military theoreticians who, he said, "make a fetish" of aircraft carriers.

Just as aircraft carriers replaced battleships, the admiral said in Pravda, aircraft carriers are "increasingly losing their value as compared to the new rocket forces of the modern navy."

In this connection, Gorshkov said Western naval men should not overlook "nuclear warheads that are inevitably delivered to their targets by rockets."

The admiral's remarks, as well as those in a similar vein by other Russian naval officers, were considered standard declarations of strength and readiness on an occasion such as navy day.

But he also stressed that "aggressive intentions are alien to the Soviet Armed Forces."

Soviet naval forces, the admiral said, are capable "of fighting the enemy at great distances from bases, of destroying surface ships and submarines in the ocean, of dealing blows at any targets on the enemy's territory."

Grishanov, writing in Izvestia, said "in recent years as a result of a wide-scale introduction of nuclear rocket weapons our navy has undergone a qualitative change and has become a mighty modern military force."

He said "its basis is submarines armed with powerful nuclear rocket weapons and atomic power installations."

Grishanov added that other arms also have been developed—"a rocket-carrying naval air force and surface craft equipped with rocket weapons."

However, Grishanov added, "the Soviet Union is a peace-loving state. The Navy threatens no one, intimidates no one. It was created for reliable protection of the peace and freedom of peoples from encroachments by zealous enthusiasts for military adventures."

Soviet Defense Minister Marshal Rodion Malinovsky issued an order of the day in which he called on servicemen "to be ever ready to smash any aggressor."

Malinovsky ordered artillery salutes to be fired in Moscow, in the capitals of Soviet Republics, in the "hero cities," and in "the fleets and flotillas," to commemorate navy day.

Mr. Speaker, the Russians will continue to develop their weapons, as they prevent us by treaty from doing the same. Meanwhile, we are reducing and eliminating other weapons systems. After reducing our arms and tying our hands on testing, the only other pact needed is some sort of nonaggression agreement to completely eliminate the United States as a threat while they complete the world takeover without war.

Obviously, at the least, Mr. Harriman, and the President and administration which he represents, has capitulated to "Better Red than dead."

Well, some of us, indeed most Americans I know, put freedom first, then peace. We do not intend to capitulate to Communist demands because of fear of a nuclear holocaust. This attempted blackmail will not intimidate most Americans. It should not scare Mr. Harriman and the President.

We must develop the antimissile missile and continue our advance research and development of weapons. Under no circumstances should we disarm or tie our hands. We must not approve this nuclear test ban.

BONNEVILLE INVADES SOUTHERN IDAHO

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the eighth of a series of articles entitled "Bonneville's Multimillion-Dollar Annual Losses and Areas of Substantial and

Persistent Unemployment Are Not Wanted in Southern Idaho."

In fairness to my colleagues and others who have been following this series of articles, I feel an explanation is in order relative to the change in the heading. Here is the story. Yesterday, July 30, 1963, I was informed by the gentleman from southern Idaho [Mr. HARDING] that the heading on my earlier articles, "Southern Idaho's New Slogan: 'Bonneville—Please Include Us Out'," was personally offensive to him.

Actually, the slogan "Bonneville—Please Include Us Out," was not my own composition but was coined from a remark made by a southern Idahoan who has no connection whatsoever with the power companies. The slogan immediately appealed to me. However, I shall respect my colleague's delicacy of feeling and change the heading of this and future articles on the same subject from "Southern Idaho's New Slogan: 'Bonneville—Please Include Us Out'," to "Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho."

I only wish the gentleman from southern Idaho had been as considerate of my feelings before he went ahead with his attack on me in his speech to the House on July 25, 1963, after having been advised only 30 minutes earlier by my office that I was out of the office and could not be reached until around 5 o'clock.

According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the proceedings for July 25, 1963, the gentleman from southern Idaho was joined by the gentleman from northern Idaho in expressing their objection to my speech in this House on July 8, 1963, and to this series of articles on why there is widespread opposition in southern Idaho to the unwarranted and untenable action of Secretary of Interior Udall in extending the Bonneville power-marketing area into southern Idaho.

I do not question the right of my colleagues to differ with my position on the matter. But I am a firm believer in Bernard Baruch's famous remark:

> Every man has a right to his opinion but no man has a right to be wrong in his facts.

My colleague says that through my speech of July 8, 1963, and my series of articles that I am, and I quote:

> Attempting to give my colleagues in the Congress the impression that the people of Idaho do not approve of the executive order of Secretary Udall which included southern Idaho in the BPA marketing area.

He then goes on to say:

> This is simply not true. However, the thing that I object to the most about this current series of articles by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is the title which he is giving them: "Southern Idaho's New Slogan: 'Bonneville—Please Include Us Out.'"

"Let's look at the record." As ranking minority member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee I feel I have a right and a duty to expose and oppose the actions of the Secretary of the Interior when I believe, as I do in this case, that such action is unjustified, unwarranted, and inimical to the best interest of the country as a whole and to the area involved. This extension of Bonneville's socialistic Federal power empire into southern Idaho by executive fiat is not the American way of doing business. This invasion of an area well served by a taxpaying utility, at reasonable rates considerably below the national average, is indefensible.

I am not, as my colleague charges, "attempting" to give the impression that the people of Idaho do not approve Secretary Udall's action. On the contrary, my articles constitute a solid factual presentation black on white of the articles, editorials, and letters from southern Idaho which express widespread and continuing opposition to the extension of the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. I leave it up to my other colleagues to judge whether these articles, editorials, and letters from southern Idaho present valid opposition to Secretary Udall's action or whether, as the gentleman from southern Idaho says, "This is simply not true."

When the Idaho Farm Bureau Federation with a membership of some 12,000 farm families advises committees of Congress of its emphatic opposition; when the president of the Idaho State reclamation expresses his opposition; when the Payette Chamber of Commerce passes a unanimous resolution opposing Secretary Udall's order; when a veritable deluge of editorials express emphatic opposition to Bonneville, I am sure my colleagues from Idaho would like to close their eyes and dismiss all these concrete evidences of opposition with the phrase, "This is simply not true." I suggest they open their eyes and take heed of actuality.

The gentleman from southern Idaho said in his speech in the House that the thing he objects to the most is the heading of my articles, "Southern Idaho's New Slogan: 'Bonneville—Please Include Us Out.'" As I noted earlier, in view of the fact that the gentleman considers this heading personally offensive I have changed the heading, even though it was coined from a remark made by a southern Idahoan who has no connection whatsoever with the power companies.

Another example of the failure of my colleagues from Idaho to do their homework properly is in regard to the following colloquy on page 13375 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where the gentleman from southern Idaho asked the gentleman from northern Idaho:

> I would like to ask my colleague at this point, "Do you know of any elected official in the State of Idaho in either party who has been critical to the point of demanding that the Bonneville Power Administration not include southern Idaho in its marketing area?"

And the gentleman from northern Idaho replied:

> I will say to the gentleman I know of no such elected individual in the State of Idaho who has been so critical.

In closing his speech the gentleman from southern Idaho said:

> Elected officials in Idaho who have not supported BPA have remained on the fence or remained silent on this great issue.

"Let's take a look at the record." An article in the Idaho Daily Statesman for March 15, 1963, disclosed that 34 Idaho State representatives and 19 Idaho State senators had signed a letter to Secretary Udall protesting most emphatically against the extension of the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. The article quoting the letter is as follows:

LETTER HITS SOUTH IDAHO BPA POWER—REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF HOUSE, SENATE PROTEST EXPANSION

Republican members of the Idaho Legislature have signed a letter protesting the proposed expansion of the Bonneville Power Administration into southern Idaho, Representative W. Larry Mills, Republican, of Ada, said Thursday.

Mills said the letter was sent to Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall and that he was advised any expansion of BPA powerlines into southern Idaho was "unnecessary, wasteful, and a threat to the sound economy of Idaho."

"The letter was signed by 34 GOP representatives and by 19 of the 23 Republican State senators," Mills said.

Several weeks ago, it was announced that the Democratic members of the legislature had signed a petition asking Udall to extend the BPA marketing area into southern Idaho.

The letter to Udall reads:

"We are greatly concerned about the welfare of Idaho reclamation, present and future, in which the Bureau of Reclamation, an agency of the Interior Department, has for so many years been a soundly constructive partner with State agencies and thousands of irrigators in reclaiming desert lands, making them into productive farms and homesites. In southern Idaho, nothing is more valuable to the economy than irrigated agriculture.

"For more than half a century the Bureau of Reclamation has worked and built solidly. From the beginning it has found ways to make hydroelectric power a paying partner of reclamation projects across the State. The feasibility of many projects would have been affected, and their chances of congressional approval for authorization and appropriations almost nil, without the use of maximum power revenues to reduce the obligation of irrigators.

"Now, the proposal before you is to supplant the Bureau of Reclamation as the marketing agent for reclamation power, replacing it in this role by the Bonneville Power Administration. The damage to be done to reclamation by this action arises from the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation's power sales provide revenues to assist irrigation projects whereas Bonneville Power Administration rates do not.

"Assurances that Bonneville's gross revenues would somehow be used to protect reclamation and 'keep it whole' have a hollow sound in view of Bonneville's admitted operating deficits over the past 5 years. Irrigation assistance can't come from operating deficits.

"And what of reclamation's future in southern Idaho? When a new reclamation project, soundly conceived and worthwhile in purpose, is submitted for congressional approval and appropriations, what will be its chances when deprived of maximum power revenues as afforded by the Bureau of Reclamation's present resale rates? Bonneville power might well prove to be a millstone around the neck of every future reclamation project in Idaho.

"The introduction of Bonneville power, which pays no taxes, into southern Idaho would have a debilitating and possibly devastating effect upon every taxing district affected. The effect would be translated into higher taxes levied against the overwhelming majority of taxpayers in order to make tax-free power available to a handful. This is diametrically opposite from the unanimous expression of the Idaho Legislature this year to foster a good business climate and to encourage equity and fair dealing among all segments of the Idaho economy.

"It is obvious that the case for Bonneville power rests upon subsidy, a subsidy provided by taxpayers. This is a peculiarly vulnerable point to members of the Idaho Legislature, whose prime concern lies in financing the pressing requirements of State government and of the public schools.

"We, the undersigned members of the Idaho Legislature, protest the proposed expansion of Bonneville Power Administration into southern Idaho as unnecessary, wasteful and a threat to the sound economy of Idaho."

I have in my office a photostatic copy of the letter referred to and the 53 signatures thereto.

The most charitable conclusion I can make is to assume that the gentlemen from Idaho were not aware of these expressions of opposition from 34 Idaho State representatives—including the speaker of the house—and 19 Idaho State senators.

One thing that stands out in the speech of my colleagues from Idaho and some of the others who took part in the discussion, is the reference to the "people of Idaho" rather than to the "people of southern Idaho," who are the subject of my articles. For instance, the gentleman from northern Idaho whose district has mostly been in the Bonneville power marketing area for years says:

A sprinkling of editorials is presented to the Congress as an accurate representation of Idahoans' convictions concerning BPA. In order to correct this inaccurate portrayal of my constituents' consensus, I hereby offer an example of a more accurate expression of their opinion by Mr. Sam Day of the Lewiston Morning Tribune.

This was followed by an extended editorial from this northern Idahoan paper, supporting Secretary Udall's action. Perhaps misery likes company and these north Idahoans want to share Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment with their southern brethren.

The gentleman from southern Idaho inserted in his remarks a letter to the editor signed by a Mr. Hal Baker, saying that he did not know Mr. Baker but complimented him on his knowledge and his courage. I do not know Mr. Baker either, but an analysis of his letter discloses no basis for complimenting him on his knowledge or courage. Mr. Baker speaks of BPA being ahead of schedule on payout and says:

Private power companies constructed powerplants to displace purchases from BPA which during the past 5 years has had $125 million worth of unsold power, that the private power companies could have bought all they needed at cost less than at their own plants.

Actually, on a proper payout and interest cost basis, BPA even now is millions of dollars behind schedule. Here is an excerpt from page 652 of the House hearings on public works appropriations for 1963:

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Luce, last year you told us that you were ahead of schedule on payout on June 30, 1960, by $53,056,573. With your indicated deficit of $15,271,834 for fiscal year 1961 and an estimated deficit of $18 million for fiscal year 1962 and $13,400,000 for fiscal year 1963, you will, at the end of fiscal year 1963 be down to around $6.4 million above the required payout under 2.5 percent interest rate.

Of course, as you agreed last year, if you used an interest rate of 3 or 4 percent, which is more in keeping with the present cost on long-term money, the payout schedule would be considerably in the red. On a 4-percent interest basis, the deficit would be in excess of $100 million by the end of fiscal year 1963.

With regard to the purported $125 million worth of unsold BPA power, almost all such BPA power has been surplus or dump power that is of no value to any utility for serving their regular load. The record also shows that nearly all of the aluminum plants that use such a large share of the BPA power made substantial curtailment in the purchase of interruptible or dump power from BPA during this 5-year period. Here is what Mr. Luce, BPA Administrator said about it on page 648 of House hearings on the public works appropriation for 1963:

A third reason, a third explanation of why our revenues have not been increasing as they should, is the fact that the aluminum industry in the Pacific Northwest has had substantial idle capacity. For instance, this year, had aluminum been operating at 100 percent of capacity, our revenues would have been some $8 million more than they were. In terms of power they could have used about 400,000 kilowatts of this secondary power more than they did.

Furthermore, planned new construction of aluminum plants, a new steel mill and other industrial expansion for which Bonneville had made firm power commitments has failed to materialize. Another factor in Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and failure to dispose of all its potential dump power was Bonneville's refusal to sell large blocks of dump power to California utilities.

I note that my colleague from southern Idaho accuses the private utilities in that area of "spending thousands and thousands of dollars to put forth a barrage of newspaper advertisements containing distortions, half-truths, exaggerations and outright falsehoods." I am wondering if this accusation is based on any more solid ground than the reference to the position of the elected officials of Idaho on the Bonneville power market extension into southern Idaho.

I shall continue my series of articles on southern Idaho's opposition to Bonneville as long as that opposition continues; that is, if Congress stays in session that long.

BOWNE HOUSE—A NATIONAL SHRINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of this House to a joint resolution which I introduced today calling for the recognition of a most significant landmark, the Bowne House in Flushing, N.Y., as a national shrine. Identical resolutions have been offered in the other body by the distinguished Senators from New York, Mr. KEATING and Mr. JAVITS.

This house, an outstanding example of early Dutch architecture, was built in 1661 by John Bowne who played an historic role in the early fight for religious freedom in the New World.

In such times as these, when we are so arduously seeking tolerance on many frontiers, it is only fitting that this house, which symbolizes John Bowne's renowned fight for the establishment of religious tolerance be designated as a national shrine so that all who look upon it will remember the great concept of religious liberty it symbolizes.

It is significant to point out that the roots of religious freedom in America were established in Flushing over a hundred years before our Bill of Rights. In 1657 the people of Flushing signed the Flushing Remonstrance which attacked the religious intolerance of Gov. Peter Stuyvesant. These brave people were then thrown in jail by the Government. It was not until 1664 when John Bowne successfully pleaded the case for religious freedom that the hopes of the Remonstrance actually came to full bloom. In this house John Bowne was arrested for defying the Governor's edict that forbade freedom by allowing Quakers to worship there. John Bowne was jailed and exiled for this offense. After several years away from his family and having successfully pleaded his cause before the authorities in Holland, he returned to his home. This, therefore, marked the establishment of the principle of true freedom as embodied a century later in the first article of the Bill of Rights.

A dedicated group of citizens recognizing the tremendous significance of this historic site organized the Bowne House Historical Society in 1945. While significant recognition has come to the house and it has long been considered a national shrine of religious freedom, this has all been unofficial. It has still to be officially designated by our Government as a national shrine. That is the objective of the goal Senator KEATING and I have been seeking through the Department of the Interior which approves such designations.

The Department has advised us that Bowne House is included as one of the many sites being considered in its national survey but that the report will not be completed until 1964. There is considerable basis to urge separate and earlier action in this instance. It is still not certain that the report will be ready by late 1964. And, even if it does make a favorable recommendation regarding Bowne House it may prove to be too late to properly plan the 300th anniversary of John Bowne's success gaining religious liberty from Holland for the colonists in the New World. Another important reason for urging early action is the fact that the New York World's Fair will open in April of 1964 and hundreds of thousands of people, even millions from all over the world will visit the fair site in Flushing Meadows only a short distance from the Bowne House.

Most considerations for national shrine recognition are based on the site's architectural values. This house unquestionably qualifies under this standard. But, our appeal for recognition is based on even broader reasonings. Its religious significance, I believe, gives it a

unique distinction, surely worthy of particular consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the resolution, which was prepared with the cooperation of the board of trustees of the Bowne House Historical Society, will win quick committee and floor approval. The full text follows:

Whereas by the Flushing Remonstrances of 1657, the freeholders of Flushing in defiance of measures of religious persecution undertaken by Gov. Peter Stuyvesant, insisted on the right to have and enjoy liberty of conscience and to welcome in their homes "any sons of Adam who come in love among us;" and

Whereas Bowne House was constructed in 1661 from timbers hand hewn by John Bowne who moved to Flushing in his determination to find a community and a home where he could worship God according to his convictions; and

Whereas despite the promise of religious liberty originally contained in the charter of the town of Flushing, John Bowne was arrested in 1662 and fined with a warning to abstain in future from religious meetings of the Society of Friends; and

Whereas he was transported to Holland for further sentencing and offered such an eloquent plea for tolerance and liberty of conscience that he was released, the governing body of the province declaring that "the consciences of men, at least, ought to remain free;" and

Whereas the trial and acquittal of John Bowne is one of the landmarks of religious freedom in this Nation, comparable to the trial of John Peter Zenger in the history of freedom of the press, one of the stepping stones that led to the drafting of the Bill of Rights in the U.S. Constitution; and

Whereas Bowne House, in which the prescribed religious meetings were held, was acquired by the Bowne House Historical Society in 1945 in celebration of the tercentenary of the community of Flushing, dedicated by Mayor Fiorello La Guardia on October 10, 1945, as a national shrine to religious freedom and tolerance, and opened to the public on Independence Day, 1947; and

Whereas Bowne House today stands with much of its original construction and with contemporary furnishings intact and has been designated in the journal of the American Institute of Architects as one of the twenty "structures of national importance in New York City which should be preserved at all costs": Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to provide, with the consent of the Bowne House Historical Society, for appropriate recognition by the Federal Government of the national historical and architectural significance of the Bowne House, Flushing, N.Y.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. VINSON, for 10 days, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. COLLIER), for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MULTER in two instances.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GIAIMO in two instances.

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. HANNA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COLLIER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. JOHANSEN in two instances.

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. 1642. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 1, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1085. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the inadequate administration of military budget support funds provided to Iran under the foreign assistance program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1086. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, relative to furnishing certain information on research grants awarded by the Agricultural Research Service during fiscal year 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85-934, dated September 6, 1958; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 6997. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 467. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7500, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 623). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of Committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. Senate Joint Resolution 51. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired; without amendment (Rept. No. 622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 7846. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 7847. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 7848. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special U.S. postage stamp in commemoration of the crusade against cancer; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7849. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 7850. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 7851. A bill to provide that certain activities of nonprofit blood banks and of physicians and pathologists undertaken to protect the health of recipients of blood and blood plasma shall not be deemed to be acts in restraint of trade under laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 7852. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7853. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7854. A bill to provide for an increase in the maximum amount of insurance coverage for bank deposits and savings and loan accounts, to protect further the safety and liquidity of insured institutions, to strengthen safeguards against conflicts of interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7855. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7856. A bill to authorize the transmission in the mails of lottery tickets and other matter relating to a lottery operated by a State or political subdivision thereof,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7857. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that motion pictures photographed outside the United States, and any advertisements thereof, shall set forth the country of origin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 7858. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7859. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 7860. A bill to authorize an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $50,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway in the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York from the vicinity of Stroudsburg, Pa., northeast to Kingston, N.Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 7861. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to make more specific the purpose for which loans may be made under sections 2 and 4 of such act, and to modify the provisions relating to interest rates on loans made under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 7862. A bill to prohibit the use of measuring or timing devices to measure the work of an individual employee in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 7863. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that motion pictures photographed outside the United States, and any advertisements thereof, shall set forth the country of origin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.J. Res. 592. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 593. Joint resolution providing for appropriate Federal recognition of the Bowne House, Flushing, N.Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.J. Res. 594. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONAS:

H.J. Res. 595. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the offering of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD (by request):

H.J. Res. 596. Joint resolution to guarantee to displaced businesses of the Southwest waterfront, District of Columbia, their prior rights to resettlement in that area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.J. Res. 599. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.J. Res. 600. 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. ROSENTHAL:

H.J. Res. 601. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.J. Res. 602. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.J. Res. 603. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve and protect references to reliance upon God in governmental matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.J. Res. 604. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Flaming Gorge Dam, Utah, as "Ashley Lake"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Con. Res. 210. Expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 7864. A bill for the relief of Margaret Feldstein, nee Koffler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H.R. 7865. A bill for the relief of Francisca Cueto-Martinez de Maturana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 7866. A bill for the relief of Max Kahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 7867. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo, Clelia Pitta, and Giovanna Branchinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 7868. A bill for the relief of Rocco Maiorano, Gerarda Maiorano, Alfred Maiorano, and Anna Maiorano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 7869. A bill for the relief of Dimitra Irini Dimitroulias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 7870. A bill for the relief of Pa Ho Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 7871. A bill for the relief of Tam Wai King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Shakespeare Summer Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most enjoyable evenings of theater that Washington has ever offered is the Shakespeare Summer Festival presentation of "Much Ado About Nothing" at the Sylvan Theater. The performances are uniformly excellent, the costumes are enchanting, the setting is superb, the lighting and musical effects are magnificent—in short, the entire production is a sheer delight.

Shakespeare's crisp and witty play is a perfect vehicle for the versatile cast and their virtually ideal setting. I should add that another of this production's virtues is the fact that there is no admission charge, thanks to the sponsoring organizations, the Department of the Interior, and the District of Columbia Recreation Department. The polished, professional touch, however, was made possible by the liberal financial support from many private organizations and individuals.

The Sylvan Theater, at the foot of the Washington Monument, is the perfect spot for such a performance, and Ellie Chamberlain, the producer, and Director Don Driver have utilized every natural and technical advantage at their disposal. I would also like to commend the exceptional cast, headed by Marian Mercer, and Robert Mandan.

Since the opening night, July 13, thousands of District residents and tourists have flocked to the theater. The weather has been ideal, the reviews were excellent, and I understand that the attendance has averaged 1,500 per performance.

Unhappily, "Much Ado About Nothing" will run through August 11 only. It is seldom that the public is treated to such a thoroughly delightful theatrical experience, and I urge my colleagues, and all others who have the opportunity, to make every effort to attend one of the

final performances. It is a rare opportunity and one which should not be missed.

I hope that next year Mrs. Chamberlain and her deft, magic touch will again turn the Sylvan Theater into Washington's most popular attraction. She is to be commended for her vision and imagination. Washington is indeed fortunate to have the benefit of her talents.

Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the preliminary negotiations have been, in the view of Mr. Harriman and his English counterpart, successfully concluded. They do not mark as the President has so rightfully expressed anything like "peace in our times" a phrase with some unfortunate history. The test ban now accomplished is to the British observer like the girl who has awaited overlong a proposal and is therefore not the catch she once was. One southerner I know said the treaty negotiation results reminded him of the story of the rebel holdout in the War Between the States who held off a Yankee patrol for about a week from a hillside cave. Finally out of food, out of water, out of ammunition, and out of spunk, the rebel's stronghold was finally and successfully rushed and when the Union sergeant towered over the emaciated holdout and shouted "We got ya reb." He replied, "Yeah, and a helluva gettin' ya got."

Well, regardless of the appraisal of what kind of "a gettin' we got" in this proposed test ban and giving due credence to the validity of calls for caution in affirmatively counting on any presentments by Khrushchev this much is to be said: the continuing, jointly expressed compassion for a world divided against itself is not a very satisfactory substitute for some affirmative action, however limited. Unless and until the two major camps in this division can weld one or two points of agreement the bridge across the schisms of doctrines and interest that now are so wide and deep will not start abuilding. The peace that is war will remain with the ever-present threat that it could start on the escalator to the nuclear weapon.

The debate in the Senate will run a heavy tide of reasons why we dare not sign this treaty. Any person even slightly informed or aware of our past disappointments would have to admit to some risks involved in the signing. But it is our belief that the greatest risk we take in this small step is one of complete disappointment by Khrushchev's failure to honor the pact. We know of this risk going in. Can we not therefore in the face of possible improvement hope that we can change from a peace that is war to a peace that is conflict, realizing that even this degree of change could be for the better and provide a possible beginning for a bridge that ultimately must be built.

Eleventh Anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express thanks to the Members of the House and Senate who spoke in the respective Chambers, or elsewhere, in commemorating the 11th anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

I regret most exceedingly that the extreme demands on my time because of pressing legislative work on July 25, prevented me from appearing in this Chamber to invite you personally to join in observing the Commonwealth's birthday.

As you may know, on the occasion of the 11th anniversary of the founding of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT spoke to the people of Puerto Rico, in San Juan, as the personal representative of the President of the United States and as an old friend returning to Puerto Rico to join in anniversary festivities. The people of Puerto Rico felt deeply honored by the visit of the distinguished Senator on this very important occasion.

I am sure that my distinguished colleagues will find in Senator FULBRIGHT'S speech, which I include here, genuine appreciation of Puerto Rico's progress on many fronts and of Puerto Rico's inspiration to the inter-American community:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS DELIVERED JULY 25 BY SENATOR J. W. FULBRIGHT IN SAN JUAN, P.R., MARKING THE 11TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RATIFICATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH

Governor Muñoz-Marín and distinguished guests, it is a great honor to represent the President of the United States on this memorable occasion and to bring to your Governor and the Puerto Rican people his cordial greetings and best wishes. It also gives me great personal satisfaction to return as an old friend who deeply admires the outstanding record which Puerto Rico has made as a progressive, forward-looking community of fellow citizens engaged in the vital task of making democracy work in this part of the world.

Eleven years ago the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was proclaimed. The Constitution was conceived by Puerto Rican minds and drafted by Puerto Rican hands. It expressed noble intentions and great ideals. It devised one of the most enlightened systems of representative democracy in this hemisphere, looking forward to a period of social and economic achievement within an institutional framework deeply responsive to the people's will. It proudly inserted in its preamble its "loyalty to the value of the human being regardless of social position, racial differences, and economic interests; and the hope for a better world based on these principles."

In the past 11 years Puerto Rico has matched the inspired words of its Constitution with inspired deeds. It has shown that democratic ideals can be translated into great achievements by resolute and imaginative effort, by hard work and a dedication to self-help. The record is here for all to see. It is a sober, dramatic, unassailable record which should give renewed hope and confidence to the people of this island as they prepare for the tasks ahead.

In many fields Puerto Rico has become the model and pioneer for the Western Hemisphere. When the American Republics met at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in the summer of 1961, the task they undertook was nothing less than the charting of a new course for the people of the new hemisphere. In the words of the "Declaration to the Peoples of America," which was there adopted, the Alliance for Progress was to be founded "on the basic principle that free men working through the institution of representative democracy can best satisfy man's aspirations, including those for work, home and land, health, and schools." The declaration added, "no system can guarantee true progress unless it affirms the dignity of the individual which is the foundation of our civilization."

This declaration, as well as the Charter of Punta del Este, summarized the aspirations of the peoples of Latin America for a better life and a better world. The documents framed at Punta del Este envisaged a peaceful, democratic revolution based on self-help measures and free external assistance. To these objectives the United States has pledged its wholehearted support.

It is altogether fitting and proper on the occasion of this community celebration to point out how Puerto Rico, by its own self-help measures, by its wise and imaginative use of all available resources—including its trade relationship with the mainland United States—has actually pioneered in many of the areas of social and economic development to which the Alliance for Progress is dedicated.

The Charter of Punta del Este looks forward to a rate of economic growth in Latin America of not less than 2.5 percent per capita per year. Puerto Rico has achieved a current growth rate of nearly 5 percent per capita per year—one of the highest in the Western World. This increase in productivity has been accompanied by a substantial effort to make available the benefits of economic progress to all the citizens of the Commonwealth. This, of course, is one of the basic objectives of the Charter of Punta del Este. The growth of purchasing power and economic well-being among all sectors of the population of the island has been achieved through farsighted legislative and executive action and through the growth of enlightened labor-management relations. Puerto Rico ranks only after Great Britain, Canada, and the mainland United States in the percentage of national income that goes to wage earners in the form of salaries and services. The progress of the Commonwealth is truly a striking example of democratic achievement.

The reform that Puerto Rico undertook of its tax laws, its efforts to avoid tax evasion and to provide the basis for an efficient public administration, committed to honest government and the general welfare, are other signal landmarks in the Commonwealth's success. These achievements, far more than noble words and intentions, are a living inspiration for other countries now struggling to modernize their political and economic institutions.

At Punta del Este the Latin American Republics committed themselves to national development programs based on self-help and the choice of basic priorities for the promotion of human and material progress. This is one of the fields in which Puerto Rico has been a pioneer for the Americas. Economic planning in Puerto Rico has involved both Government action and effective private par-

ticipation. It has been democratic planning at its best, conducted largely on the municipal and local level. It has generated a sense of common purpose in the community effort, a sense of confidence and hope for the future. It has created a generation of planners, many of whom are now lending their experience and techniques to other governments as well as to international institutions.

A land of meager natural resources with neither coal nor oil, with no important mineral deposits and with limited forest preserves, Puerto Rico has demonstrated that human resources and dignity can overcome the obstacles of nature. Largely through judicious fiscal and trade relationships with the continental United States, the Commonwealth has created a favorable industrial climate and achieved an amazing expansion in its manufacturing activities. The basic source of these accomplishments is the initiative and vision of the people of Puerto Rico. The creative, enterprising spirit of the present generation of Puerto Ricans has produced in a single decade of effort one of the world's most successful development programs. The Puerto Rican story is uniquely one of the triumphs of human resources over natural obstacles.

As in other fields, Puerto Rico has become a model for all Latin America in dealing with the difficult problems of land reform. Puerto Rico has left far behind its heritage of a one-crop economy and has moved ahead with its own agrarian reform. Agriculture has been greatly diversified, as exemplified by the striking growth of the poultry and livestock industries during the last decade and the considerable expansion of the production of fruits and vegetables for the domestic market. The resettlement of 73,000 families on their own plots, with essential community service available, is a striking illustration of the Commonwealth's concern for the welfare of the campesino and his family. And this has been achieved in the best democratic manner with neither social upheaval nor loss of productivity.

At Punta del Este, the inter-American community wisely stressed the improvement of human resources and the widening of educational and cultural opportunities as a key priority target of the Alliance for Progress. Investment in education was rightly considered to be a preeminent factor in national development.

Of all the achievements of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, none is more impressive, or more encouraging, than its progress in the field of education. The Puerto Rican people have clearly understood that the acquisition of knowledge and skills is the indispensable prerequisite to economic improvement and spiritual fulfillment. The wiping out of illiteracy and the availability of primary education for all children of school age—two basic targets of the Charter of Punta del Este—are close to being accomplished realities on this island. Progress in higher education has made Puerto Rico a center of learning for the entire Caribbean area.

Nor has education been limited to the schoolroom: vocational training has been extended to the community and put to work as a basic factor in community development. In its emphasis on vocational training—which is probably the most neglected field of education in the United States—Puerto Rico is setting a valuable example, not only for Latin America, but for the continental United States as well. This pioneering spirit in so many fields has turned Puerto Rico into a laboratory of social experiment and creativity. Both in symbol and in substance, this island is an eminently suitable training ground for the young men and women of the Peace Corps. On this island the Peace Corps trainee is able to see the benefits and the promise of self-help as living, growing realities.

As Governor Muñoz-Marín pointed out a few years ago, "There has been nothing automatic about Puerto Rico's progress to date. Only hard, uphill work has brought it about." [1] The success of the Puerto Rican people in their hard, uphill effort has commanded the respect of their fellow citizens in the United States and of the entire free world. On this occasion of its 11th anniversary, the Commonwealth is entitled to take great pride in its achievements and in its prospects. When one contemplates the poverty, the illiteracy, the social injustice and the political instability which afflict so much of the world today, it is natural to wonder why, in contrast to the world about her, Puerto Rico has been so successful.

After 20 years of political experience, it is my conviction that one of the indispensable and most significant ingredients of your success is the discriminating judgment which you have repeatedly shown in the selection of your chief executive, the Governor. As free citizens of this Commonwealth, you have exercised the power of the franchise responsibly and intelligently, for which you are to be commended most highly.

It is my privilege today to convey to the Puerto Rican people the admiration and regard of all Americans for their progress toward the goal defined by Gov. Muñoz-Marín as a society based on the "maximum respect for that minimum minority which is the individual." [2]

[1] Luis Muñoz-Marín. "Puerto Rico Does Not Want To Be a State," New York Times magazine, Aug. 16, 1959.

[2] Godkin Lecture, Harvard University, Apr. 28, 1959.

To Authorize the Mailing of Lottery Tickets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday July 31, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 7856, which would authorize the transmission through the mails of lottery tickets and other material relating to a lottery operated by a State or political subdivision thereof.

I have introduced this bill because I believe that the Federal law prohibiting the transmission through the mails of lottery information should be amended so as to exclude State and local governments.

I am very much in favor of the recent action of the New Hampshire State Legislature in establishing a State lottery for the purposes of raising revenue to provide that State with more and better schools and hospitals and public debt amortization.

Governor King and the people of New Hampshire are to be congratulated for adopting a sensible solution to some of the fiscal problems facing all of our State and local governments.

As an example of the kind of proposal which would be possible if my bill were adopted, I would cite the resolution put before the New York City Council by Councilman Morris Stein which would provide for the sale of non-interest-bearing bonds by the city of New York with a substantial prize if the purchaser's bond number is picked in a lottery. If the New York State law is amended to permit this, the lifting of the Federal prohibition would aid greatly in the sale of such bonds.

New Chairman Discusses Role of the House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of last week, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS, the new chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, delivered two outstanding addresses in New Orleans, La., in which he discussed the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The first of these addresses was delivered before the annual convention of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation and dealt particularly with the role of the Committee in relation to national security.

Both because of the important subject matter of this address and because it reflects the broad viewpoint and philosophy which Mr. WILLIS brings to his new and heavy responsibilities as chairman of the committee, I am happy to include the address in the RECORD. I hope it will receive the thoughtful attention of all our colleagues:

THE COMMITTEE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Representative EDWIN E. WILLIS, Democrat, of Louisiana)

I would first like to say how pleased I am to be here in New Orleans to address you, the delegates to the annual convention of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, your friends, and distinguished guests. I love Washington, but I love Louisiana—the grassroots of America and its people—more. It is always a pleasure for me to return to my home State, to meet and talk with its people, to get down to earth again—if I may use that phrase—after some time in the rarified atmosphere of Washington.

It was most fortunate that I was able to be here for the presentation of your Freedom Awards. I say with all sincerity that it has been inspiring to be a witness to this program, to see the awards being given, to know that many Americans are devoting themselves, their time and effort to their country. It is heartening to know that organizations such as the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation are alert and perceptive enough to encourage and award those who work for freedom's cause.

My congratulations to each of the award winners—and to you, the members of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, for initiating this program. I hope you will continue it for many years to come.

Freedom is everybody's job. It is the job of farmers, the job of educators, the job of clergy, the job of Members of Congress—and of every man and woman in our country. This morning, I have seen something of what the people of Louisiana are doing for freedom. I think, therefore, that it would be

appropriate for me to tell you something of what the Congress and, more particularly, the Committee on Un-American Activities, is doing for this same cause.

Early this year the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly not only to continue the Committee on Un-American Activities, but to give it the largest appropriation it has ever had. As the newly elected chairman of the committee, by the unanimous vote of the House, I assure you that I will do all in my power to see that the funds appropriated to the committee will be well spent, that any unneeded funds will be returned to the House, and that I will do all I can to see that the committee is strengthened in every way possible and its life continued for as long as it is needed.

Why do we need the committee? Why has the House, for 25 years, voted funds for its continuing operations?

It is because the House knows—just as you and I do—that freedom in every part of the globe is today challenged by the most deadly enemy it has known since the dawn of civilization. That enemy, the world Communist movement, has fifth columns in over 80 nations of the world, including these United States. The aim of this movement is to seize control of the entire earth. It uses every conceivable weapon to achieve that aim—military forces, espionage, sabotage, terrorism, treachery, deceit, and infiltration into governmental and other groups. This is the finding of the Congress of the United States. It is a finding that has been upheld by the Supreme Court.

We know that we must build and maintain powerful military forces to protect this country from the tremendous military might created by the forces of world communism. By the same token, we know, too, that because Soviet leaders openly proclaim that the United States is their No. 1 enemy—and because they have a fifth column within our border—that we must have adequate internal safeguards. That, basically, is why the House continues its Committee on Un-American Activities.

What is the Committee on Un-American Activities? And what is its function?

Is it a spy-catching agency? No, that is the job of the FBI which has the responsibility of collecting evidence against those who break our Federal security laws, though the hearings of the committee have actually assisted them in this respect. The committee is not a counter-espionage agency, though it has uncovered some spies.

Is the committee supposed to convict people of being Communists or violating security laws? Again, the answer is "No." The committee is not a prosecuting agency like the Department of Justice. Nor is it a court of law, set up to pass judgment on legal guilt or innocence. Again, however, the committee's investigations and hearings, through the facts which they develop, are helpful in this connection.

What then is the committee and what is its function, if it is not supposed to catch spies or convict Communists?

Stated simply, it is the eyes and ears—and the principal legislative advisor of the House of Representatives—on matters concerning subversion and internal security.

It is a nine-member, standing committee of the House, commissioned to investigate subversive activities and propaganda within this country—whether of foreign or domestic origin—and to report its findings to the House.

There are 20 standing committees in the House. All have the power to investigate in specified areas, as may be granted to them by the House from one session to another. But with the exception of the Government Operations Committee, the Committee on Un-American Activities is the only one which has permanent, continuing investigative power.

It can hold hearings in any part of the United States, whether or not the House is in session. Other committees need special authorization from the House to conduct investigations.

Like all other committees, the Committee on Un-American Activities has a basically legislative function. It is its duty to hold hearings on, and weigh the merits of, bills relating to subversive activities and internal security which are referred to it for consideration. In the same area, the committee has the duty of recommending new legislation where it sees a need for it. It also has the duty of proposing amendments to existing legislation when its hearings, investigations, and study reveal weaknesses in our laws which need correction.

Again, like all other committees, the Committee on Un-American Activities has an oversight or watchdog function. That is, it should keep an eye—"exercise continuous watchfulness," the rules of the House say—on the administration of security legislation by the executive branch.

What is the jurisdiction of the committee? Are there any limitations on the areas in which it can investigate?

The Supreme Court held in the Barenblatt decision of 1959 that in the field of national security the House has given the Un-American Activities Committee pervasive authority to investigate Communist activities in this country.

In other words, no matter where the committee finds Communists operating, no matter where it finds subversive efforts being made against the security of the United States, it has the right to investigate.

Lloyd Barenblatt, whose contempt conviction was upheld in the Supreme Court decision I have just mentioned, claimed in his appeal that the field of education should be excluded from the committee's authority. The Supreme Court rejected his claim. It held that the committee's right to interrogate him—even though he was a college professor—was unassailable.

I want to point out here, while touching on the Barenblatt case, that the committee does not investigate educational institutions as such. It does not investigate churches. It does not investigate unions, business firms, or any other bona fide organizations or institutions.

Communist fronts, however, are a different matter. When the committee has compelling evidence that an organization is Communist-controlled or a front, as defined in the Internal Security Act, then it may properly investigate the organization.

When dealing with individuals, the committee's policy is that it will not be deterred from investigating their subversive activities simply because they happen to be labor, church, or business leaders, college professors or whatever.

The committee's interrogation of Professor Barenblatt is an illustration of its policy in this respect. When it questioned him, it was not investigating the college with which he was affiliated. It did not concern itself in any way with the overall activities or policies of the college or what it was teaching. It concerned itself only with Barenblatt's individual activities as a Communist.

This is what the committee has always done in the past. It is what it will do in the future. The courts have unequivocally upheld the committee's right to follow this policy.

No citizen of this country, because of his trade, profession or calling, can claim that he is somehow different from, or superior to, other citizens, and that he is therefore exempt from and beyond the power of the Congress when he engages in activities which are violative of our laws or designed to help a foreign power destroy our Government.

Now, let me illustrate the role the committee plays in protecting our national security by citing facts about some of its current and recent investigations and hearings.

Over the past 3 months, in 6 separate days of hearings, the committee has taken testimony from over a score of witnesses on the subject of illegal travel to Cuba. Generally, American citizens have been barred from visiting Cuba since the severance of diplomatic relations on January 1, 1961. Special passport validations are given, however, to those who have a legitimate, compelling reason for such travel. Despite this, committee investigation has uncovered the fact that many Americans have been going to Cuba without validation.

These people are violating this country's laws. The committee has learned that many of these people have Communist backgrounds. It has also learned that a considerable number of them, after returning to the United States, have gone about lecturing on the glories of Castro's Cuba without registering as agents of his government.

What is the purpose of these hearings? Of what use are they?

First, they have had a definite legislative function. They're developing facts which will assist the committee in judging the merits of a travel and passport control bill which has been referred to it for consideration. They will also help the Judiciary Committee weigh the merits of several bills which have been referred to it and which also deal with the problem of controlling travel in times of national emergency.

Second, it is the committee's hope—and belief—that the facts developed about the propaganda activities in behalf of the Castro regime carried on in this country by these lawbreakers, will enable it to propose amendments to the Foreign Agents Registration Act. These amendments will be designed to compel the registration—and thus force the disclosure—of many Communist propagandists who are today succeeding in thwarting the intent of Congress when it passed that Act 25 years ago.

Third, a necessary, unavoidable and useful offshoot of these hearings, of course, is the fact that they reveal to the American people the current activities of the Communist Party and its agents. This is a part of the informing function of Congress. By doing this, the hearings are making it more difficult for the party to mislead the American people and achieve its goal of destroying your freedom and mine.

Fourth, in these hearings the committee is also carrying out its watchdog or oversight function. Specifically, it is overseeing the administration of our country's travel control regulations and the Foreign Agents Registration Act by the executive branch of the Government.

Finally—though this is by no means the least result—because of the facts developed in these hearings, I have referred the cases of 14 witnesses to the Department of Justice for prosecution on the grounds that they are in violation of travel regulations.

Another example: two employees of our supersecret National Security Agency disappeared in the summer of 1960. The committee immediately began an investigation of the background of these men, Bernon F. Mitchell and William H. Martin. Later, on September 5, 1960, they surfaced in Moscow at a highly publicized press conference—to publicly defame and vilify their country. Undoubtedly, they also told all they knew about NSA's activities to Soviet intelligence officials. By this time, the committee's investigation had convinced it that they never would have been hired by the NSA—or retained in its service for any length of time—if the Agency had been following adequate security procedures. A full-scale NSA investigation was then instituted.

Because of the highly sensitive nature of NSA operations, the committee made no in-

quiry into its activities. It did, however, hold 16 executive hearings in which it thoroughly explored NSA's personnel and security procedures. The committee's investigators spent 2,000 man-hours—and covered 15 States—developing the facts for these hearings.

What were the results? Twenty-two reforms in security and personnel practices were instituted by the NSA.

The Director of Personnel was dismissed.

The Director of Security resigned upon request—as did two other officials in his office.

Twenty-six other NSA employees were dropped for reasons of sex deviation.

In addition, the committee drafted a bill which will establish sound security practices in the agency for all time. That bill was passed by the House just a few weeks ago.

Can there be any question about the fact that, by inquiring as it did in this case, into the administration of security practices by an agency of the executive branch, the committee made a very real contribution to our Nation's security and welfare? It found a shockingly lax situation in NSA when it began its inquiry. Today, I believe the NSA's security procedures are as tight and effective as they can be made.

The Communists and other enemies of the committee are forever charging that the committee has done little or nothing in the legislative field and that it concentrates on exposure and defamation of witnesses, who often aren't even Communists but merely people who oppose the committee.

The truth is that the committee has been responsible, over the years, for over 40 security laws or amendments to existing laws enacted by the Congress. This is a legislative record of which any committee can be proud.

The Communists have demonstrated by their own actions that one of the laws they fear most today is the Internal Security Act, a law drafted by the committee. In June 1961, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the key element in this law, its registration provisions. Just last week a special three-judge court in Washington upheld another of its provisions—the one denying passports to members of the Communist Party.

After the Supreme Court's decision, Gus Hall, leader of the Communist Party, said the party would refuse to comply with the law because it "asks the Communist Party to commit suicide."

This statement was quite a tribute to the committee. It was an admission by the top Communist in the United States that the committee knows how to hit the conspiracy where it will hurt most.

How did the committee do this in the Internal Security Act? It did it by drawing up a law that compels the party to be honest—to reveal the identities of its members and the organizations it controls. It drew up a law that strips the party of its major weapons—deceit and concealment.

To what extent has the party used these weapons successfully in the past?

You will know that nearly all party members have always concealed their membership. They have known they could get nowhere with most people if they openly proclaimed they were Communists. It is as secret, hidden Communists that they have been able to carry out their undermining activities.

Have they successfully used false labels, deceit and concealment in the organizational sense?

Here is a copy of the "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," published by the Committee on Un-American Activities. This 250-page document lists nearly every organization and publication in this country which, as of December 1961, had been cited as Communist or subversive by Federal legislative and executive agencies and by various State and territorial investigating committees. The names of 663 organizations or projects and 122 publications are contained in this volume.

This is an indication of the extent to which the Communist Party relies on, and has successfully used, the false label to peddle its wares.

The Communists themselves have referred to these front organizations as "innocents' clubs" and "transmission belts." They are outfits through which the party has spread its line and won acceptance for it from many thousands of non-Communists. Through them the party has also taken millions of dollars from the pockets of non-Communists and made widespread use of their time and talents, to help destroy America.

What distresses me—and this is a sad commentary on our times after years of exposure of this front device—is the way the party, through these organizations, can still entice good people into doing its dirty work. It gets them to lend the prestige of their names, to give their time and money, to promote communism and undermine freedom. What is wrong with some of our citizens? Can't anything shake them out of their carelessness and irresponsibility?

But now, let's get back to the committee. Before closing, I would like to say a few more words about what it does and what it does not do.

The committee does not subpena witnesses for its hearings unless it has evidence that they possess information about the matter under investigation. It does not accuse any witness of being a Communist Party member—or even ask them if they ever were or are one—unless it has documentary evidence or reliable confidential information they are or have been members of the party.

It does not call witnesses to expose or harass them, but rather, as I indicated before, because it knows that they are in a position to give Congress information which will help it in developing remedial or needed legislation.

Naturally, because the committee deals primarily with Communist activities, it must call Communists as witnesses. Because the Communist movement is secret and conspiratorial, they are the only ones who have first-hand knowledge of its operations. That this results in the exposure of certain Communists, I grant. This, however, is something that cannot be helped. It is a basic part of the legislative process, and the committee can no more carry out its function without calling Communists as witnesses than the House Education and Labor Committee can carry out its function without calling educators and labor leaders as witnesses.

Serving on the committee and being its chairman is not a pleasant task. You are subject to a continuous barrage of vilification and false accusations. You are compelled by the very nature of your task to deal repeatedly and continually with the activities which border on the treasonous.

However, it is not always the knowingly and deliberately disloyal we are dealing with. In some cases, I feel that our troubles stem primarily from ignorance and lack of knowledge about communism, rather than from treason. This is particularly true in regard to foreign policy positions where some tragic mistakes have been made, both in and out of government.

That is why it is so important to study communism, to know our enemy well, in addition to having effective security laws and agencies—such as the committee—to cope with the internal subverters.

This is why I have been discussing with you the subject of the committee and national security and why, in a few moments, I will be talking to another audience in another room of this hotel on the subject of "Education for Victory," meaning, of course, education about communism.

Frankly, as regards both the field of law and of education, and all other fields, I think I can say with complete truth that every member of the committee wishes that there was not need for it; that all of them will be glad if the day ever comes when the committee is abolished because there is no longer a Communist fifth column in this country and thus no need for a Committee on Un-American Activities.

That day however—I am afraid—is a long way off. And until that day comes I can assure you that each member of the committee will do his utmost to see that the committee is not deterred for any reason from carrying out the function assigned to it by the House of Representatives.

Each year, of course, an effort is made by the Communists, their stooges, and some misguided but well-intentioned liberals to abolish the committee. Naturally, this creates a problem. Despite this, I am convinced that there is no need to fear that this move will ever be successful. I have too much faith in the Congress to believe that, as long as we have a real internal security problem, its Members would fail to carry out their duty of protecting this Nation from those who would destroy it.

The committee's life is in the hands of the Congress and of the people of this country. It is in good hands. I am certain that they will preserve the committee—and that the committee will continue its vital role in the preservation of our Nation.

A Fair, Impartial, and Controlled Test for Krebiozen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday July 31, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 598, which would authorize and direct the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen and would direct the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such a test. The resolution would further authorize the appropriation of $250,000 to conduct the test.

The arguments and discussions over Krebiozen have been going on now for many years; I believe it is now time to end the controversy by having the National Cancer Institute conduct the necessary tests immediately and without further delay so that we may determine whether Krebiozen serves any useful purpose in the treatment of cancer. It seems unnecessary to mention the pain and suffering caused by cancer and the number of people who lose their lives each year because of this dread disease. All of us are familiar with it; all of us know from personal experience, either through family or friends, the fearful toll taken by cancer.

I strongly urge that this resolution be given immediate consideration by the

Congress so that those now using Krebiozen may continue to use it until the completion of the National Cancer Institute's tests. If there is the slightest chance that Krebiozen is helping those now using it, we must not allow the Food and Drug Administration to keep the drug from them.

President Should Ban the Test Ban Bandwagon Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last when President Kennedy addressed the Nation on the partial test ban treaty he called for full discussion and debate, not only in the Senate, but amongst the American people. However, Kennedy strategists appear to be attempting to choke off such debate and full scrutiny of the pact. The Senate majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] has made optimistic statements both about support for the treaty and the shortness of time in which it will be considered. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman have claimed very widespread support for it amongst the public and in the other body. Administration-inclined columnists and commentators also have taken it upon themselves to assert to the effect that "almost everybody is for the pact." The administration has given out stories that it is popular in capitals all over the world.

Obviously, these statements are not based on any widespread and accurate information on just what is the state of opinion either amongst the public or in the other body. Senator after Senator has stated he is reserving judgment on the matter until more facts are in.

Despite the President's words last Friday, consciously or unconsciously, administration stalwarts have adopted the strategy of rushing consideration of the treaty as fast as possible, before thoughtful consideration can be given to it. This is a strategy of choking off debate and discussion, both by limiting it in time and by stampeding public opinion. Before the average person even gets to consider the matter, he is being told everybody is for it. This is the old bandwagon technique so effective in political campaigns. It is calculated at getting support by implying anybody on the opposite side is out of step.

I call upon the President to match his words last Friday with action. To do so he must order his subordinates and associates to cease and desist their shabby tactics and give the Nation the opportunity he has promised for full and fair evaluation of the claimed advantages and claimed disadvantages of the partial test ban treaty.

Diamond Jubilee Celebration of St. Vincent de Paul Parish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Sunday to have participated at the diamond jubilee celebration of my parish church in Milwaukee, St. Vincent de Paul Parish.

St. Vincent de Paul's has established a reputation during its 75 years for outstanding achievement in spiritual, civic and cultural activities. Twenty-seven sons of the parish and 57 of its daughters have answered the call to the religious life. The parish has sponsored cultural activities in the fields of art, music, and drama.

The day of celebration began with a solemn high mass of Thanksgiving at which the Most Reverend William E. Cousins, archbishop of Milwaukee, presided in cappa magna. Celebrant was St. Vincent de Paul's distinguished pastor, the Right Reverend Monsignor S. J. Studer. Deacon and subdeacon were the able parish assistants, the Reverend Albin Sowinski and the Reverend Edward Wawrzyniakowski.

The diamond jubilee also was observed with an evening banquet. Upon that occasion, I gave the following address, for which I ask permission to insert in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI AT DIAMOND JUBILEE CELEBRATION, ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PARISH, JULY 28, 1963

It is a singular honor for me to be a part of this celebration today, as we commemorate the diamond jubilee of our parish, St. Vincent de Paul's.

This is, indeed, a happy and memorable occasion. The words of the gradual of the mass for Easter are particularly appropriate today: "This is the day which the Lord has made. Let us rejoice and be glad." As is customary on birthdays and anniversaries: Congratulations are in order.

First, I want to extend sincere congratulations to our beloved pastor, the Right Reverend Monsignor Studer. Monsignor Studer truly has followed in the footsteps of our Lord as the good shepherd of our flock.

All of us who have had the privilege of knowing him, and working with him, share the same esteem for his character. We are all indebted to him for his spiritual counsel and advice. We cherish him in our affections as a venerable man of God.

In recent years, Monsignor Studer, you have had many trials and tribulations, particularly with respect to your health. All of us have been concerned for your physical well being. We thank God for granting us your continued services. May our Good Lord further grant us our prayers that you may be with us for many more years to come.

Next, on behalf of all the parishioners past and present, and in my own behalf, I want to express sincere appreciation to those who have dedicated themselves in a special way to St. Vincent's Parish: To the assistant pastors, present and past; to the venerable and beloved sisters who teach in our school; to the lay people who work at the church; to the numerous organizations and societies, particularly the ushers, choir, altar society, church committee, and altar boys; to all of these, go our sincere gratitude and earnest prayers.

Third, it is appropriate to pay tribute to you, the members of the parish.

Our beautiful church, our school, and participation in 75 years of honor to Almighty God and service to fellow men stand as concrete evidence of the strong faith of this congregation. You have been willing to sacrifice in order to devote your best efforts to the glory of God.

As a Member of Congress, I have—through the years—spoken to hundreds of groups. None of them, however, has held for me the personal and heartfelt association which this occasion presents. As a member of this parish, and its former humble servant, I am particularly honored that you have asked me to say a few words at this diamond jubilee celebration.

I would like to address my remarks this evening to the challenges which face the world today—and the opportunities which thereby are presented to every citizen, but especially to every Catholic man, woman, and child.

Let us therefore, briefly review the past and its lessons, the present and its problems, the future and its portents.

First, the past. Since this parish was founded 75 years ago, there have been truly amazing advances in science and technology.

Diseases like cholera, smallpox, typhoid, and diphtheria which once ravaged whole continents, snuffing out the lives of millions, have been conquered. The invention of the internal combustion engine has made possible the vast array of automobiles, trucks, and buses that ply the highways of the world. It has created millions of new jobs and revolutionized our society.

Man has learned to fly. And with that knowledge has tried to fly faster and higher, until today he aims at the very stars themselves.

Laborsaving devices in our homes, in our businesses, and in our factories have made life easier and more healthy for millions of us.

The atom—that building block of all matter—has yielded up its secrets. Harnessing the energy of the atom has made possible many new advancements. They brought about achievements that promise a prosperity that would have been dismissed as a wild dream 75 years ago.

But the atom has also loosed other forces in our world—forces which likewise would have been beyond the belief of our forefathers. The cracking of the atom has made possible—for the first time in history—universal destruction and annihilation.

The possibility of a nuclear holocaust is not a remote one. It is a very real threat to the lives of each of us, to Western civilization, to the very existence of life on this planet.

Man has evolved a Frankenstein's monster which could some day destroy man.

Why has this terror entered our lives at a time when so many positive achievements have been gained? Because men have forgotten God.

As men learned more about the physical universe, they neglected the spiritual universe. Along with discoveries in science and technology came new philosophies which rejected God as an outworn myth. Man and the material universe became the sole concern.

What a Pandora's box of evils these errors loosed on the world. In Germany, a man named Karl Marx used these ideas to formulate the philosophy of atheistic communism—the philosophy which threatens to bury us today.

The scourge of communism can, in my opinion, be directly traced to the rejection of God.

In our own country, we experienced a rise of materialism. It took a different form here. It infected people with the insane de-

sire for money and possessions. It gnawed at the very moral fiber of our citizens. This materialism led to a self-centered individualism which rejected moral values in a search for cheap thrills, and worthless pleasures.

Through it all the Catholic Church stood as a beacon of faith in a sea of strife and error. The church, buffeted by wave after wave of denunciation, denial and outright persecution, continued to teach those moral truths laid down for it by its founder, Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

With error all about, the church, of necessity, was put on the defensive. Its principal efforts were directed to protecting the faith of Christians against the evils of atheism, secularism and materialism. It was felt that the less contact Catholics maintained with the world around them, the better off they would be.

Today the situation is changing. Men are coming to reject the sterile existence of life without spiritual meaning. The world has been frightened by the cruelty and terror loosed on the world by fascism and nazism.

Freedom-loving people are alarmed by the steady march of communism, with its barbaric, police-state methods.

Mankind fears instant death under a hail of hydrogen bombs. And they have no place to turn.

All see the poverty, ignorance, disease, hunger and unrest in the world about us, and yearn for an answer.

We, as Christians, have the answer. But too often we have been content—even smug—in our faith. Although we realize that we embrace the truth, we have been slow to communicate it to others. We have, in some instances, failed to recognize that the problems of the world are our problems and that we have the responsibility to aid in their solution.

It should be of concern to us as Christians that in many countries the per capita annual income is less than $50 a year.

It should be of concern to us that thousands of babies die of starvation each day in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

It should be of concern to us that the people of Thailand are ravaged by disease for lack of proper sanitary facilities.

It should be of concern to us as Christians that there are millions of people who have never had the opportunity to learn to read or write, who will never hear the name of God.

If we truly believe in the teaching of the church or the brotherhood of man and the mystical body of Christ, then we must be concerned for the welfare of people all over the globe. It makes no difference whether their skins are black, or their eyes are slanted or their customs are alien to ours. We have an obligation in Christian charity to care for—to help—those less fortunate than we are.

Our example in this endeavor should be the late Pope John XXIII. His charity and goodness gained him worldwide love and reverence. At his death he was sincerely mourned not only by Catholics, but by Protestants, Jews, Buddhists, Moslems, and even those of no religious belief.

Why? Because the inner peace and wisdom which Pope John radiated touched a responsive chord in the hearts of men everywhere. His impact on the world is proof that—as never before in recent history—men are ready for Christ's message.

Pope John realized this. He convened the Ecumenical Council and thereby showed the world that the Catholic Church is capable of a healthy self-examination and—where needed—progressive reform.

Pope John's encyclicals, "Mater et Magistra" and "Pacem in Terris," once again put the Catholic Church in the forefront of advanced social thought. These brilliant documents demonstrated that the truths of catholicism are as relevant today as they were in the middle ages or in early Christian times.

"Pacem in Terris," the most recent encyclical, asserts the right of every human being to security in cases of sickness, inability to work, widowhood, old age, unemployment, or any other case in which an individual is deprived of his livelihood through no fault of his own.

The encyclical proclaims that all men are equal by reason of their natural dignity and that racial discrimination cannot be justified.

"Pacem in Terris" declares that every trace of racism must be eliminated.

This great encyclical condemns the terrifying contest between nations to amass bigger and more destructive weapons.

"Justice, right, reason, and humanity," it asserts (and here I am quoting) "urgently demand that the arms race should cease; that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned; that nuclear weapons should be banned; and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of control."

These are words to remember as the Nation debates the ratification of the test ban agreement recently negotiated with Russia.

"Pacem in Terris" expresses support for the purposes and goals of the United Nations and other international organizations, such as United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) which seek to bring peace and prosperity among peoples.

The splendid work begun by Pope John XXIII is being carried on by Pope Paul VI. Under his direction, the Ecumenical Council will resume its work this coming September. The results of the council will profoundly affect the future of the church—and perhaps of the world.

For us as Catholics and children of St. Vincent de Paul Parish, the challenge is clear. We must cast away old defensive attitudes about our religion. Unafraid and unashamed, we must take our Christianity into the world to share it with our fellow men.

What, you ask, can we as individuals do to prepare ourselves for this encounter?

First, quite obviously, we mst know the dogmas and teachings of holy mother the church. The texts and interpretations are available in Catholic books, newspapers, and periodicals. Our church organizations are a good source for this information Knowing the teachings of the church, we must live by them. Unless we practice what we preach, our efforts will be fruitless.

Uppermost in our minds must be the key virtue of charity. Let us have charity for all men, regardless of race, color, nationality, or religion.

Second, we should have a thorough knowledge of the recent pronouncements of the Popes in their encyclicals. These, too, are available from Catholic sources. Further, we should be able to discuss the encyclicals with others in order that they, too, may learn the exciting and significant ideas these papal documents contain.

Third, we must continue to support our parish as we have in the past.

It would be extremely foolish, I am sure you will agree, to set out to change the world and neglect our starting point and home base: our parish church. For here is to be found the fountainhead of God's graces. If our efforts to implant the seeds of Christ's truth in the hearts of men are to be successful, we will need those graces.

Our efforts will be futile unless we continue to serve God through our parish and our parish priests, following the leadership of our beloved monsignor.

Many of us are the descendants of the founders of this parish. Those men and women faced grave problems, but they forged ahead with faith to establish a parish, to build a church and then a school. Their sacrifices have worked to our great benefit.

Let us, therefore, remembering their religious fervor, rededicate ourselves today to the future progress and well-being of this parish so that our children and our children's children will have the same rich heritage that we are privileged to possess.

Then truly can we rejoice and be glad on this day which our Lord has made.

Education for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as I have noted in another extension in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, our able colleague, Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS, successor to the lamented Francis E. Walter as Chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, delivered two addresses in New Orleans, La., last week.

His second address, "Education for Victory," was delivered at a luncheon meeting of the Americanism Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans area.

In this excellent speech, Chairman WILLIS discusses the importance of public information and education regarding the threat of international communism and calls attention to the contributions which the House Committee on Un-American Activities has made and is continuing to make in acquainting the American people with the threat posed by this alien and hostile system.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the text of Mr. WILLIS' address:

EDUCATION FOR VICTORY

(Address by Representative EDWIN E. WILLIS before the Americanism Committee, Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans Area, July 23, 1963)

I feel truly privileged in being invited to address this luncheon meeting of the Americanism Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans Area. Mr. Rhodes, your chairman, was kind enough to send me some information about the accomplishments of the committee in the brief 2 years of its existence. You have carved out an impressive record with your lectures, film showings, and distribution of literature on communism.

You are to be congratulated for what you have done. You are also to be congratulated for the basic approach you have taken to the problem. Through it, you have demonstrated your appreciation of the fact that the first step toward victory over communism is the study of communism, along with effective internal security laws. Just an hour ago, I addressed another group on the subject of "The Committee and National Security." Now, I want to discuss with you the problem of education and victory.

Knowledge is the beginning, the essential first step, in licking any problem. This is true whether we are searching for a cure for disease, economic disruption, crime—or for the means of protecting our freedoms from destruction by the Communist fifth column.

As an example, look at the progress we have made in recent years in fighting cancer. The disease was once incurable. Today many thousands of people are saved by treatment or surgery. Soon we will have a cure for it, and then a preventative.

Why? Because we have fought this evil calmly and intelligently. The American people have contributed millions of dollars for research. Our best doctors, scientists and hospitals are learning everything they can about the disease. This is the way the cure will be found and this enemy of mankind eliminated.

Now, we must do the same thing about what is today mankind's deadliest enemy—communism. This is a political, social and ethical cancer. It not only destroys men's bodies; but degrades, warps, and corrupts their minds—and kills their souls.

This cancer, too, must be destroyed—and it will be. In the past, we have tended to fight communism on the basis of instinct and emotion rather than knowledge. Now the picture looks brighter. We are beginning to act more like competent military commanders in the field. We are abiding by the first rule of warfare—know your enemy.

We realize that we are faced with a formidable adversary who threatens our country, our civilization and the very concept of freedom. We perceive that we will not have any real security until the bulk of our citizens and public officials know this enemy well. Until this condition prevails, we cannot be assured of victory.

What do we have to know about him? We must know his basic philosophy and doctrines, his objectives and the means he has used—and will continue to use—to achieve those objectives.

And—let's not kid ourselves—this is a big order. It's going to take a lot of serious study. Communism is not a simple thing. It is attempting to undermine us on many fronts; military, economic, diplomatic, propaganda, cultural, and scientific, as well as political. Its strategy is carefully planned; its tactics clever and varied. It has thousands of tricks, ruses, and deceptions. It makes abundant use of lies and half-truths. It is not something we can learn all about quickly and easily.

But, as I said before, things are looking up. Here in Louisiana and in many other States, we are teaching about communism in our schools. In many parts of the country, seminars and study conferences are being held. In hundreds of communities, Americanism committees such as yours are working at the grass roots level and doing a very effective job.

And here is something that should be of interest to you on this point. A bill has been introduced in Congress to establish a national Freedom Academy, where key leaders from every walk of life in our country can be sent to get a solid, thorough grounding in the essential facts about communism. The Senate has completed hearings on the bill. The House version of the bill has been referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

It is too early for me to predict—or even hazard a guess—about what will be the outcome of Congress consideration of this measure. Whether or not the academy is established, however, it is significant that such a bill should be introduced in the Congress with strong bipartisan support, and support that is not only bipartisan, but both conservative and liberal.

This is an indication of how much serious consideration is now being given to a matter that is so vital to our national survival—the study of communism.

Here in the New Orleans area, you are doing what you can to promote knowledge and study of communism. I hope you will continue this important work.

And now I would like to outline for you some of the things the Committee on Un-American Activities has done in this field. Some of the facts I will cite will surprise you, but they will give you an idea of the help the committee's work can be to you in your educational efforts. They will also give you a better idea of the overall contribution it has made to our country.

The committee has been in existence for a quarter of a century. We celebrated our 25th birthday on May 26 of this year.

During these years the committee has heard the testimony of over 3,500 witnesses; has published over 500 separate volumes of hearings, consultations, and reports; has distributed over 7½ million copies of these documents to the American people; has been the initiator of over 40 security laws and amendments thereto enacted by the Congress; and has had over a dozen of its policy recommendations accepted by the executive branch of our Government.

Despite this record, there are some people—in addition to the Communists—who want the committee abolished. In an effort to support their demand, they make all kinds of false charges against the committee—charges which, I hope, are based on ignorance and misinformation rather than evil intent.

I challenge these people to name any institution in the United States, governmental or private—and other than that grand organization, the FBI, which cannot publish its information—that can match this record of accomplishment. I know of no agency that has given the American people so much solid, substantial information on every phase of communism. To the extent that the American people, over the last 20 years, have been informed about communism and the threat it presents, I say that the Committee on Un-American Activities can claim major credit for it.

What about the committee? How does it operate?

There are those who claim that the committee does not operate in a very laudable manner. When pressed, they will grudgingly admit the committee's accomplishments which I have just mentioned, but then they will claim that it has amassed all this information by procedures and methods that are unfair and which violate constitutional rights. They claim the committee harasses, persecutes, and abuses the witnesses who appear before it.

The truth is that in the area of fair procedures, the committee has been a pacesetter for the Congress. It was the first committee to have written and printed rules of procedure. A copy of these rules is presented to each witness when he is subpenaed. The committee is bound by these rules.

The committee went further than that. It created its own subcommittee on rules to study and refine its procedures. This subcommittee took another step. It wrote to every Member of the House of Representatives, asking them if they had any constructive suggestions to offer. This was first done years ago, and it has been continued over the years. The scarcity of replies and constructive suggestions received from Members of Congress is an indication of how carefully and fairly the committee has devised its methods of operation and rules of procedure.

Another point on this issue: Some years ago, each member of a Special Committee of the American Bar Association reviewed a varied selection of the committee's hearings. The purpose of this study was to analyze and make a finding about the committee's methods and hearing procedures.

I am not going to read the full report of the Bar Association Committee on this subject, but these last two sentences from the report are sufficient to refute the charges made about the committee's alleged unfair methods:

"Your committee is impressed with the fairness with which hearings before that committee have been conducted. * * * We are satisfied that the witnesses called to testify before the committee are being treated fairly and properly in all respects and we also feel satisfied that each witness is accorded full protection so far as his constitutional or other legal rights are involved."

Now, as I said before, the committee's primary duty is investigation for legislative purposes. Despite this, the committee is also really a kind of educational institution. This is because the purpose of a congressional hearing is to develop facts. Now, facts are facts, and facts are educational, for whatever purpose they are developed. The committee's hearings, reports, and consultations therefore serve an educational need and are useful tools in the study of communism.

Attempts have also been made to create the impression that the information published by the committee is not really very informative. It is claimed to be shallow, on the extremist or flamboyant side, and therefore of little value to anyone who wants to study communism seriously.

Again, the truth is the very opposite of this. The committee's publications are used as sources of speech material by Members of Congress, clergymen, civic and business leaders, educators, and many others. The committee's documents are also used as texts and supplemental reading material in schools and colleges. As a matter of fact, they are also used in our Government training program—and the committee has had the honor of having foreign governments order them so they, too, can use them as aids in equipping foreign service and security employees for their jobs.

I don't want to take the time to do it now but, if I were so minded, I could read at this point a list of a few dozen recognized authorities who, in writing scholarly works on communism, have used the committee's publications as source material.

The work you are doing—education on the subject of communism and Americanism—is controversial. I am neither surprised nor dismayed at this. Many innovations and new concepts meet with resistance. They are opposed by the uninformed and by persons who have an ax to grind. This should not worry you too much. This resistance will be overcome, and before long I feel certain that there will be overwhelming acceptance of the educational work you are doing.

I would like to comment here about one point that has been made on the subject of teaching about communism. Some people are placing great stress on the fact that this teaching must be thoroughly objective, that there must be no indoctrination in it.

Generally speaking, I agree with this. Instruction on communism must be factual and objective. If it is not, we are misinforming ourselves and our students about our enemy, and therefore aiding him and his evil designs instead of helping ourselves.

No rational person can object to the idea that education on communism must be thorough, objective, and sober—and that it should not be mere indoctrination or ranting against communism. At the same time, I cannot help viewing with caution the excessive warnings against indoctrination made by some persons.

After all, in any study—even in mathematics—there must be some indoctrination in basic principles if the student is to learn anything at all and be able to find the answers to problems. Without this indoctrination, he would be helpless.

Similarly, there must be some indoctrination, some value judgments offered and advanced, when teaching about communism.

Let me illustrate what I mean: communism proposes a way of life vastly different from our own. The students are presented with the way of life offered by the Communists. Questions naturally arise in their minds.

"Is their way of life as good as, better, or inferior to, our own?"

"Is our judicial system better, equal to, or inferior to that of the Soviet Union?"

"Is our system of private property and private enterprise superior, or inferior, to the Soviet system of collective ownership?"

These and manifold other questions must be answered by the student. He has to make a judgment. Given all the facts on many of these issues, our students will be able to come up with the right answers.

But not all the questions are as simple as those I have just mentioned. Some are much more complicated. The Communists have devised clever propaganda arguments for their side, and young students cannot always readily see through them.

What happens?

He turns to his teachers, his parents, and other adults for help and guidance.

Are you going to turn him down? Or will you go so far as to talk about principles and ethics—not mere facts—in talking with him? When this point is reached, I say that we have an obligation to help—even if it means what some people call "indoctrination."

The claim of the anti-indoctrinators that many matters concerning communism are gray, rather than black and white, is actually an argument for indoctrination. The more gray area there is, the less black and white there is, the more difficult the problem and the more the student needs help in making a value judgment.

A final point: Hand in hand with the study of communism, we must have study of Americanism. How can you expect students, our youth, to be patriotic, to have a deep love for our country and its institutions if they are ignorant about it? How can we expect them to stand up for and defend our country, if they don't know what it stands for?

No one can appreciate what he does not know. Our youth must know and thoroughly understand the principles on which this Nation is founded, its history, its great traditions and—though this may seem trite—its heroes. Only if they know these things, will they be able to appreciate the value and worth of our institutions. Only then will they be able to understand what a terrible loss it would be for them if these institutions were ever to be destroyed by communism or any other ism.

I am no advocate of jingoism or extreme and excessive nationalism. But I know one thing; that knocking and debunking our heroes and institutions is no way to develop loyalty. That kind of so-called education can only weaken loyalty and undermine patriotism.

Our country is not perfect. No country is. Our country has its weaknesses, some blotches in its history. But, at the same time, when compared with any other country on earth, I say that there is nothing for us to be ashamed of and much for us to be proud of. In its principles, history, its accomplishments, there is no other country like it.

I am not appealing for suppression, even with students, of anything in our past that is not admirable. I only appeal for objective teaching of both the good and the bad, with special emphasis on neither.

Why do I make this appeal? It is because I know that the good and the great and the glorious in our history so far outweigh the bad that objective teaching cannot help but instill pride and love of country.

Unfortunately, in the past, we have often neglected instruction in American history and government. In addition, when this instruction has been given, it has sometimes not been objective. There has been undue emphasis on debunking. There has been failure to give adequate consideration to all that is great in our past.

As a result of this faulty teaching, we have seen the development of the apathetic, indifferent, uncommitted citizen—the political neutralist who exists in a vacuum as far as patriotism is concerned.

We must face the reality that a man who stands for nothing, can fall for anything.

We must face the fact that nature abhors a vacuum.

We must face the fact that Communists—and other totalitarians, too—are always eager to fill politically empty minds with their insidious philosophy.

We must realize that they can fill these empty minds much more easily than minds which have something in them that has to be destroyed before there is room for communism.

Our youth want and need belief. If we don't give it to them, someone else will. We cannot let them down.

We face a great challenge today. But we are a great Nation, and I don't fear the future. We do have great public officials, great educators, great citizens. We will meet that challenge in a great way—as we have met all such challenges in the past. I am absolutely convinced that through education—and educated action—in the areas of Americanism and communism, we will achieve victory in the cold war.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, seldom has the death of anyone been felt as a personal loss by an entire country. When Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt died last fall, a nation and, indeed, the whole world mourned.

Such affection and respect are not extended to every man and woman. Such sentiments are reserved for those who do not seek them, who in their daily living have exhibited the purest virtues, who know no prejudice, whose greatest love is mankind.

What Mrs. Roosevelt saw in 1948 as the ideal for a Declaration of Human Rights is what should guide men of all nations, races, and creeds. "Personal rights, such as freedom of speech, information, religion, and rights of property; procedural rights, such as safeguards for persons accused of crime; social rights, such as the right to employment and social security, and the right to enjoy minimum standards of economic, social, and cultural well-being; political rights, such as the right to citizenship and the right of citizens to participate in their Government."

Millions who knew such misery and dejection during the depression will long remember the humanitarian spirit which Mrs. Roosevelt brought to the White House. Those millions of us who have been so eager for the United Nations to succeed are well aware of and thankful for the hopeful enthusiasm which she has infused in that organization tirelessly and magnificently.

Eleanor Roosevelt will be remembered not because she sought fame, or reward, but because she had a deep sense of what she knew to be right and she spent her life seeking that goal.

Broadcasting and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, 1963, Chairman OREN HARRIS, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, addressed the first National Broadcast Editorial Conference. This conference which lasted 3 days was sponsored jointly by the Georgia Association of Broadcasters and the School of Journalism at the University of Georgia, and was held on the campus of the University at Athens, Ga.

The subject of broadcasting and politics is of particular interest not only to Members of Congress but also to public officials and candidates for public office in State and local governments.

The Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been conducting hearings on broadcast editorializing in general and on my bill, H.R. 7072, in particular. The purpose of my bill is to amend section 315 of the Communications Act to give candidates for public office who are attacked in a broadcast editorial an opportunity to reply in person over such station. Similarly, if a broadcasting station editorializes in favor of a candidate, other candidates for the same office would have, under my bill, a right to reply in person. Chairman HARRIS' address went in considerable length into some of the problems presented by broadcast editorializing, and raised many questions to which answers must be sought in the public interest. Therefore, I am enclosing the text of the address at this point in the RECORD:

BROADCASTING AND POLITICS

(Speech of Hon. OREN HARRIS)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, participants and honored guests of the National Broadcast Editorial Conference, there is an old saying that a statesman is a dead politician. I am glad to be alive; I am proud to be a politician; and I am gratified that you have invited me to participate in this conference on broadcast editorializing to talk to you on the subject "Broadcasting and Politics."

The assignment is not an easy one. But then a man does not choose to be a politician because he prefers an easy life. A successful politician considers problems not so much as difficulties to be avoided but as challenges to be met.

The subject "Broadcasting and Politics" is certainly a challenging one. In discussing it with you, I do not expect to provide you with easy answers to many difficult questions. My hope is to suggest some pertinent questions for your critical consideration.

In recent years there have been several Supreme Court decisions with which I have disagreed emphatically. However, I must say I concur fully with a statement by Justice Frankfurter in a decision involving the first amendment that "Broadcasting * * * has produced its brood of complicated problems hardly to be solved by any easy formula about the preferred position of free speech."

About 3 months ago I had occasion to speak to another group of southern broadcasters. (Incidentally, I am gratified that this conference proves once again that southern broadcasters are not in the rearguard of the profession but in the very forefront.) Today when this region of our country is being challenged by our Federal Government and often criticized unfairly by persons living in other regions of this great Nation, it is vitally important that we should be able to demonstrate to ourselves and to the Nation that as in the past the South is still capable of producing leaders in all walks of life who are an asset to the entire Nation and of whom we in the South can be proud.

In speaking to the Mississippi broadcasters, I entitled my talk, "Broadcasting and Tightrope Walking." I expressed the thought that those persons who are engaged in the field of broadcasting whether as broadcasters or as Government regulators of broadcasting must make skillful tightrope walking a regular habit if they aspire to become successful broadcasters or regulators.

In no area of broadcasting is this more true than in that area of programing and program control which seeks to deal with broadcast editorializing. Perhaps it might be said that in that area broadcasters and regulators have to acquire the skill of dancing tiptoe on the tightrope. The tightrope which I have in mind stretches between public needs and private interests and more particularly between the first amendment and section 326 of the Communications Act at the one end and the licensing standard of the public interest at the other end.

As you well know, our Subcommittee on Communications and Power has been conducting hearings during the past week on broadcast editorializing. You may not be familiar with the occasion for these hearings.

In the course of the hearings on the House resolution proposing to suspend section 315 for presidential and vice presidential candidates during the 1964 campaign, frequent reference was made to broadcast editorializing. During the committee consideration of the bill in executive session several members of our committee urged adoption of amendments to the resolution aimed at dealing with the rights of candidates in case of broadcast editorializing for or against political candidates.

I urged my colleagues not to attempt to tack on any highly controversial amendment dealing with broadcast editorializing to the somewhat less controversial temporary suspension of section 315 limited to presidential and vice-presidential candidates for 1964. I promised that our Subcommittee on Communications and Power would hold hearings on the entire subject of broadcast editorializing in the course of which all aspects of this problem would be gone into carefully. Subsequently, in the course of the debate on the floor of the House on the suspension resolution, I advised the membership of the House of our plans to conduct these hearings.

Now, there has been some open criticism of our decision to hold congressional committee hearings on this highly sensitive subject, and I understand there has been a good deal of not-so-open grumbling and a great deal of apprehension among broadcasters.

It has been suggested that these hearings were being conducted for the purpose of intimidating radio and television broadcasters so that they would think twice before editorializing over their facilities, and particularly with regard to political candidates.

Let me state to you emphatically that in my opinion the appropriate committees of the Congress have not only the right but the duty to go into this admittedly highly sensitive subject. We will not avoid our responsibility because it happens to be a delicate problem.

The Communications Act of 1934 does not have any specific provision which sets forth a congressional policy toward broadcast editorializing. The act does not specifically permit or specifically prohibit broadcast editorializing nor does it lay down any ground rules for such editorializing.

The Commission tried to deal with the problems of editorializing first in 1941 in the Mayflower decision by applying the general provisions of the act that a broadcast license may be granted only if it serves the public interest, convenience, or necessity. The Commission construed that provision as precluding broadcast editorializing by licensees because the Commission felt that licensee editorializing could not be reconciled with the interest of the public in having broadcast operations conducted fairly and impartially.

Later, in 1949, after extensive hearings on the subject, the Commission, with one Commissioner dissenting, reached the opposite conclusion and determined that licensee editorializing was compatible with the public interest, provided licensees affirmatively aid and encourage the airing of opposing views.

Thus, the statutory language of an act of Congress has been construed to reach diametrically opposite results. As the practice of broadcast editorializing becomes more frequent, the Congress would be derelict if it did not exercise its oversight function to examine into the practices and policies relating to broadcast editorializing and the possible need for further clarifying legislation.

The purpose of such an examination is to establish what the facts are and to identify such problems as may exist which are of public concern. I submit—and I trust you will agree—that there are few things, if any, in the area of broadcast editorializing which are exclusively matters of private concern.

After all, broadcast editorials are concerned with public issues, are addressed to the public, and the public airways are used to disseminate them to the public.

By no stretch of the imagination can they be considered the private outpourings of individuals destined to reach only a preselected group. The participants in broadcast editorializing cannot, in my opinion, claim any right of privacy seeking to screen the circumstances from public scrutiny. However, there may be limits which should be imposed upon such scrutiny, and I trust your conference may want to explore what these limits should be.

Personally, I have been for some time a strong advocate of broadcast editorializing. In a speech in May 1958 before the Connecticut Broadcast Association, I had this to say on the subject of editorializing—and I quote:

"In reading the reports on the recent NAB convention at Los Angeles, which many of you may have attended, I was glad to see that the key speakers appealed to you, the broadcasters, to make use of your right to editorialize. I agree with the speakers on it and I hope you will do so and will do so freely, and in so doing you will of course observe the rules of fairness which the Communications Act imposes on broadcasters as a part of the requirement that broadcasters must operate in the public interest. * * * In editorializing you will not be able to look at 'ratings' in order to decide whether your efforts at editorializing are successful. * * * In editorializing you will find that to a large extent you must shoulder responsibility for your editorials yourself and you cannot pass that responsibility on to the listeners or the viewers. Having shouldered this responsibility yourself in the case of editorializing, you may rely to a lesser extent on 'ratings' and to a greater extent on your own proper sense of values."

If the Commission at different times reached different conclusions with some Commissioners dissenting with respect to editorializing, it should not surprise anybody that individual broadcasters and individual politicians differ when it comes to the "brood of complicated problems" inherent in broadcast editorializing.

In order to discuss complex problems halfway intelligently we first must be reasonably certain that we give approximately the same meaning to the terms which we use in our discussions. When we talk about "editorializing" we must realize that there is the narrower concept of editorializing referred to by the Commission as "overt editorializing" which consists of advocacy by broadcast licensees identified as such.

In fact, there is the type of broadcast editorializing by means of licensee selection of news editors and commentators sharing the licensee's general opinions.

There is also broadcast editorializing by making available the licensee's facilities to persons and organizations reflecting the licensee's viewpoint either generally or with respect to specific issues.

In order to have a fruitful discussion it will be necessary at all times to bear in mind these different types of broadcast editorializing and we shall have to specify which type we have reference to when we talk about broadcast editorializing.

Chairman Henry, in his prepared statement before our subcommittee, suggested that the Commission and the Congress are most concerned about the "overt" type of editorializing. I cannot agree at all that this type of editorializing is the main concern of the Congress in this area, and I believe that the Congress and the Commission would be remiss in their duties if they concerned themselves only with this particular aspect of editorializing.

I venture to guess that many political officeholders—and I am not speaking only of Members of Congress—are likely to be apprehensive with regard to broadcast editorializing for or against political candidates. Their apprehensions are not based so much on lack of trust in the fairness of broadcasters but on the certain knowledge that radio and television broadcasting are today among the most powerful mass media of influencing public opinion in general and the voters at election time in particular.

Therefore, the first choice of many politicians might be to avoid this new threat and to prevent broadcast editorializing for or against political candidates. On more mature consideration, however, most politicians may come to the conclusion that their first choice might not be a wise one, quite apart from the fact that a prohibition of this particular kind of broadcast editorializing might be attacked in the courts on the grounds that it violates the constitutional prohibition of the first amendment.

Thus, their second and probably wiser choice might be to attempt to bring about the enactment of an amendment to the Communications Act to assure fairness to politicians in the use of radio and television facilities when used for purposes of editorializing for or against particular politicians.

Incidentally, your conference may want to explore the question whether fairness to politicians and fairness to the public are necessarily one and the same. I may be prejudiced and, therefore, not a good judge. As George Bernard Shaw has remarked: "The love of fairplay is a spectator's virtue, not a principal's." I can assure you, however, that politicians, as a rule may object to having their "rights" of answering broadcast editorials depend on the discretion of broadcasters.

Congressman Moss' bill constitutes an attempt in setting up some ground rules in the limited area of editorializing with regard to political candidates. It would make applicable the equal opportunity provisions of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 to editorializing by broadcast licensees for or against political candidates.

As was testified in the course of hearings before our subcommittee there are some difficulties inherent in the approach proposed by the bill. These difficulties, however, can be corrected and our committee will have occasion to consider the bill after the hearings have been completed. Whether or not the bill becomes law, however, Congressman Moss ought to be congratulated on his efforts to place before the public a concrete proposal designed to deal with one important aspect of broadcast editorializing.

While it may be difficult to lay down hard and fast rules with regard to broadcast editorializing we must nevertheless strive to do so. The very fact that the Georgia Broadcasters have called this conference seems proof to me that you agree with that proposition. Discussion of the problems in this area is wholesome and constitutes a valuable and important aspect of our democratic processes.

Let me attempt to make some observations which I hope will focus attention on some aspects of editorializing which I happen to believe are of transcending importance.

Broadcast editorializing is but one aspect of broadcast programing. Regulation of broadcast programing is a most difficult and elusive subject. This is true of regulation by government as well as self-regulation by industry through voluntary codes, etc.

Since all broadcasters require a government license before they are permitted to engage in broadcasting, there is a natural tendency to base regulations—governmental as well as private—on the fallacious assumption that broadcasters are pretty uniform when it comes to aspirations, interests, capacity, outlook, and other human traits. This assumption is factually incorrect and as supposition it is not in the public interest.

If there has been a regrettable tendency towards uniformity among broadcasters, this tendency ought to be counteracted to the utmost, and especially by organizations which purport to represent broadcasters.

I wonder whether many persons would suggest that newspapers are pretty uniform or that magazines are, and that standards with regard to their contents could be established by establishing minimum standards for their personnel or facilities.

Similarly, would it not be inappropriate to attempt the establishment of standards for broadcast programs, including broadcast editorials, by establishing minimum standards with regard to personnel or facilities?

The NAB committee on editorializing seeks to encourage editorializing as broadcasters become—and I quote—"properly equipped to perform the editorial function with the highest degree of professional skill and integrity." Chairman Henry stated before our subcommittee—and I quote: "We have cautioned that the licensee should not do so [namely, editorializing] if he is not prepared to act fairly and to employ an adequate staff as the foundation for meaningful and intelligent editorialization."

Are the NAB and FCC getting ready to establish minimum standards with respect to staffing? I hope not. I doubt that meaningful minimum standards in this respect can be established for all broadcasters.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not trying to say that there are not and should not be standards of procedure to be followed by all broadcasters with regard to broadcast editorializing in order to assure performance in the public interest. But is exclusive or primary focusing on the question of staffing going to be helpful?

For example, I submit that a radio broadcaster who operates an electronic juke box and who does not give any time for the discussion of public issues either by political candidates or by spokesmen for different points of view on such issues, has not equipped himself in any sense of the word to editorialize on such issues or candidates even if he should hire a qualified person to write the editorials for him.

I submit that the right to editorialize must be earned and this right should be properly exercised only within the context of other exposures of the issues or the candidates over the facilities of the station.

Furthermore, your conference may well desire to discuss the application of the principles underlying section 317 of the Communications Act to broadcast editorializing—the overt type of licensee editorializing as well as other types of editorializing.

Section 317 provides substantially that all matter broadcast by any radio station for which any money or other valuable consideration is directly or indirectly paid or promised to the station by any person shall at the time the matter is so broadcast be announced as paid for or furnished by such person.

The broad principle on which this statutory provision is based is that the listeners or viewers have the right to expect that matters broadcast are broadcast because of the independent editorial judgment of the broadcast licensee rather than because of some consideration paid or promised to the licensee for broadcasting this matter. Listener and viewer reliance on the broadcaster's editorial integrity is an important public interest factor which is entitled to protection.

Of course, section 317 would be applicable if a broadcaster were to broadcast an editorial for which he receives compensation from any other person. However, should not the listeners and viewers also be apprised of the fact, if such fact happens to be the case, that a particular editorial was prepared by a source not controlled by the licensee himself; such as, for example, an editorial service to which the broadcaster happens to subscribe? Or that the editorial was furnished free of charge by some organization or another?

The existence of editorial services is a well known fact and many newspapers avail themselves of these services. True enough, no newspaper is required to disclose to its readers the fact that some or most of its editorials are derived from such a source. Many newspapers, however, do so anyway.

I would like to leave with you, however, the question whether the public interest does not require such disclosure in the case of radio and television broadcast editorials.

Our committee's payola and ratings investigation have demonstrated the tremendous power which organizations not licensed by our Government, such as phonograph records manufacturers and distributors, and rating services have exercised over the programs broadcast by many licensees. If, unbeknown to viewers and listeners, persons not controlled by individual licensees, such as editorial services were to achieve similar control over broadcast editorializing, the potential harm to the public could be infinitely greater than it has been in these other situations.

Therefore, as the practice of editorializing grows, in order to forestall any harm to the public should we not require certain disclosures with regard to the sources of editorials and, perhaps, other circumstances which surround the origin of editorials?

Questions of how the public interest can best be protected in the area of broadcast editorializing are just beginning to be asked. In no area of broadcast programing is the public interest more difficult to protect. In no area will protection be needed more as the practice of editorializing assumes greater prevalence.

I am glad that you are aware of the urgent need to discuss these problems, and I hope that I have left with you a little food for thought for the impending dialog in this important area.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 1963

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

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

Joel 2: 21: *Fear not, O land; be glad and rejoice: for the Lord will do great things.*

God of all majesty and mercy, create within us during this moment of prayer, those longings and desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy.

Grant that integrity of character, devotion to duty, and reverence for Thy law may be the cardinal virtues whereby we are known among our fellow men.

May we listen in on the life of struggling humanity with those noble attitudes and feelings of sympathy and charity, of kindness and good will.

Show us how we may encourage the hearts and strengthen the hands of our Members of Congress who are safeguarding the good name of our beloved country and extending its influence as a mighty power in establishing universal peace.

Help us to lay hold of Thy divine power and gird us with that indomitable faith which will enable us to meet our adversaries fearlessly and valiantly.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina