shall be considered "disabled" for benefit and freeze purposes even though the disability is not permanent and to permit the payment of disability insurance benefits to an individual from the beginning of his disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 8665. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8666. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 8667. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 8668. A bill to facilitate the transmission in the mails of certain educational kits containing laboratory apparatus for the use of blind persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 8669. A bill to designate the dam and lock now under construction on the Alabama River at Millers Ferry, Ala., as the "Robert F. Henry Dam and Lock"; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8670. A bill to amend the St. Lawrence Seaway Act to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in publicity or promotional activities such as free or paid advertising; solicitation of cargoes; publication of ocean, rail, port or motor carrier rate or service comparisons; or other activities that are actually or potentially disruptive to the flow of waterborne trade among ports in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 8671. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer to impose certain time limitations within which offers for settlement must be accepted; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 8672. A bill to amend section 613(c)(4)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain treatment processes considered as mining in the determination of percentage depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 8673. A bill to amend title V of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the validity of an instrument the recording of which is provided for by such act shall be governed by the laws of the place in which such instrument is delivered, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 8674. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for certain nonreimbursable expenses incurred by volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8675. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide that the State agency administering any of such provisions in any State may make direct rent payments to landlords on behalf of recipients of such assistance when such action will aid in reducing rentals or improving such recipients' living conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 8676. A bill to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska Ferry system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 8677. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 8678. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 8679. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 8680. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 8681. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.J. Res. 762. 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. KARTH:

H.J. Res. 763. 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. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 764. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 8682. A bill for the relief of M. R. Agarwal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8683. A bill for the relief of Erasmo D'Angelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8684. A bill for the relief of Israel Kritzman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 8685. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sedat M. Ayata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 8686. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherina Varisco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 8687. A bill for the relief of Teresa Giuffrida Nasonte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 8688. A bill for the relief of Amir Hooshang Missaghian, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 8689. A bill for the relief of Dominico Sarappa, Madelina Sarappa, Aniello Sarappa, and Guiseppe Sarappa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

332. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting that the Committee on Foreign Affairs make a study of the situation in South Vietnam and report back to the House of Representatives their findings in order to answer certain questions, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 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 who hearest prayer, to whom all flesh shall come, the inmost soul of us cries out for the living God. The hurrying pace of our fleeting years here frightens and awes us. So teach us to number our days, that we may fill swift hours with mighty deeds and lay up treasures beyond the reach of moth and rust.

If the glowing vision that once lighted our horizon has faded to somber shadows, even standing on the debris of our dearest dreams, may we be stabbed by a strengthening glimpse of divine resources, vista beyond vista, glory reaching out to further glory. Take Thou our faltering hands in Thine. Lead us on, o'er moor and fen, and crag, and torrent, till the night is gone and the day dawns.

In the Redeemer's name, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 30, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Public Works, the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilizing of Prices of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

REPORT OF NAVY CLUB OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the National Shipswriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, Springfield, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that club, for the fiscal year 1962, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a cablegram in the nature of a petition, signed by Herbert Bernhard, of Columbia, S.C., and sundry other American members of the International Society for Labor Law and Social Legislation, at Lyon, France, favoring the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1963, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RIBICOFF, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H.R. 7544. An act to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 551).

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

H.R. 7195. An act to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems (Rept. No. 552).

IMPROVEMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL AND MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 553)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, and I submit a report thereon, together with the individual views of Senators CLARK and PELL and the minority views of Senators GOLDWATER and TOWER. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the individual and minority views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitttd:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Dr. Russell Alexander Dixon, of the District of Columbia, and Dr. Herman Howe Fussler, of Illinois, to be members of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service; and Colin Munro MacLeod, of New York, to be Deputy Director of the office of Science and Technology.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

W. True Davis, Jr., of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Switzerland.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

Dan H. Fenn, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of August 1963. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, AUGUST 1963 AND JULY 1963, AND PAY, JULY 1963 AND JUNE 1963

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for August 1963 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In August Numbered—	In July Numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In July was—	In June was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,515,008	2,518,857	−3,849	$1,370,056	$1,225,421	+$144,635
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,462,223	1,467,209	−4,986	792,171	699,977	+92,194
Department of Defense	1,052,785	1,051,648	+1,137	577,885	525,444	+52,441
Inside the United States	2,349,172	2,356,351	−7,179			
Outside the United States	165,836	162,506	+3,330			
Industrial employment	567,061	568,503	−1,442			
Foreign nationals	161,597	162,473	−876	27,808	[2] 27,604	+204

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.

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

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

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

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

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

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1963, and comparison with July 1963, and pay for July 1963, and comparison with June 1963*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	August	July	Increase	Decrease	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	114,843	116,679		1,836	$59,645	$50,630	$9,015	
Commerce	32,212	32,494		282	20,766	17,073	3,693	
Health, Education, and Welfare	82,820	82,487	333		44,152	40,077	4,075	
Interior	69,822	[1] 70,343		521	40,904	[1] 36,883	4,021	
Justice	32,127	32,288		161	22,605	19,394	3,211	
Labor	9,670	9,778		108	6,226	5,216	1,010	
Post Office	590,162	590,133	29		291,714	260,272	31,442	
State [2] [3]	42,911	43,053		142	23,737	20,988	2,749	
Treasury	86,678	87,473		795	54,338	47,292	7,046	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	380	381		1	272	263	9	
Bureau of the Budget	498	512		14	466	399	67	
Council of Economic Advisers	46	51		5	42	36	6	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	77	78		1	42	38	4	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	30	30			24	25		$1
National Security Council	40	41		1	35	30	5	
Office of Emergency Planning	470	493		23	411	353	58	
Office of Science and Technology	50	53		3	36	29	7	
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	26	22	4		22		22	
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation	17	19		2	7	4	3	
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing [4]	4		4					
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	27	26	1		28	21	7	
American Battle Monuments Commission	435	434	1		89	89		
Atomic Energy Commission	7,267	7,274		7	5,807	5,225	582	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	624	633		9	446	379	67	
Civil Aeronautics Board	862	855	7		697	601	96	
Civil Service Commission	4,073	4,081		8	2,692	2,386	306	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			7	6	1	
Commission on Civil Rights	90	92		2	55	46	9	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			3	2	1	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	299	304		5	225	286		61
Farm Credit Administration	237	238		1	186	166	20	
Federal Aviation Agency	46,567	46,549	18		34,785	30,700	4,084	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,532	1,538		6	1,118	957	161	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,304	1,247	57		864	755	109	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,245	1,257		12	906	796	110	
Federal Maritime Commission	243	251		8	192	162	30	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	399	403		4	376	322	54	
Federal Power Commission	1,209	1,222		13	903	787	116	
Federal Trade Commission	1,164	1,176		12	885	771	114	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	144	147		3	86	70	16	
General Accounting Office	4,591	4,651		60	3,225	2,820	405	
General Services Administration	33,017	32,871	146		17,247	15,028	2,219	
Government Printing Office	7,241	7,210	31		4,784	4,088	696	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	14,189	14,302		113	9,443	8,285	1,158	
Indian Claims Commission	21	21			28	23	5	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,413	2,426		13	1,788	1,544	244	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	30,538	30,582		44	22,768	20,368	2,400	
National Capital Housing Authority	435	434	1		219	193	26	
National Capital Planning Commission	64	66		2	54	46	8	
National Capital Transportation Agency	74	82		8	64	56	8	
National Gallery of Art	316	318		2	149	125	24	
National Labor Relations Board	2,017	2,052		35	1,516	1,302	214	
National Mediation Board	128	136		8	118	131		13
National Science Foundation	971	1,071		100	733	644	89	
Panama Canal	14,987	15,031		44	5,020	4,988	32	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	57	58		1	43	36	7	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,963	2,002		39	1,174	1,040	134	
Renegotiation Board	219	222		3	197	165	32	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	169	165	4		106	95	11	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,391	1,404		13	1,021	876	145	
Selective Service System	6,928	6,926	2		2,366	2,068	298	
Small Business Administration	3,398	3,406		8	2,338	2,008	330	
Smithsonian Institution	1,580	1,633		53	851	720	131	
Soldiers' Home	1,084	1,075	9		379	344	35	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	15	[1] 18		3	11	13		2
Subversive Activities Control Board	25	25			21	20	1	
Tariff Commission	283	290		7	217	192	25	
Tax Court of the United States	158	157	1		130	118	12	
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,984	18,017		33	11,743	10,331	1,412	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	168	155	13		150	109	41	
U.S. Information Agency	11,982	11,957	25		4,262	5,345		1,083
Veterans' Administration	172,577	[1] 173,617		1,040	84,058	73,132	10,926	
Virgin Islands Corporation	616	674		58	146	187		41
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,462,223	1,467,209	686	5,672	792,171	699,977	93,395	1,201
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			4,986				92,194	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,203	2,252		49	1,897	1,656	241	
Department of the Army	378,699	[1] 376,581	2,118		196,601	186,255	10,346	
Department of the Navy	343,864	344,682		818	[5] 198,596	[1] 177,909	20,687	
Department of the Air Force	297,173	297,154	19		163,725	144,293	19,432	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,010	2,002	8		1,080	941	139	
Defense Communications Agency	593	587	6		392	352	40	
Defense Supply Agency	24,951	25,070		119	13,749	12,082	1,667	
Office of Civil Defense	1,097	1,133		36	906	812	94	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40			36	31	5	
Interdepartmental activities	14	13	1		9	7	2	
International military activities	59	59			43	38	5	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1963, and comparison with July 1963, and pay for July 1963, and comparison with June 1963*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	August	July	Increase	Decrease	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense—Continued								
Armed Forces information and education activities	420	425		5	$233	$203	$30	
Classified activities	1,662	1,650	12		618	865		$247
Total, Department of Defense	1,052,785	1,051,648	2,164	1,027	577,885	525,444	52,688	247
Net increase, Department of Defense			1,137				52,441	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [6 7]	2,515,008	2,518,857	2,850	6,699	1,370,056	1,225,421	146,083	1,448
Net change, including Department of Defense			3,849				144,635	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.
[2] August figure includes 17,242 employees of the Agency for International Development, as compared with 17,206 in July and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The August figure includes 4,674 of these trust fund employees and the July figure includes 4,660.
[3] August figure includes 1,075 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,151 in July and their pay.
[4] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 11063 dated Nov. 20, 1962.
[5] Subject to revision.
[6] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.
[7] Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658), as follows:

Agency	August	July	Change
Agriculture Department	1,881	1,655	+226
Interior Department	528	267	+261
Tennessee Valley Authority	60	68	−8
Total	2,469	1,990	+479

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1963, and comparison with July 1963*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	113,598	115,491		1,893
Commerce	31,546	31,882		276
Health, Education, and Welfare	82,171	81,838	333	
Interior	69,287	[1] 69,823		536
Justice	31,758	31,916		158
Labor	9,578	9,675		97
Post Office	588,755	588,673	82	
State [2 3]	11,118	11,137		19
Treasury	86,065	86,853		788
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	380	381		1
Bureau of the Budget	498	512		14
Council of Economic Advisers	46	51		5
Executive Mansion and Grounds	77	78		1
National Aeronautics and Space Council	30	30		
National Security Council	40	41		1
Office of Emergency Planning	470	493		23
Office of Science and Technology	50	53		3
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	26	22	4	
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation	17	19		2
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing [4]	4		4	
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	27	26	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7		
Atomic Energy Commission	7,231	7,237		6
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	624	633		9
Civil Aeronautics Board	861	854	7	
Civil Service Commission	4,070	4,078		8
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	90	92		2
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	299	304		5
Farm Credit Administration	237	238		1
Federal Aviation Agency	45,507	45,492	15	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,530	1,536		6
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,302	1,245	57	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,245	1,257		12
Federal Maritime Commission	243	251		8
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	399	403		
Federal Power Commission	1,209	1,222		13
Federal Trade Commission	1,164	1,176		12
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	103	104		1
General Accounting Office	4,498	4,550		52
General Services Administration	32,995	32,850	145	
Government Printing Office	7,241	7,210	31	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,996	14,112		116
Indian Claims Commission	21	21		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,413	2,426		13
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	30,525	30,571		46
National Capital Housing Authority	435	434	1	
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Capital Planning Commission	64	66		2
National Capital Transportation Agency	74	82		8
National Gallery of Art	316	318		2
National Labor Relations Board	1,984	2,019		35
National Mediation Board	128	136		8
National Science Foundation	958	1,057		99
Panama Canal	167	163	4	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	57	58		1
Railroad Retirement Board	1,963	2,002		39
Renegotiation Board	219	222		3
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	169	165	4	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,391	1,404		13
Selective Service System	6,779	6,776	3	
Small Business Administration	3,343	3,350		7
Smithsonian Institution	1,562	1,614		52
Soldiers' Home	1,084	1,075	9	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	15	[1] 18		3
Subversive Activities Control Board	25	25		
Tariff Commission	283	290		7
Tax Court of the United States	158	157	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,983	18,016		33
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	168	155	13	
U.S. Information Agency	3,416	3,362	54	
Veterans' Administration	171,578	172,618		1,040
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,397,690	1,402,405	768	5,483
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			4,715	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,143	2,188		45
Department of the Army	327,598	328,264		666
Department of the Navy	319,248	320,309		1,061
Department of the Air Force	271,698	272,256		558
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,010	2,002	8	
Defense Communications Agency	565	560	5	
Defense Supply Agency	24,951	25,070		119
Office of Civil Defense	1,097	1,133		36
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40		
Interdepartmental activities	13	12	1	
International military activities	37	37		
Armed Forces information and education activities	420	425		5
Classified activities	1,662	1,650	12	
Total, Department of Defense	951,482	953,946	26	2,490
Net increase, Department of Defense			2,464	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,349,172	2,356,351	794	7,973
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			7,179	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.
[2] August figure includes 3,050 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,990 in July.
[3] August figure includes 719 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 785 in July.
[4] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 11063 dated Nov. 20, 1962.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1963, and comparison with July 1963*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,245	1,188	57	
Commerce	666	672		6
Health, Education, and Welfare	649	649		
Interior	535	520	15	
Justice	369	372		3
Labor	92	103		11
Post Office	1,407	1,460		53
State [1] [2]	31,793	31,916		123
Treasury	613	620		7
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	428	427	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	36	37		1
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1		
Civil Service Commission	3	3		
Federal Aviation Agency	1,060	1,057	3	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	41	43		2
General Accounting Office	93	101		8
General Services Administration	22	21	1	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	193	190	3	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	13	11	2	
National Labor Relations Board	33	33		
National Science Foundation	13	14		1
Panama Canal	14,820	14,868		48
Selective Service System	149	150		1
Independent agencies—Continued				
Small Business Administration	55	56		1
Smithsonian Institution	18	17	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	1	1		
U.S. Information Agency	8,566	8,597		31
Veterans' Administration	999	[3] 999		
Virgin Islands Corporation	616	674		58
Total, excluding Department of Defense	64,533	64,804	83	354
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			271	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	60	64		4
Department of the Army	51,101	[3] 48,317	2,784	
Department of the Navy	24,616	24,373	243	
Department of the Air Force	25,475	24,898	577	
Defense Communications Agency	28	27	1	
Interdepartmental activities	1	1		
International military activities	22	22		
Total, Department of Defense	101,303	97,702	3,605	4
Net increase, Department of Defense			3,601	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	165,836	162,506	3,688	358
Net increase, including Department of Defense			3,330	

[1] August figure includes 14,192 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 14,216 in July. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The August figure includes 4,674 of these trust fund employees and the July figure includes 4,660.

[2] August figure includes 356 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 366 in July.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1963, and comparison with July 1963*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,973	3,998		25
Commerce	5,796	5,816		20
Interior	9,015	9,104		89
Post Office	270	271		1
Treasury	5,311	5,255	56	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	279	281		2
Federal Aviation Agency	3,076	3,042	34	
General Services Administration	1,735	1,735		
Government Printing Office	7,241	7,210	31	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	30,538	30,542		4
Panama Canal	7,593	7,620		27
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	164	164		
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,783	14,825		42
Virgin Islands Corporation	616	674		58
Total, excluding Department of Defense	90,390	90,537	121	268
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			147	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 140,447	[2] 140,735		288
Outside the United States	[1] 4,902	[2] 4,636	266	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	197,437	197,903		466
Outside the United States	1,263	1,265		2
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	129,757	130,513		756
Outside the United States	1,082	1,123		41
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,783	1,791		8
Total, Department of Defense	476,671	477,966	266	1,561
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,295	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	567,061	568,503	387	1,829
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			1,442	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of August 1963, and comparison with July 1963*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	August	July	August	July	August	July	August	July
Canada	33	35					33	35
Crete	78	62					78	62
England	2,974	3,003			121	122	2,853	2,881
France	21,219	21,289	17,341	17,455	12	11	3,866	3,823
Germany	78,132	78,722	66,106	66,631	86	84	11,940	12,007
Greece	247	255					247	255
Japan	50,598	50,732	17,804	[1] 17,906	14,422	[1] 14,449	18,372	18,377
Korea	6,214	6,200	6,214	[1] 6,200				
Morocco	1,494	1,567			738	747	756	820
Netherlands	56	56					56	56
Trinidad	552	552			552	552		
Total	161,597	162,473	107,465	108,192	15,931	15,965	38,201	38,316

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of August totaling 2,515,008. This was a net decrease of 3,849, as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of July.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by month in fiscal year 1964, which began July 1, 1963, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July	2,518,857	9,149	
August	2,515,008		3,849

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of August was 1,462,223, a decrease of 4,986 as compared with the July total of 1,467,209. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in

August was 1,052,785, an increase of 1,137 as compared with 1,051,648, in July.

Civilian agencies reporting larger decreases were Agriculture Department with 1,836, Veterans' Administration with 1,040, Treasury Department with 795, and Interior Department with 521. The largest increase was reported by Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with 333.

In the Department of Defense the largest increase in civilian employment was reported by Department of the Army with 2,118. The largest decrease was reported by the Department of the Navy with 818.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 7,179 and outside the United States civilian employment increased 3,330. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in August totaled 567,061, a decrease of 1,442.

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

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,515,008 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 161,597 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during August who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in July was 162,473. A breakdown of this employment for August follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Canada	33			33
Crete	78			78
England	2,974		121	2,853
France	21,219	17,341	12	3,866
Germany	78,132	66,106	86	11,940
Greece	247			247
Japan	50,598	17,804	14,422	18,372
Korea	6,214	6,214		
Morocco	1,494		738	756
Netherlands	56			56
Trinidad	552		552	
Total	161,597	107,465	15,931	38,201

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2195. A bill for the relief of Prof. Arturo Serrano-Plaja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2196. A bill to provide for the free entry of a rheogoniometer for the use of Ohio State University; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 2197. A bill to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. HART):

S. 2198. A bill to provide for a separate session of Congress each year for the consideration of appropriation bills, to establish the calendar year as the fiscal year of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 2199. A bill to provide for a parkway connection between Mount Vernon and Woodlawn Plantations, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2200. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a presumption of service connection for emphysema which develops within 5 years from the date of separation from services during a period of war; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2201. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of the late Edwin H. Van Gessel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2202. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, in order to extend the period within which certain veterans of World War II may be afforded vocational rehabilitation training under such chapter; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. McGEE, and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 2203. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 2204. A bill authorizing the project for navigation at Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2205. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe DiCenso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S.J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to provide that October 15, 1963, shall be designated as White Cane Safety Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of Senate Procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

RESOLUTIONS

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NORTH AMERICAN CONSERVATION HALL OF FAME AND MUSEUM

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. McCARTHY) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 205) favoring the establishment of a North American Conservation Hall of Fame and Museum, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

CREATION OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. HARTKE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 206) to create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

ENFORCEMENT OF PROVISIONS OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Mr. PELL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 207) to urge the President to secure fuller enforcement of provisions of the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

AUTHORIZATION TO SHIP AUTOMOBILES TO AND FROM ALASKA BY COMMERCIAL MOTOR CARRIER AND ALASKA FERRY SYSTEM

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, in behalf of the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and myself, a bill to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system.

Alaska and Hawaii are treated by the military departments, for many purposes, as oversea duty stations. One of the benefits accruing to armed services personnel, in making a permanent change of station to an oversea area, is that the Government will pay for transportation of one privately owned vehicle per family, between regular ports of embarkation and debarkation. In other words, the family of a member of the armed services, moving on a permanent change of station to Alaska, would be entitled to have the family automobile sent, at Government expense, between Seattle and Anchorage.

As I understand it, some of these privately owned vehicles move by Government vessel, some by charter vessel, and the rest, more than half, by privately owned American shipping services. All of these methods are authorized by statute, and in most oversea areas the only means possible is water transportation. Alaska, however, is connected to the contiguous 48 States by land as well as water routes. Therefore, it would be possible to move these private vehicles by land carriers to and from Alaska. It would be possible, that is, if payment for such transportation were authorized by law. It is not.

It is a general rule that between any two points transportation of cargo by water is cheaper than transportation by land carrier. Between Anchorage, Alaska, and Seattle, Wash., however, on certain items, truckers have become competitive with water carriers. The reason for this is that part of the trip is made on the Alaska ferry system, a State-owned ferry service, connecting points in Alaska with Prince Rupert, British Columbia. By using the ferry, truckers cut their costs way down. In fact, one carrier has advised me that he could save the Government $100 per vehicle if he were given the opportunity to move these

privately owned vehicles, which he believes would result in an annual saving of more than $100,000.

Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. GRUENING] and I believe, and we are certain our colleagues will agree with us, that the Defense Department should be authorized to transport the privately owned vehicles of military personnel by the mode that is least expensive. This is why we have introduced legislation in this regard. In the interest of increasing economy in Government as well as developing more competition in the Alaska transportation industry, I hope this proposed legislation is taken up for consideration at an early date.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The bill (S. 2197) to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out the word "or" at the end of clause (1);

(2) striking out the period at the end of clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or"; and

(3) adding at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

"(3) in the case of movements to and from Alaska, by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system between customary ports of embarkation and debarkation, if such means of transport is more economical for the United States than other authorized means."

PROPOSED CHANGE OF GOVERNMENTAL FISCAL YEAR

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a separate session of Congress each year for the consideration of appropriation bills, to establish the calendar year as the fiscal year of the Government, and for other purposes. I ask that the bill may be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which I believe has jurisdiction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2198) to provide for a separate session of Congress each year for the consideration of appropriation bills, to establish the calendar year as the fiscal year of the Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for Mr. MAGNUSON and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am grateful to the Senator for introducing the bill, on behalf of myself and other Senators. Such a bill was introduced by me in previous sessions, in the hope that some of the things suggested even by editorial writers could be done. It would save some money in the long run.

I have discussed the bill with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I understand he is agreeable to having the bill sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration, where I believe it belongs. He has stated that he will take the matter up with his committee.

We can obtain a hearing on the question, for the first time, to determine whether something can be done about doing what every other parliamentary body in the world of which I know does, namely, having what is known as a legislative session and a fiscal session. Even in State legislatures where perhaps there are continuous sessions, at a certain time during the session legislative activity is stopped and the legislature proceeds to consider appropriations and taxes. Then the right hand knows what the left hand has been doing, and there is an opportunity to evaluate progress. This bill would afford a similar opportunity for the Federal Government.

There is an added feature. Adoption of this proposal would allow the Congress to take a recess at the time it should take a recess, and then proceed to consider appropriations, taxes, or whatever might be required for the fiscal year. The proposal has a great deal of merit. It would allow us to consider authorizations and evaluate them, and determine exactly what should be done to implement the authorizations in a fiscal way.

No doubt there will be some "bugs" in the proposal; but I am sure they can be eliminated.

This proposal would change the fiscal year of the Government and make it correspond with the economy of the Nation. It would change the fiscal year to the calendar year, January 1, to December 31.

The way things have been going, the date of July 1 has become a fiction, so far as appropriations for the fiscal year are concerned. I am chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which deals with the independent offices of the Government. We consider a large appropriation bill, affecting a great many segments of the economy of the country. That bill has not even come to us from the House, yet it is now the 1st of October. Last year it was nearly the end of the session before we received the bill and were able to do something about it. The bill deals with many agencies which have great effect on the economy of the United States. Those agencies do not know what they can do or cannot do. They do not have their appropriations.

This procedure would allow us to go forward in an orderly way. I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania feels that it would be helpful, along with his other suggestions, with which I agree wholeheartedly, as he knows.

This is another key in the business of adapting Congress to the times, particularly in the fiscal field. We cannot guarantee anything, but I believe the Appropriations Committees of the Congress should be given more time and greater opportunity to consider the authorizations. Perhaps committee members should even have time to go home and find out what the people think, in order to make appropriations in a much more judicious, economical, and sensible manner.

There have been many occasions when I have attended meetings of the Appropriations Committee when the committee was discussing an appropriation for a certain program at the same time the Senate was, in this Chamber, discussing the same program and changing the authorization or certain portions of it.

Formerly there was one appropriation bill, and perhaps one or two deficiency appropriation bills at the most.

The Senator from Alabama, who has served a long time on the Appropriations Committee, as I have, knows that the handling of appropriations has been concluded nearer and nearer to the beginning of the calendar year. There is no longer such a thing as having appropriation bills passed by July 1.

This proposal would put some sense and order into the procedure, and add other features. I am pleased to have the Senator from Pennsylvania join me.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] said that at the first meeting of the Judiciary Committee he would ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I hope that the Parliamentarian will see fit to refer it to the Committee on Rules and Administration now, because I think technically and logically it belongs to that committee, anyway.

BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IND.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize navigation improvements for Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind.

Indiana badly needs a public harbor facility to serve the industrial development in our Porter County area. The Corps of Engineers has recommended the project after finding it feasible from both technical and economic considerations. The Bureau of the Budget has now concurred in recommending its construction.

The State of Indiana, Mr. President, has long been interested in total development of its Lake Michigan shoreline. It is today the only State bordering on a Great Lake which does not have a public, deep draft harbor constructed under the Federal navigation improvement program. The Burns Waterway Harbor will provide us with this facility.

There has been considerable delay in the consideration of this project caused by careful study of the land-use priority of the area. After careful deliberation, the executive agencies now concur in recommending industrial and harbor use of this section of the shoreline. Other adjacent sections are of significant value to preserve for conservation and to provide for the recreation of the millions who live around the southern tip of Lake Michigan. The Department of Interior is presently developing a proposal to provide an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

A bill implementing their proposal will be introduced soon, and I intend to be a sponsor of that legislation also. There is no conflict between the harbor and industrialization of one section of the Indiana Lakeshore and the development of a national park in other sections.

With the introduction of this bill, I am hopeful we will begin our final step toward realization of these two important projects—the Indiana Public Harbor and the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

The authorizing bill we introduce today contains provision to reimburse local interests for work done on the project. The pace of industrial construction in the area has accelerated. The need of harbor facilities is growing. To meet this need, the State of Indiana has undertaken to study the feasibility of locally financed construction of the Federal portion of the harbor. Indiana should not be penalized for taking this initiative. This bill provides for reimbursement if the State is successful in expediting the construction of this badly needed facility.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2204) authorizing the project for navigation at Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind., introduced by Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. HARTKE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

A NORTH AMERICAN CONSERVATION HALL OF FAME

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] and myself, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution designed to encourage and commend the action that is being taken to establish a North American Conservation Hall of Fame.

In recent weeks Gov. Karl F. Rolvaag, of Minnesota, has advocated the establishment of such a hall of fame and museum. The State of Minnesota has offered a site high on the bluffs at historic Fort Snelling State Park. On September 10, 1963, the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, and the American Fisheries Society, meeting in combined sessions, endorsed the idea unanimously.

This is indeed a splendid idea and long overdue. Governor Rolvaag has likened it to the Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum at Cooperstown, N.Y. This new purpose, however, is to honor the men who have reminded us to conserve and protect the natural resources and the beauty of our land. There is a distinguished line of worthy candidates already: Henry David Thoreau, John Audubon, Gifford Pinchot, Aldo Leopold, Theodore Roosevelt, and many others.

In such a Hall of Fame for Conservation, we do more than honor the pioneers of conservation. We honor the cause of conservation and provide ourselves with a continuous reminder of a most important task of the Nation. We owe much to these early conservationists. In many respects they were literally voices in the wilderness. At that, their amazing foresight did not envision, probably the quick and massive expansion of this continent, the growth of the population, the tremendous needs it had to draw upon the land.

It is all the more important then that their message be heeded. For years we have been prodigal with our natural resources. It was not wise, but there was so much wealth in the land that the raiding could be glossed over. It can be glossed over no longer. We need wisdom in our policy, and a part of getting it is a program of conservation education. The project in Minnesota will contribute much in creating a national consciousness in this important area.

Our natural resources are much more than the minerals under the soil, the timber above it, and indeed the quality and richness of the soil itself. There are also to be considered the fish and wildlife whose conservation is important to us. Recreation for our people is important too. Nothing is more vital in this than to provide opportunities for men to get close to original nature frequently and periodically, to nurture both body and spirit on its variety and beauty, its creative wildness, its deep support of human life.

By honoring those who have gone before, we will remind ourselves of present and urgent duties, and give inspiration to generations to come to maintain, conserve, and enrich the legacy.

The least we can do, and we should not do less, is to commend the actions being taken to establish a national shrine to give honor to the cause and to the outstanding Americans who have kept faith with it.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that a press release outlining Governor Rolvaag's plans for the Conservation Hall of Fame be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the resolution and press release will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 205) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Whereas Governor Karl F. Rolvaag, of the State of Minnesota, has called for the establishment of a North American Conservation Hall of Fame and Museum; and

Whereas the State of Minnesota has offered for consideration a site for such a hall of fame and museum at historic Fort Snelling State Park, Minnesota; and

Whereas on September 10, 1963, the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, and the American Fisheries Society, meeting in combined sessions, declared their unanimous endorsement of the proposal calling for the creation of a North American Conservation Hall of Fame and Museum; and

Whereas the establishment of such a hall of fame and museum would serve to honor and pay fitting tribute to the pioneers of conservation whose dedication led to the founding and development of the science of natural resources management; and

Whereas it is appropriate that every effort should be made to promote and inspire leadership in conservation endeavors, and to give lasting recognition to the great conservation leaders, past and present, of the North American countries; and

Whereas such recognition will serve to focus renewed international attention on the need for wisdom in the use of our resources and on the urgency of accelerated programs in conservation education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that there should be established and maintained, as a memorial to the important role played by conservation in the development of our free societies, a North American Conservation Hall of Fame and Museum, and the Senate does hereby commend, encourage, and sanction the efforts of the State of Minnesota, the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, and the American Fisheries Society to establish such a hall of fame and museum.

The press release presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

ROLVAAG PROPOSES ESTABLISHMENT OF NORTH AMERICAN CONSERVATION HALL OF FAME AT FORT SNELLING

Gov. Karl F. Rolvaag today offered a Minnesota site for the establishment of a North American Conservation Hall of Fame—a national shrine dedicated to the pioneers of conservation.

In his welcoming address to delegates of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners convened here, the Governor proposed locating the shrine "on historic and hallowed ground, high on the bluffs near old Fort Snelling at the confluence on the Mississippi and Minnesota Rivers."

Emphasizing that "our living standard can be no higher than the standards of our natural resources," Rolvaag said that the "creation of such an international edifice would contribute to a new focus on the need for wisdom in the use of our resource heritage and the urgency for accelerated programs in conservation education."

He compared his plan to the national Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum at Cooperstown, N.Y., except that "we would be paying tribute to the Henry David Thoreaus, the John Audubons, the Gifford Pinchots, Aldo Leopolds—to those men who dedicated their lives to making us understand that our national strength stems from those resources we have all too often taken too much for granted."

The Governor said that he had already made inquiries concerning the proposal in the Nation's Capital, and that the idea had met with "enthusiastic support" from Federal officials.

"Key Federal officials are agreed that recognition for conservation's pioneers is long overdue. I personally feel a sense of historical urgency for this proposal," he said.

He urged the assembled conservationists to support the proposal and to "move together in a united effort to insure that future generations, who shall inherit the blessings of

resources enriched and preserved through the wisdom of pioneer conservationists, shall not forget them but find them fully honored in a national shrine."

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution to amend Senate rule XXV, to provide for a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The time is overdue for the establishment of such a full-scale committee and staff as a counterpart to the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House. That committee was established by Public Law 601, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which reduced the number of standing committees in the House from 48 to 19 and in the Senate from 33 to 15. As originally introduced by Senator La Follette, however, the act provided for a 16th Senate committee to be called the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

This provision was stricken from the bill at the time in part on the argument that the then limitation of each Senator to two committees would deprive the proposed Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the service of experienced members of the Finance Committee, which still holds responsibility for veterans' pensions, insurance, and compensation. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on the other hand, deals with veterans' education and training, vocational rehabilitation, and GI loans. Under the proposed resolution, the nine-man Committee on Veterans' Affairs would preserve and consolidate the valuable experience of members of these two committees by including three members of the Committee on Finance, three from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and three from the Committee on Armed Services.

Veterans' affairs are of a scope and volume fully warranting, even requiring, a single committee with adequate staff and consolidated responsibility. The more than 20 million veterans in this country are about 6 times the number of farmers in the land and are served by a Veterans' Administration with some 175,000 employees. Seven hundred thousand of them enter the 170 VA hospitals in a year. A million disabled veterans receive non-service-connected disability pensions, 2 million get similar service-incurred pensions, and more than a million survivors of veterans—widows, children, dependent parents—receive death compensation or pensions. In all, the Federal Government's programs in veterans' affairs are a $6 billion annual business.

The heavy business of the Finance Committee and of the Labor and Education Committee leave too little time by either members or staff for thorough consideration of important veterans' affairs from pensions and life insurance to vocational rehabilitation and medical care. As Senator La Follette said as long ago as 1946, a Veterans' Affairs Committee must be set up "in the near future in order to relieve the Finance Committee of a tremendous burden"—and today he might have added, the Labor and Education Committee as well. In the the 87th Congress well over 400 veterans' measures were introduced. Their channeling through a single Committee on Veterans' Affairs in this body is a needed forward step toward their best and most effective handling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 206) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section (1);

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (1) of section (1); and

(3) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (p) the following new paragraph:

"(q) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, three who are also members of the Committee on Finance, three who are also members of the Committee on Armed Services, and three who are also members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "and Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs."

SEC. 3. Section 6(a) of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to the designation of ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations) is amended by adding at the end of the tabulation contained therein the following new item:

"Committee on Veterans' Affairs—For the Veterans' Administration."

SEC. 4. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization confer with the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters theretofore referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the Eighty-eighth Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF H.R. 8363 TO REMOVE LIMITATIONS ON DEDUCTIONS FOR EXPLORATION EXPENDITURES BY MINING INDUSTRIES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on June 27, I introduced on my own behalf and for Senators ALLOTT, BARTLETT, BIBLE, ENGLE, HUMPHREY, LONG of Missouri, MCGOVERN, MOSS, MUNDT, and SIMPSON, the bill S. 1807, which would remove existing limitations on income tax deductions for exploration and discovery expenditures of mining industries. The purpose of this measure is to accord expenditures for exploration and discovery of new mineral deposits the same tax treatment that is allowed research expeditures in other industrial enterprises. By provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, deductions are now limited on exploration expenditures by mining enterprises to a total of $400,000, at a rate of no more than $100,000 a year. Clearly, this limitation penalizes investors in mining enterprises and operators of mines.

As this measure is a logical amendment to the Internal Revenue bill, H.R. 8363, which was passed by the House of Representatives last Wednesday, it has been suggested by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee Mr. BYRD of Virginia, that it be submitted as an amendment to H.R. 8363.

I now send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 8363 to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove limitations on deductions for exploration expenditures of mining industries, in which I am joined as sponsor by Senators BARTLETT, BIBLE, HUMPHREY, LONG of Missouri, MUNDT, and MOSS. I ask unanimous consent that this amendment lie on the table until Friday, October 4, so other Members of the Senate who wish to do so may join me in cosponsoring it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR A COMMITTEE TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time allowed on the Committee on Government Operations to file certain reports of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate be extended to December 31, 1963.

This request is made necessary because of the extremely heavy workload now being carried by the subcommittee. There are two reports which have not yet been filed: First, the Department of Agriculture Handling of Pooled Cotton Allotments of Billie Sol Estes; and, second, Pyramiding of Profits and Costs in the Missile Procurement Program. The subcommittee feels that the record of the hearings in the Department of Agriculture investigation will not be complete without hearing the testimony of Billie Sol Estes. Until recently his appearance before the subcommittee has not been possible because there were existing pending court trials in which he was a defendant. The subcommittee delayed his appearance in order not to prejudice or jeopardize these judicial proceedings. This situation no longer exists and at the earliest possible time the subcommittee plans to schedule his appearance. The report concerning the missile

inquiry has not been filed as yet because of the inability of the subcommittee to find sufficient time to devote to study of the record. We hope that this also can be concluded in the not too distant future.

On July 2, 1963, the Senate granted permission to extend the time for the filing of these reports to September 30. At that time, it appeared that it might be possible to finish the work by that date. In the light of the necessary delays for reasons I have mentioned above, it has not been possible to do so and I hereby request unanimous consent for the extension of the time until December 31.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OVERTIME SERVICES OF CUSTOMS OFFICERS—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BILL TO LIE AT THE DESK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2173) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the act of February 13, 1911, to eliminate those provisions which require payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees, be held at the desk for additional cosponsors until the close of business October 8, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CHARLES H. TENNEY TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to announce that the hearing scheduled for Thursday, October 3, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Charles H. Tenney, of New York, to be U.S. district judge, southern district of New York, vice Alexander Bicks, deceased, has been postponed until further notice.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that Mr. YOUNGER had been appointed as a conferee on the part of the House in the conference on the bill (S. 1576) to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers, and for other purposes, vice Mr. BENNETT of Michigan, excused.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2485) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THE STOCKPILE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "The Symington Report," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for September 29, 1963; and one entitled "The Stockpile Report," published in the Washington Daily News of September 30, 1963.

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

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 29, 1963]

THE SYMINGTON REPORT

There has always been a high degree of political content in the Symington subcommittee's stockpiling investigation. That was inevitable because officials of the Eisenhower administration were being investigated by a Democratic Senator with the aid of a Democratic administration. The flavor of politics continues with the refusal of Republican members of the subcommittee, and of Democratic Senator THURMOND, to sign the report approved by Senator SYMINGTON and two other Democratic members.

It would be unfortunate, however, if the report were simply shrugged off as partisan. By and large, the hearings were responsibly and objectively conducted. A distinguished Republican lawyer, Richmond C. Coburn, of St. Louis, directed them as chief counsel for the subcommittee. The report deserves serious attention, and its conclusions are disturbing.

The investigation has established beyond doubt, it seems to us, that unnecessary official secrecy has been used to hide information of the stockpiling program which the public was entitled to; that a program supposed to serve only the national security has been diverted to other purposes, including price support for favored interests and certain foreign policy objectives; that defensible standards for purchase of supposedly strategic materials have been lacking, and have been rigged at times to favor particular interests; and finally that unconscionable profits have accrued to some suppliers who took advantage of the Government.

The most prominent case in the last category involves the M. A. Hanna Co. and its nickel deal, signed in the waning days of the Truman administration just before George M. Humphrey, board chairman of Hanna, became Secretary of the Treasury in the Eisenhower Cabinet. The subcommittee report proves, we think, that this contract never should have been accepted by the Truman administration; that the Hanna Co. took merciless advantage of the Government in time of war in order to gain for itself a highly profitable smelter at no risk and at the public cost.

Mr. Humphrey has never admitted there was anything improper about this deal, but the hard fact remains that the company in which he continued to hold stock while serving the Government acquired for $1,772,000 a $22 million smelter paid for by Government funds. No less than four times during the hearings Mr. Humphrey insisted that the Government investment in the smelter had been "fully repaid with interest," but the report makes clear that in fact Hanna's only outlay for a $22 million plant was $1,772,000, and that the Hanna firm did indeed reap a tidy windfall.

Mr. Humphrey also told the Senate committee which in 1953 confirmed his appointment to the Cabinet that "I have no connection with it whatsoever" (referring to the Hanna deal which had been signed a few days before); but the Symington report establishes conclusively that he made the policy decisions on it and profited from it while he sat in the Cabinet.

This is not a pretty story, and it is not to be glossed over with the cry of "politics." If the Hanna deal and others like it are now water over the dam, they point up an urgent need for legislation proposed by the subcommittee staff to prevent such abuses in the future. Stockpiling for strategic purposes ought not to be used for price support, the Government should be protected against windfall profits to contractors, and full information on the program should be available to the public. The Symington investigation, we would say, has been an extremely useful one.

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 30, 1963]

THE STOCKPILE REPORT

A Senate subcommittee says subsidiaries of M. A. Hanna Co., Cleveland, made unconscionable profits in a nickel stockpiling deal with the Government. Republican members say Chairman STUART L. SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, slanted the findings against Eisenhower administration officials, notably George M. Humphrey.

Mr. Humphrey was head of Hanna and the contract was signed 3 days before he became Treasury Secretary. This was regrettable timing for Mr. Humphrey.

The report is a good one. It makes no charges of criminal doings against Hanna but establishes that the firm's nickel profits were considerable, to say the least.

What the report boils down to is this:

At grips with the war in Korea, the Government sought a domestic supply of nickel ore. Hanna alone had such a supply. Federal officials sought more favorable terms, but they were outgunned. Hanna had the ore. It also had Mr. Humphrey, a hard-headed businessman famed for driving good bargains.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, these two editorials discuss in some detail the Symington report on the so-called stockpile problems. They point out favorably the contribution the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has made to the solution of this very difficult problem.

On the basis of these editorials and other information the Senate has obtained both within and outside the Symington report, I suggest that the Department of Justice proceed without delay to take note of the fact that Mr. George M. Humphrey, the former Secretary of the Treasury, testified under oath, and it should make a thorough investigation as to the possibility of serious

discrepancies between his testimony under oath and the facts, because such an investigation is necessary in order to determine whether Mr. Humphrey has committed perjury and in order to determine whether legal action and prosecution should be instituted.

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, late yesterday afternoon I discussed briefly some of my views on the Dominican Republic crisis. This morning I asked the Foreign Relations Committee to recall before it the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Martin; and the U.S. Coordinator, Alliance for Progress, Mr. Moscoso; and in addition, I have asked that there be called before the committee the Director of the CIA, Mr. McCone, because as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I am greatly disturbed by information I have received from sources I consider highly reliable.

In my speech yesterday, I referred to the alleged activities in the Dominican Republic of American business interests who, it is said, were behind the military coup, and who are strong opponents of the Bosch regime, which was the constitutional regime of the Dominican Republic. So far as I am concerned, I shall press for presentation to the Foreign Relations Committee of every known bit of evidence in regard to the activities in the Dominican Republic of powerful American business concerns who, it is charged in some quarters, helped engineer the overthrow of the Bosch regime. Not only is it important that the President of the United States be informed of the facts, whatever they may be—for I am satisfied that if such facts exist, he has not been informed of them; it is also important that the American people be informed.

CLOSING OF U.S. BASES IN FRANCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article—from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch—dealing with the closing of certain U.S. bases in France. I highly commend that course of action.

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

UNITED STATES CLOSING SOME BASES IN FRANCE AND RETURNING HOME THEIR 5,400 TROOPS—6,200 FRENCH CIVILIANS TO BE DISMISSED AT SUPPLY DEPOTS—GERMAN INSTEAD OF FRENCH PORT TO BE USED FOR STREAMLINED LOGISTICS LINE

WASHINGTON, September 28.—The United States is streamlining its military supply lines in Europe, closing a group of bases in France and sending home the 5,400 U.S. soldiers who man them.

A Pentagon spokesman said the action, announced yesterday, was being taken in the interests of economy. He denied that friction with the government of French President Charles de Gaulle had anything to do with the shutdown.

The 6,200 French civilians working at the military supply depots will be dismissed, the Defense Department said. This move will eliminate nearly one-third of the U.S. Army's civilian French employees, who totaled 19,000 as of last July 1.

Earlier this week, the Pentagon announced that an entire armored division, 16,000 troops, would be airlifted to West Germany in 240 transport planes for a week of maneuvers. The operation will be the largest oversea airlift ever undertaken.

MAY POINT TO WITHDRAWALS

There was speculation at that time that the massive airlift could point the way to eventual withdrawal of some of the U.S. combat troops now stationed in Europe, thus aiding in reduction of the Nation's balance-of-payments deficit.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has said that the airlift would "provide a dramatic illustration of the U.S. capability for rapid reinforcement of NATO forces." He said that it would "project a new magnitude of U.S. military responsiveness."

The Pentagon said yesterday that the port and depot facilities would be closed in France because "shorter, more economical routes of supply * * * will permit forward positioning of military stocks."

The troops to be returned home were identified as the 4th Logistical Command, with headquarters at Verdun. There was no estimate as to when the reorganization might be completed, but similar operations have sometimes taken 12 to 18 months.

FORTY THOUSAND TO BE REDEPLOYED

The troops being brought home presumably are in addition to the 40,000 scheduled for redeployment back to the United States by the end of this year.

Involved in the base shutdown is the organization called the communications zone in France, which backs up U.S. combat forces of the 7th Army in Germany and other U.S. forces in France. It includes port installations, storage and supply depots and transport facilities.

The Pentagon stressed that it will preserve the present capability of the line of communication to expand in event of wartime requirements on short notice.

"This action will permit forward positioning of military stocks and will yield tangible economies in U.S. material and manpower," the Pentagon said. "It will result in more economical and efficient use of transportation resources."

The Pentagon said improved American sea and airlift capabilities, which it called massive, "make it feasible to reinforce these installations if this becomes necessary."

DISCUSSED WITH ALLIES

The new arrangements have been discussed with the French and German Governments, and the NATO alliance council, the Pentagon said.

U.S. Army strength in Europe now stands at around 250,000.

Much of the equipment now used by U.S. forces in Europe is delivered mainly through French ports. Under the reorganization, most of the gear required on a day-by-day basis will move, instead through Bremerhaven, Germany.

All U.S. depot activities, except maintenance, west of Orleans, France, will be reduced or placed in war reserve storage status.

Depot maintenance activities in western France will be shifted to forward depots in Germany and to the continental United States, except for Marine maintenance facilities at Rochefort.

Depot maintenance at Chinon and logistical activities at Saumur and Ingrandes will be trimmed significantly.

In northeastern France, some of the depot sites in the Nancy, Verdun and Metz areas will be closed or converted to war reserve storage.

Depots in France will be reorganized into five general complexes—at Braconne, La Rochelle, Ingrandes, Nancy and Verdon.

DE GAULLE REPORTED ANGERED

The United States was reported, meanwhile, to have offered to share the use of some of its military supply bases in France with West Germany. This move has angered President de Gaulle, reliable sources have said.

Officials in Washington denied the report. They said that all three countries have been holding private discussions on cooperative use of logistical facilities, both in France and elsewhere in Europe for reasons of military efficiency.

French sources here said the bases had been placed in France under a treaty with the United States and they assumed French permission would have to be granted for the Americans to share them with the Germans.

Washington's aim, diplomatic sources believe, is to tie the Germans as tightly as possible to American military power in hope that this would forestall the eventual possibility of Bonn turning to France for a bilateral nuclear deal.

NASSER'S WAR IN YEMEN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, unnoticed by many Americans, and consigned to the inside pages of the newspapers by more dramatic tales of Indonesia's aggressive activities and the guerrilla warfare in South Vietnam, a virulent shooting war is going on in the strategic Middle Eastern land of Yemen. For nearly a year now, what amounts to an Egyptian army of 20,000 to 30,000 men, equipped with modern Soviet weapons, is fighting an irregular army of Yemen tribesmen supporting a deposed king.

Most observers agree that if the Egyptians left, the Royalist tribesmen would sweep the new republic out of power, and would return their king to the throne. U.S. recognition was extended to the republic only on condition that foreign troops be withdrawn; but Egypt's President Nasser has no intention of deserting his new outpost of empire.

Meanwhile, Soviet influence is gaining in Yemen. The number of Soviet technicians has increased tremendously, and Soviet equipment and personnel are, in fact, making it possible for Nasser to continue his occupation of Yemen.

Mr. President, it is incredible to me that the United States continues, even under these circumstances, to supply Nasser with U.S. foreign aid. Our aid to Indonesia will be curtailed, we are told, in a dramatic gesture of disapproval of Sukarno's aggressive threats against Malaysia. Yet U.S. aid to Nasser, who not only threatens aggression, but sends his troops into a foreign nation, continues unabated. It is further evidence, Mr. President, of the double standard that is applied in the Middle East—a double standard which results in continued U.S. aid to a regime which has violated virtually every principle of international law, and has directly flouted the interests of the free world and of the United States.

Mr. President, it is time to expose and to end this double standard, and to see the facts for what they are. Nasser's aggression to Yemen is no less reprehensible than Sukarno's designs on Malaysia; and the fact that Nasser took advantage of a civil uprising to send in his troops is no camouflage for the Egyptian aggression that now is underway in Yemen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an

informative article on the Yemen situation. The article was written by Joseph M. Hochstein, of the Advance Washington bureau, and was recently published in the Staten Island Advance.

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

YEAR-OLD WAR IN YEMEN GIVES RUSSIA A FOOTHOLD

(By Joseph M. Hochstein)

WASHINGTON.—While the cold war dominates the world spotlight, a shooting war is being waged with amazing results in the strategic Middle Eastern land of Yemen near the Asian entrance to the Red Sea.

Virtually unobserved by outsiders, this bitter conflict is the hottest war on the face of the globe today and now appears headed into its second year.

It has produced gains for the Soviet Union and setbacks for the United States.

The most accurate intelligence obtainable about the fighting in remote Yemen, where no U.S. newsmen are based, has been assembled from various sources here and is as follows:

On one side is a trained Egyptian Army of 20,000 to 30,000 men equipped with modern Soviet jet fighters, jet bombers, and tanks. Propping up a regime that staged a revolt against King Mohamed al-Badr last September 26, the Egyptians hold Yemen's three biggest cities and major roads.

On the other side is an irregular army of 25,000 or more Arab tribesmen native to Yemen's mountainous hinterlands. They support Yemen's deposed king and control two-thirds of the nation, fighting with small arms.

The Soviet-armed Egyptians have been unable to dislodge the mountaineers, and observers on all sides agree that the royalist tribesmen would sweep the Yemen Republic out of power if Egyptian troops were not present.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union has exploited the situation to grab a new foothold in this part of the Middle East.

The number of Soviet technicians in Yemen has increased at least tenfold since the revolt last September, and some 700 to 1,000 are now building a jet airfield that probably will serve as a fueling base for Soviet flights to Africa.

Until last fall, the Soviet presence had been on a decline dating from a break between Yemen and Egypt in November 1961, and had hit a low point of probably fewer than 100 technicians.

The figure today, including technicians from East Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, is believed between 1,300 and 1,500

In addition, it has been reported that Soviet airmen have flown as co-pilots on Egyptian bombing missions over Yemen villages.

Washington lacks direct evidence that would disprove or confirm those reports.

But it has been learned that a squadron of Soviet aircraft presumably intended for use in Yemen was delivered several months ahead of schedule to Egypt last year, leaving the Egyptians short of trained men to operate the planes. It is speculated that Soviet fliers filled the gap.

The cost of the war in Yemen to Egypt is estimated between $200 million and $350 million at a yearly rate.

Egypt has maintained as many as 28,000 to 30,000 troops in Yemen and now has at least 20,000. A first group of Egyptian technicians arrived in Yemen by sea the day after the September 26 overthrow of the king. Rotation of troops as replacements has brought perhaps as many as 40,000 Egyptians to Yemen in the past year.

The Egyptians are using Soviet equipment that includes about 40 MIG-21 jet fighters, about 40 TU-16 jet bombers, 40 to 60 IL-28 jet bombers of the type that were placed in Cuba last fall, and enough T-54 medium tanks and Stalin Mark-3 heavy tanks to equip an armored brigade of 5,000 men. The T-54 is the standard medium tank of the Red Army, and the Stalin Mark-3 is the heaviest tank in the Middle East.

The Egyptian force in Yemen has consisted of 5 full brigades of 5,000 men each plus elements of 4 others.

The five full brigades are one armored unit, one motorized infantry brigade with armored personnel carriers, two regular infantry brigades and one commando brigade including two paratroop battalions.

Estimates of casualties place the Egyptian dead and wounded at about 3,000. The Egyptians have lost large amounts of equipment in rugged terrain.

Royalist casualties have been heavy but mainly among civilians, including women and children. Egyptian bombing raids have wiped out at least 200 villages. With accurate figures unavailable, a rough estimate figuring 10 percent of the villagers as casualties would put the dead and wounded in excess of 10,000.

No outside authority has investigated the attacks on civilians. The role of the United Nations in Yemen is to observe and report on the withdrawal of foreign influences.

The United States withheld recognition of the Yemen Republic for almost 3 months until it obtained a promise that foreign troops would be withdrawn, but has been unable to make Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser keep his promise to pull out.

Washington succeeded in April in halting shipments of small arms and bullets to the royalist tribesmen from the neighboring royal government in Saudi Arabia. Those arms were embarrassing Washington, since they had been supplied earlier to Saudi Arabia as U.S. aid.

U.S. officials have given up hope of holding Egypt to its past promise to pull out. No withdrawal is expected by Washington as long as the royalist forces remain able to fight on their own and threaten the Egyptian-backed Yemen Republic.

U.S. officials feel the problem cannot be solved in military terms, and they are now working behind the scenes for a coalition government in which posts would be offered to supporters of the deposed king in return for Egyptian withdrawal.

The proposal could have the effect of sowing dissension among the king's supporters and splintering their strength.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED SENATE VETERANS COMMITTEE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for a number of years I have strongly supported and worked for the creation of a Committee on Veterans Affairs in the U.S. Senate. As a member of a subcommittee which studied this specific question in detail in 1959, and as one who is firmly convinced of the need for a standing committee with special competence in the field of veterans legislation, I deplore the fact that no action has been taken in this matter.

Mr. President, it is said that consideration of a veterans committee should be a part of the overall study of congressional reform and reorganization which has been recommended by the Senate Rules Committee. Yet the creation of a veterans committee is a relatively small step. It has been studied not once but many times, and it is clear that on the basis of rational argument the creation of such a committee is long overdue. To tie the issue in with an overall congressional reform is in my judgment the best way to kill it, or, at the very least, postpone it indefinitely.

I have already included in the RECORD a number of resolutions passed by veterans organizations in support of the establishment of a Senate Veterans Committee. I now ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the RECORD a resolution on this matter passed by the 68th annual national convention of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

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

Whereas legislation concerning veterans affairs regularly takes up considerable time of the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the House of Representatives has found it helpful to establish and maintain a Committee on Veterans' Affairs to which is referred all bills affecting veterans; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States has no similar committee but assigns such proposed legislation to its Committee on Finance, Labor, and Welfare, and to other committees, all of which have crowded calendars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America in 68th annual national convention assembled in Washington, D.C., August 4–11, 1963, urges upon the Senate of the United States the immediate establishment of a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION IN THE OPERATION OF THE RAILROADS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Monkey Wrench in Rails," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on September 28, 1963. I commend the editors of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for a series of excellent editorials which they have written ever since the beginning of the crisis in the rail dispute. The editorial is in line with their high standard of journalism.

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

MONKEY WRENCH IN RAILS

The five railroad operating unions, having reduced collective bargaining to impotency, are now apparently trying to perform the same service for compulsory arbitration.

They demand that the board created by Congress to settle the two issues of firemen and crew makeup hold the railroads to all the proposals they have accepted or made in the past 2 years even though the proposals were rejected by the unions. They contend that the arbitrators are bound to this course by the language of the congressional resolution defining their powers, specifically the provision that the board "shall incorporate in (its) decision any matters on which it finds the parties were in agreement * * * and shall * * * give due consideration to

those matters on which the parties were in tentative agreement."

The parties were not in agreement on either of the issues before the board. As to elimination of firemen from diesel freight and yard engines, the unions offered a reduction of only a few hundred from the 32,000 firemen in freight and yard service and the railroads rejected the proposal. As to crew makeup, the railroads and the unions could never agree on the classes of service to which an agreed-on procedure should supply. Nonagreement on the two especially stubborn issues is in fact what the arbitration board is all about.

But the unions want to stretch the definition of "agreement" to include concessions made in the course of bargaining in the hope they might lead to agreement, and to include proposals the railroads accepted from two Presidential boards and from Secretary of Labor Wirtz. Howard Neitzert, chief counsel for the railroads, is, we believe, entirely right when he contends these concessions should not be made the floor for the arbitration's board design of settlement. If they were, parties engaged in collective bargaining in the future might be understandably reluctant to offer concessions of substance, or to accept proposals of Presidential boards or mediators as the basis for further negotiations, lest they be held to them in the event of compulsory arbitration. The process of collective bargaining and the procedures of the Railway Labor Act as well would suffer immeasurably in consequence.

The board of arbitration will need all the elbow room it can get in order to do a creditable job. We hope it will not allow itself to be hedged in with old failures. Plainly Congress intent was that the board should profit from the spadework of the Presidential boards and Secretary Wirtz, and should make the most of voluntary agreements before imposing settlements. But we do not believe it was the intent of Congress or should be the policy of the board to penalize either party for proposals made or accepted in a spirit of reasonableness and bargaining in good faith. The cleaner the board wipes the slate, the better it will be able to write on it.

THE GOLD MYTH AND THE DOLLAR DILEMMA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the balance-of-payments deficit problem of the United States and the corresponding fear of some people about the soundness of the American dollar nags us. If it has not been as immediately urgent in business before us as the test ban treaty, or civil rights, it is not far out of sight, and cannot be put out of mind. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], has kept us all in his debt for his depth analyses and commentary in recent weeks.

I myself have called attention to the report of the Brookings Institution and its analysis by Walter Salant and a team of economists. I wish now to call attention to a pertinent and provocative article by the economist and investment banker, William Stix Wasserman. It appears in the Thursday, August 29, issue of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle.

Mr. Wasserman has noted that the American dollar is basically in sound shape. We have had unjustifiable fears about our balance-of-payments position in terms of its effect upon our budget. That is, our adverse balance of payments looks puny indeed against the nearly $100 billion of our ownings abroad. Much of the scare talk simply has not looked at the total picture of our situation.

This is not to say that there are no problems or concerns to which to apply a corrective. There is a problem of "liquidity," of enough cash or credit available at a given time to finance some of the necessary expansion of trade and economic development in the world. On September 3 here, I referred to it as essentially a problem of having more blood to fill the arteries and supply the needs of a larger body. As long as cash and credit is tied narrowly to gold reserves, and as long as they do not grow at the same rate as the economic body does, we will continue to have this problem. No manipulation of interest rates, promotion of American intourism, expansion of our our exports, further tying of our foreign aid to purchases in America—however desirable some of these may be—are going to make much difference. I believe there is a consensus of the economic experts on this now.

Thus far we either talk about this problem in such a way as to create an unwarranted psychological panic or take restrictive and deflationary fiscal measures at home, such as raising interest rates on short-term money, when our own economy needs a contrary attitude and procedure with which to expand. Or, if we do look forward as the Salant report does, to an overcoming of our present deficit in balance of payments by 1968, it is bound, under present circumstances, to be achieved by pinching someone else.

The answer strongly points to a broader base than gold to support international credit.

Mr. Wasserman cites a forceful example of how one can have a lot of gold and literally choke on it. He cites another to underline the economic truth that it is productivity, not gold, which is the basis of a nation's strength and wealth. In the middle thirties we had 12 million unemployed on the streets, while our banks bulged with gold. At the same time, with no gold, Germany was building one of the greatest war machines in history.

Mr. Wasserman acknowledges the psychological hold of gold upon us. He does not think it wise to try to abandon it or its mystique completely. He does advocate the loosening of its stranglehold upon the economy of the free world. He proposes a five point program. In part, it involves international agreement to restrict speculation and hoarding in gold and to achieve greater cooperation of the central banks in using larger amounts of the free world currencies for their reserves. In part, and if necessary, he advocates that the United States pursue a flexible policy upon its buying price for gold and upon taxation of short-term funds borrowed here for use in speculation with the dollar.

I do not profess to be an economist or to have all of the answers. I know Mr. Wasserman to be a conservative in the best sense of that word—which does not preclude learning new duties and new techniques to meet new occasions. He is no advocate of easy money, cheap money, or inflated money.

Whether we are economists or not, we are all going to have to do some serious study, investigation, and learning in this area. By way of bringing Mr. Wasserman's lucid discussion to the attention of my colleagues for study and reflection, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LETTER TO THE EDITOR: THE GOLD MYTH AND THE DOLLAR DILEMMA

EDITOR, COMMERCIAL AND FINANCIAL CHRONICLE:

For hundreds of years, sea exploration was retarded because most men believed that the earth was flat, and that should they venture too far to sea they would certainly encounter disaster at the earth's rim.

Today, men are held in equal bondage by the myth that gold is essential to their well-being, and that without it their money would lose value in an avalanche of inflated paper. Nothing could be further from the truth. A nation's wealth is based not on its gold supply but its productivity. Two examples of staggering force have occurred within our lifetime to prove the truth of this basic maxim. At the height of the depression in the early thirties when 12 million unemployed walked the streets and this country was in the direst economic straits it has ever been in, our banks and Treasury were bulging with gold. Conversely, despite the opinion of the majority of the banking world that Germany could never go to war because she had no gold, Hitler built the greatest war machine in the history of mankind. Dr. Schacht convinced him that production alone was the real source of wealth, and that if he could put the German people to work he need not worry about gold.

In both cases, solutions to the problems of the times lay in a fresh appraisal and a new economic approach. Our chief problem is one of liquidity where a diminishing gold supply is called upon to finance an ever-increasing volume of business at a time when our balance of payments is adverse.

OUR CONTEMPORARY BANK CURRENCY

It cannot be stated too often that the currency of our times no longer consists of gold or silver, or even a large number of paper dollars, but rather credit or bank currency in the form of checks. Almost all of our major business transactions are conducted on the basis of check or bank deposits. In the long run the Federal Reserve maintains the value of the dollar by regulating the total amount of bank credit outstanding in relation to the amount of goods and services available. Gold has ceased to have any bearing on the problem except as it affects Federal Reserve policies, which must be governed by the necessities of maintaining a balance between the country's credit needs on the one hand and a stable balance of international payments on the other. Today these are in conflict. Domestically we require low interest rates and easy credit. Internationally, to prevent further gold losses, we require tight money and high interest rates to attract foreign balances and to create a psychological climate of confidence by showing we mean to defend our gold position come what may. If the dollar was intrinsically weak there would be some justification for the latter course, but to defend the dollar at the expense of our economy by creating a condition of lessened rather than increased production (tight money always hampers production) seems completely absurd in view of the other steps available.

Logically, we might ignore our gold losses and permit our reserves to dwindle to the vanishing point secure in the knowledge that the intrinsic strength of our currency would eventually maintain its trading value. However, this might create a world panic. The psychological hold of gold on people's imagination is so great that pure logic must be abandoned and a more gradual approach substituted, embodying the retention of gold and acknowledgment of its mystique, while at the same time loosening its stranglehold on the economy.

THE DOLLAR'S INHERENT STRENGTH

Most people fail to realize the great inherent strength of the dollar. They become panicky at our continuing gold losses because they are unaware that we have been trading dollars and gold for the ownership of at least half the fuel resources of the free world, for oil fields in Arabia, Libya, and Venezuela, for refineries, pipelines, and filling stations throughout Europe, Asia, and Africa; for the ownership of at least half the automobile factories of Europe; for a dominant position in the telephone manufacturing companies of England, France, Holland, and Germany; and for ownership of countless other industries where American industry has established profitable subsidiaries throughout the free world.

If the total income of these investments were returned to the United States instead of being used for expansion, a large part of our balance-of-payments problems would be solved. Or, if we decided to curtail our economic and military aid and call in part of our $20 billion of Government loans abroad, the problem would disappear. But neither of these actions is feasible.

What constructive steps can be taken to increase the free world's liquidity and free our economy from its golden chains without upsetting world confidence? Ideally, individual gold speculation should be outlawed, and the tremendous supply now in private hands returned to the central banks to increase their liquid resources. To date, gold has been a one-way street with the advantage to the hoarder. He could always exchange his gold for a usable currency at a rate never below his purchase price and often considerably above. Consequently, most of the free world's newly mined gold has not gone to the central banks but rather into individual hands, for hoarding.

To be sure, to persuade the governments of Europe to prohibit private purchases of gold will be no easy matter. London has for centuries been its leading marketplace and it will be difficult to induce the British Government to pass laws that will diminish London's importance in this respect. In France one will encounter formidable opposition from a people long accustomed to regarding the hoarding of gold as their chief protection against a currency continually devalued. The Swiss, who earn an important part of their living by acting as custodian of the world's private fortunes, and who view private property in all forms as sacrosanct from government interference, will not welcome these measures. Therefore, as a workable compromise the following steps are suggested.

A CONSERVATIVE COMPROMISE

1. An agreement between the Central Banks of the free world that all their dealings in gold will be restricted to transactions amongst themselves. They will not buy from or sell to private banks or individuals any gold whatsoever, with the exception that the purchase of newly mined gold will be permitted providing it is made from certified mining companies. The mining companies, in turn, will be permitted to sell only to the Central Banks. Present individual gold owners will be given a grace period to exchange their gold at present rates for the currency of their choice. This will leave the free markets of London, Zurich, and Paris intact, but without Government support.

2. In the event of the refusal of the Central Banks of London, France, and Switzerland to cooperate in respect to the above, an announcement on the part of the President should be made that the United States reserves the right to lower its buying rate for gold should such action be deemed advisable.

3. Abolition of the present statutory—note cover requirements, whereby some $12 billion of Treasury gold must be kept on hand as a reserve for our combined deposit and Federal note liabilities.

4. The greater use of free world currencies as an acknowledged part of the Central Bank's reserve.

5. Curtailment, by taxation if necessary, of the use of so-called "Euro-Dollar" transactions. "Euro-Dollars" consist of money borrowed on short-term from American banks by both European and Canadian banks, who have used these credits to help finance European speculation against the dollar as well as the boom on the European stock exchanges. Part of these funds have been used for long-term industrial credits and could easily help provoke a liquidity crisis, since their withdrawal would present serious problems. Their existence is one of the main reasons for the present imbalance of the American exchange position. It is estimated that more than $5 billion is currently being utilized to maintain the present "Euro-Dollar" position.

The steps outlined above, by denying the private speculator access to the gold reserves of our Central Banks, would remove the most potent threat to the free world's exchange position. The Central Banks at this point would be exempt from outside pressures. Gold movements would take place only in response to the coordinated economic planning of the central banks, whose basic interest must be to promote exchange stability and economic growth.

In the long run, exchange stability depends on confidence. In the 19th century, the British pound was supreme despite the fact that the Bank of England gold reserves were meager, and that there were often adverse balances of trade and payment. The world knew that Great Britain was the world's leading industrial nation, that she had great invested wealth abroad, and most importantly, had wise economic leadership. Wisdom begins at home. We must teach the American people how strong the dollar really is. Part of our dollar weakness has resulted from our own ignorance and unjustifiable fears in regards to our budget position and balance of payments. Today, America is the world's greatest producer. Our wealth abroad is estimated at close to $100 billion, an enormous sum in comparison with the few billions of adverse balances that have created so much alarm. With a realistic solution to our liquidity and gold problems, we need no longer be inhibited in following a policy of expansion, which is so essential for our own and the world's well-being.

WILLIAM STIX WASSERMAN.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM G. "BILL" REIDY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to express my thanks and best wishes to a gentleman whose long service to this body deserves the gratitude of every Member. I refer, Mr. President, to William G. "Bill" Reidy, until yesterday staff director of the Special Committee on Aging, and who has served since 1947 as a valuable, stimulating, and constructive staff member in the Senate. Bill Reidy has been associated with major legislative enactments of the Congress, which have left a deep imprint on American society in the field of education and health.

I recall his valuable assistance to me in my efforts early in my Senate career to revitalize the Veterans' Administration's medical care program. Without his strong assistance it would have been impossible to accomplish the task.

I am happy to say that the task was fulfilled, and today the Veterans' Administration medical program is one of our finest programs.

I think the RECORD should show at least some of the major programs in which Bill Reidy has been deeply involved during his 16 years in the Senate. In chronological order, they are as follows:

Creation of the National Institute of Dental Research, 1947.

Creation of the National Institute of Metabolic Diseases, Blindness, 1949.

Creation of the National Institute on Arthritis and Rheumatism, 1948.

Creation of the National Library of Medicine, 1956.

Creation of a library service in rural areas, 1956.

Financing of local public health units, 1951.

Aproval of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1953.

Amending Food and Drug Act as regards pesticide chemicals and raw agricultural products, 1954.

Basic amendments to the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act, 1954.

Construction of non-Federal research facilities, 1955.

Poliomyelitis vaccination program of 1955.

National survey of mental illness, 1955.

Creation of the U.S. National Health Survey, 1956.

Institution of a Federal program for training of practical nurses and professional public health personnel, 1956.

War Orphans Educational Assistance Act, 1956.

Teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children, 1957.

Library Service of Captioned Films for the Deaf, 1957.

Construction of Indian health facilities, 1957.

The White House Conference on Aging, 1958.

Grants to schools of public health, 1958.

National Defense Education Act, 1958.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senate is losing a valued and trusted associate, and I know that each of my colleagues joins with me today in expressing to Bill Reidy our friendship, our admiration, and our very best wishes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am more than happy to yield to the distinguished

chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Mr. HILL. I join the distinguished Senator from Minnesota in expressing thanks, good wishes, friendship, and appreciation to Mr. "Bill" Reidy. As the Senator from Minnesota has well said, for a number of years Mr. Reidy was a staff member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in connection with health and education legislation. He made many splendid contributions to the work of the committee and the work of the Senate.

The Senator from Minnesota has referred to a number of bills to which Mr. Reidy has made contributions. I call attention to two bills that have been passed by the Senate at the present session of Congress. They are bills which I consider to be landmark measures. First, I refer to the bill passed by the Senate a few days ago to provide Federal aid for mental, dental, osteopathic, and other health related schools. A measure on this subject has been proposed in the Senate and before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for at least 12 to 14 years. During Mr. Reidy's service with the committee he did much work to bring about the legislation now on the statute books—legislation in which all of us can feel a deep sense of pride. He made many contributions.

The other measure which I consider to be a landmark is a bill which was passed by the Senate not too many days ago, providing for the mentally retarded and the mentally ill. Members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have been in conference with the conferees on the part of the House only this morning to iron out differences in that proposed legislation. I believe that legislation will soon be on the statute books. It will be a tremendous step forward in the care, treatment and, most important, the rehabilitation and restoration of the mentally retarded and mentally ill.

Mr. Reidy was with us as a staff member when the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported to the Senate, the bill creating the National Commission on Mental Illness and Health.

That act was the foundation stone upon which rested the subsequent legislation on mental health and mental retardation.

Mr. Reidy made many splendid contributions in the battle we have been waging through the years to bring about the victory which now seems to be within our grasp.

I am happy to join the Senator from Minnesota in expressing appreciation to Mr. Reidy for his work and his many fine contributions toward helping the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Senate and for his services to our country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota is granted 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I express my gratitude to the Senator from Alabama for the fine tribute he has paid to Mr. Reidy. I can think of no higher praise one could receive than comments from the Senator who has done more for the health of our Nation and for the educational well-being of our Nation than any other Senator; namely, the great senior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator for his most generous words.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The depth and breadth of our gratitude, respect, and friendship for Bill Reidy has been far more eloquently expressed by the senior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from Alabama than I could express it. I wish to associate myself with all that has been said.

In the few years I have served in this body Bill Reidy has always been available to devote his time and his talents to advising me on the many complex problems which arise in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, most recently, in the Special Committee on Aging, of which I have the privilege of being a member. It is a new committee with a new responsibility.

I am deeply grateful for the friendship and talent of Bill Reidy. I express appreciation of literally thousands of people in the State of New Jersey, whose representatives have come to us with their complex problems in connection with the Hill-Burton program and other programs. Bill Reidy was always immediately available to help them with their problems. He has been associated with many of the programs, and has contributed to their success.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is with mixed feelings that we react to the news of the retirement of William G. Reidy, staff director of the Special Senate Committee on Aging.

We are, of course, gratified that Bill will now be free to devote a larger portion of his time to richly deserved leisure. We regret, however, that his valuable abilities will no longer be available to Members of this body.

It has been my privilege to know, and work cooperatively with Bill Reidy while a member of the Special Committee on Aging, sharing his counsels and seeking to frame legislation which would genuinely benefit the more senior segment of our population. Mr. Reidy has proven himself a conscientious gentleman; one who is knowledgeable in many legislative fields, and dedicated to the public interest.

It is a pleasure to join with other Senators in commending Bill for his steadfast and effective service to the Senate, and to the citizens of the United States.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it is with mixed emotions that I join in this tribute to William Reidy on his retirement from Federal service.

For his long years of service to the Government, including more than 15 with the Senate, Bill has earned this retirement.

However, after some years closely associated with Bill in the work of the Senate, and as a beneficiary of his advice and counsel, I certainly will miss him.

Of course, so far as Bill is concerned, retirement is only a formal word. I know there are many areas where he intends to put his talents to work; and some of them, I am sure, will keep him within shouting distance of his friends in the Senate.

I first knew Bill as a professional staff member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. During that period, his advice and interest were most helpful in the creation of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging.

Later, it was my pleasure to appoint Bill Reidy as staff director of the subcommittee's successor, the Senate Special Committee on Aging.

Mr. President, indicative of the esteem in which Bill is held is a letter I have received from Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON. In the letter, the Vice President states, in part:

> I just want Bill to know that we will all miss him and wish him well, and that taking a man out of the Senate is something like taking a boy out of the country—you can take the boy out of the country, but you can't take the country out of the boy.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I know we shall not be losing contact with Bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Vice President's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C. September 25, 1963.

Hon. PAT MCNAMARA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCNAMARA: I have just heard that after all these years Bill Reidy is getting set to leave the Senate. Personally, I think this is just about as big a break with the "homeland" as took place when his ancestors left Ireland. But since he seems determined to strike out for greener pastures I guess we must accept his decision with regret.

I just want Bill to know that we will all miss him and wish him well, and that taking a man out of the Senate is something like taking a boy out of the country—you can take the boy out of the country but you can't take the country out of the boy.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO FOR CIVIL RIGHTS STAND

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Toledo Blade of September 8, 1963, entitled "Said With 'Vigah'" which makes laudatory comment about the efforts of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

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

SAID WITH "VIGAH"

Sounding a robust warning to any faint-hearted colleagues in the Senate who would just as soon skip the ordeal of fighting a possible southern filibuster against civil rights, Senator STEPHEN YOUNG calls for 24-hour sessions if necessary. Round-the-clock

meetings are used—but rarely—to wear down filibustering Senators by keeping them talking day and night.

The trouble is this requires the antifilibuster forces to remain on duty likewise, even if it means sleeping on cots in cloakrooms to answer quorum calls. And some Senators have questioned the tactic because it might be an exhausting burden on their colleagues up in years. To which Senator YOUNG replies:

"The magnitude of the problem does not justify this excuse for abandoning the fight for meaningful civil rights legislation. We who favor the President's proposal will protect any colleagues who, for various reasons, cannot suffer the hardships that will be involved in breaking a possible filibuster."

Does that sound like a 74-year-old Senator, weary of office, short of stamina, and long on tired blood?

Nope. It sounds suspiciously like and indefatigable incumbent who wants to make it very plain that he's got the moxie needed to become what is generally called a vigorous candidate for reelection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio points out the magnitude of the problem of having civil rights legislation passed by the Congress and the importance of the Senate at least measuring up to the challenge by going into long sessions and remaining at its job until the task is complete.

STATE OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three articles and an editorial dealing with the difficulties we in the Congress in general, and in the Senate in particular, are experiencing in transacting the public business expeditiously and in the public interest, may be printed in full in the RECORD. They are: "Action or Reform," by Roscoe Drummond; "Can Senate Shake Lethargy?" by Charles Bartlett; "State of the Congress," an editorial published in the Washington Post; and "Legislative Peril—World's Parliamentarians Worried", by Roscoe Drummond.

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

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 3, 1963]

ACTION OR REFORM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

This summer and fall will be a good time for the American people—and the Congressmen themselves—to watch and decide whether Congress can go on much longer with its present archaic machinery.

Every student of government who looks upon the functioning of Congress with any detachment is convinced that its machinery must be modernized if it is to recover its eroded authority and have any chance of transacting the public business efficiently and responsibly.

What we are going to learn this summer and fall is not only whether Congress can transact the public business at all.

During the many years I have been in Washington there has always been urgent business before the Congress. At this session there is transcendently urgent business before the Congress. There is the problem of rising racial tension, unrelieved unemployment despite substantial prosperity, a sluggish economy, the matter of tax reduction, and the overhanging threat of a rail strike.

Legislation dealing with all of these matters will be before Congress. The issues are being clearly drawn. The President has done his part by decisively committing his leadership, by alerting the Nation to the problems, and by offering Congress concrete proposals for action.

The initiative is now wholly with Congress. The responsibility for action—or inaction—is with Congress, plus responsibility for the consequences. Congress has the ball.

After 6 months of frittering, no wonder everybody is uncertain about what is going to be done—if anything. From January to July Congress has accomplished little that is visible to the naked eye and nothing significant. And now Washington is filled with talk that Congress can hardly be expected to do two big things the same year—that is, deal with civil rights legislation and tax reduction over a 12-month span. The talk is that if Congress can handle one major problem a year, like civil rights, that would be transacting the public business pretty well.

It wouldn't. It would be a sorry record and one that Congressmen who want to see Congress recover its initiative, authority and prestige cannot and should not condone as an acceptable standard of government.

The truth is that Congress has been continuously losing power to the President for more than a quarter century. We no longer have a system of three coordinate branches—legislative, executive, and judicial. Through its own fault and inefficiency Congress is no longer coequal with the executive and the judiciary. It can retrieve its position only by modernizing its methods of discharging its responsibilities. It has lost control of the budget. It is not an adequate monitor of the administration. It is so burdened with trivia that it is rarely able to give priority to crucial legislation. At most points it is so understaffed with its own experts that, more often than not, it cannot give independent study to Presidential proposals.

How responsibly Congress conducts itself from now to adjournment—what it does and what it fails to do—will disclose the congressional reforms most needed.

Congress now has the ball. What the country is anxiously waiting to see is whether Congress is going to sit on it, throw it into the stands—or run with it.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 4, 1963]

CAN SENATE SHAKE LETHARGY?

(By Charles Bartlett)

The burning legislative question is whether a thoroughly bogged and bored Senate can rise now to the challenge of an awesome agenda at a time when its Members would normally be thinking of home.

Like blobs of whipped cream upon a limp banana split, the nuclear test ban, the civil rights proposal, and imminently, the tax bill, are piling upon a Senate that has shown little taste for even its routine functions.

The situation is unprecedented and unpredictable. No one claims an ability to foretell whether the Senate will react by exploding into a whirl of decisive activity or by continuing to sulk in its impassive tent. A probability of the latter course is indicated by an examination of the factors that are currently at work.

The most important of these is the Senators' awareness of the deep public apathy toward the many things they have left undone. Sensitive above all to the thinking of their voters, they are conscious that the people have not been aroused by the tax bill or any item on the legislative agenda and that many would be pleased if they simply adjourned without further fuss.

DELAY AIDS STRATEGY

Southerners control 10 of the Senate's 16 standing committees and they know that a tactic of delay on every front will strengthen their strategy of obstruction on the civil rights legislation. A filibuster will have its greatest effect if the agenda is already clogged and the leadership is desperate to obtain action on other matters.

This strategy is ardently supported by the Republican leadership, which is prepared to go to the voters next year on a record of blocking administration proposals. The minority band of liberal Republican Senators is ignored as it argues that the party cannot succeed at the polls without constructive positions on major issues. This is an alien philosophy to Republican Senators who have made careers out of riding negative sentiments among their constituents and find the ride at the moment extremely comfortable.

One tendency is to blame the impasse upon the majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, who has brought to the post neither the flourish of LYNDON JOHNSON nor the taut discipline of Robert Taft. Senator MANSFIELD's strength as leader rests heavily upon the fineness of his character and the Senators take advantage of his gentleness instead of responding to his problems. He does not, as Senators JOHNSON and Taft did, run the scheduling of the Senate with an iron hand and the Members incline increasingly to operate in their own orbits.

FEELS NO PRESSURE

But the Senate will never respond to an iron hand unless it feels the pressure of urgency and this pressure does not exist. "You can't flog Congress in times like this," says one veteran of the legislative mill. "It's like hitting a sack of potatoes."

The issues raised by President Kennedy this year have failed to evoke this urgency. The momentum of the tax bill has been lost in the popular doubt that it is proper to cut taxes when the Government is running a deficit. Other programs have been stalled by a cautious consensus against new Government spending. The cutting edge of the Negro ferment is dulled by the powerful southern opposition.

Criticism of the President is centered on the point that the impact of his proposals has been badly diluted by their number and that the emphasis of his support has been spread too thin among too many measures. It is argued that Congress, along with the public has been unable to digest the flow of White House proposals or discern their priorities and that the President's leadership has suffered as a consequence.

TOTAL OF 403 REQUESTS

Studies by the Congressional Quarterly show that the President has made 403 legislative requests during the year, more than the 355 in 1961, and 298 of 1962. By comparison, Dwight Eisenhower asked for 44 pieces of legislation in 1953, 207 in 1954; and 232 in 1955.

Only 19 of these requests have been given final approval.

The sense of glut has been compounded by the necessity of placing the complexities of the test ban, civil rights proposals, and the railway legislation before Congress late in the session. The original intention of the White House to concentrate upon the tax bill has been obscured by the diversion of interest to these new issues and by the snail's pace of the House Ways and Means Committee.

When confronted by a pile of work in August and the prospect of delayed adjournment, the Senate usually becomes irritable and unpleasant. But the backlog is now so great and the prospects of adjournment so remote that most of the Senators have settled into a routine of long weekends and short working days. They are conscious of looking absurd as a group but they expect to survive as individuals.

NEWS FOCUS NOTES

There have been no formal discussions between Moscow and Washington on a visit by President Kennedy to the Soviet Union, but Premier Khrushchev is reported to have

indicated in private correspondence that he would like the President to repay his 1959 visit here at an appropriate time.

The President is reported to be proceeding with plans to visit Japan, Australia, and Indonesia in early October but there is no indication that a Russian visit will be tied into this trip.

Democratic fears on the President's political future in the South have been brightened by the findings of polls in Texas which show Mr. Kennedy to be considerably higher in public esteem than any of the prospective Republican contenders.

An interesting finding of these polls was that Gov. George Romney received a slightly better response than Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, who had been assumed to be strong in Texas.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 25, 1963]

STATE OF THE CONGRESS

Congress is coming in for a new round of criticism as it enters the showdown stage of the present session. For nearly 9 months it has dawdled along with an astonishing lack of systematic effort or sense of purpose. Now it is confronted by hopelessly congested calendars, overworked individuals, and possibly frustrated national objectives.

Senator SCOTT and others are worried by the probability that some Members of Congress may not survive the turmoil of the session-end squeeze. His concern has ample justification. Yet the greater damage is likely to fall in the realm of congressional prestige. Senator JAVITS has pointed out that in the eyes of the people Congress "seems to be listless, halting, haphazard, and half-hearted in its efforts." Consequently, he feels, along with many of his colleagues, that "Congress is in the gravest danger of suffering tremendously in its reputation with the country."

The Congressional Quarterly's boxscore on 26 major bills before the 88th Congress shows final action taken on only 6. These include such routine bills as the corporate and excise tax extension, the debt limit, extension of the draft, and the feed-grains program. Congress did show that it could act in an emergency by promptly passing the railway settlement bill. But that good work stands out in embarrassing contrast to the sluggish motion elsewhere.

Anxiety hangs heaviest over the two biggest bills of the session—the tax-cut and omnibus civil rights bills—now that the test ban treaty has been approved by the Senate. Although the House is scheduled to vote on the tax bill on Wednesday, the Senate has taken no action, and the danger that the tax bill will become entangled in a civil rights filibuster mounts with each day of delay. The civil rights bill itself is still in the House Judiciary Committee.

Less concern over the fate of these measures would be felt if Congress had cleared its legislative channels of the glut of lesser bills. But nearly 3 months after the beginning of the fiscal year, only two appropriations bills—Interior and Treasury-Post Office—have been enacted. Eleven more appropriations bills and a vast number of legislative measures await completion aside from the big bills on which public attention is centered. On three bills which the administration deems to be of major importance, medical care for the aged, unemployment benefits, and the creation of an Urban Affairs Department, no action whatever has been taken.

It is impossible to conclude from this record that Congress is doing well. Many of its own Members have called it variously the "stand-still Congress," the "do-nothing Congress," the "limping Congress," and so forth. It is not a question of whether Congress may ultimately muddle through to a defensible legislative record. What is most disturbing is the failure of Congress to use tested and reliable methods of handling its business with efficiency and dispatch.

The most tangible hope for improvement to come out of the present session is the Senate Rules Committee's approval of a Senate-House committee that would take up the congressional reform trail where the La Follette-Monroney committee left off nearly two decades ago. The Senate committee also approved rules changes that would require Senators to stick to the subject under debate for at least 3 hours a day (why only 3 hours?), permit longer committee sessions and authorize former Presidents to address the Senate.

Even the study resolution sponsored by Senators CLARK and CASE was unfortunately watered down, however, and its chance for survival in the House is considered slender. The country has cause to be alarmed over the plight into which Congress has fallen. Senator CASE was right in saying the other day that it has 'become so ensnarled in its own archaic and complex procedures that the executive and judicial branches of Government have had to take over the primary responsibility for the conduct of the Nation's business."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1963]

LEGISLATIVE PERIL—WORLD'S PARLIAMENTARIANS WORRIED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

BELGRADE.—The world's parliamentarians are becoming alarmed about the state of their parliaments.

They find parliamentary democracy dangerously weakened in many parts of the world and most of the American delegates say that goes for the Congress of the United States.

This is one of the dominant themes of the 52d Conference of the Interparliamentary Union to which elected lawmakers from 59 nations are gathered here at Belgrade.

The consensus is that many Western parliaments are losing power and prestige, partly because of their own faults, that the newly independent countries are finding that independence does not bring democracy, and that the Communist parliaments are simply facades, pliant tools of the government.

The speaker who offered the most constructive measures which elected parliaments could take to restore their vigor and strength was the chairman of the U.S. delegation, Representative KATHERINE ST. GEORGE, Republican, of New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE put forward a series of proposals for strengthening parlimentary democracy, a number of which were as applicable to the Congress of the United States as to other parliaments. She advocated that parliamentary government could be improved:

By having the national government assume campaign costs. "The rising cost of running for public office," she explained, "exposes politicians to pressures from affluent groups with special interests. Responsibility for financing political campaigns should be shifted to the public at large."

By preventing the executive from monopolizing the means of mass communication, parliaments, as well as executives, should have fuller use of radio and television.

By expanding and making equally available to all members of the legislature's professional research staff.

By strengthening the power of the national legislature to supervise and control the activities of the government. "The chief modern task of parliament," Mrs. ST. GEORGE said, "was the exercise of delegated power."

By reducing the extraneous workload on parliament, failure to do which, as in Washington, dangerously retards the legislative process.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE's plea to the Communists was that the composition of all parliaments be made "truly representative of the people," and she called for "eternal vigilance to prevent military dictators from seizing power and dissolving parliament or converting it into a puppet regime."

SALE OF WHEAT TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, many editorials have been written supporting the sale of wheat to Russia, and many columns have also been written on the subject. Practically all of them that I have read have been favorable.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Why Not Sell Wheat to Reds?" written by Richard Wilson and published in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, September 25, be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

WHY NOT SELL WHEAT TO REDS?—PAST OBJECTIONS VIEWED AS REMOVED BY RUSSIAN WILLINGNESS TO PAY CASH

One thing that neither the Russians nor the Chinese can shoot at us is wheat. We can grow wheat until it runs out of Khrushchev's ears.

What is wrong, then, with selling wheat to Russia and Red China, even if some of it goes to Cuba?

The wrong that would be committed, it is claimed, is that supplying the people of Russia, its satellites and Red China with foodstuffs would help maintain Communist regimes we are otherwise opposing with the dedication of all our lives and fortunes. Why feed your enemies?

This seems to many thoughtful and patriotic people to be a faulty argument. By one device or another the Communist regimes are able to get foodstuffs in sufficient quantity to offset partially their own shortfalls in production. These supplies have proved sufficient to tide Russia and China over some bad periods.

The Communist government in Russia has lived through famines that probably have cost millions of lives without losing political control of the Russian people. The Chinese Communists have survived famines, the most recent a severe ordeal last year.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, poses a pertinent question: "How does a Senator from North Dakota feel when the farmers of his State are told to plant less wheat, while across the border in Canada, farmers are told to plant as much as they can?"

Canada has made a huge wheat deal with Russia—$500 million worth of wheat for cash. Russia wouldn't buy unless a prior commitment was made that some of the wheat would go to Cuba. History long since should have taught the lesson that communism cannot survive on wheat alone, nor fall because of the lack of it.

In the past there have been logical reasons for not selling wheat to Russia. She was not prepared to pay for it on a basis favorable to the U.S. balance of trade. But conditions are different today. Time and again Premier Khrushchev told Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman on his recent trip to Russia: "We can buy. We've got the money." Khrushchev was speaking not merely of wheat. He wanted whole fertilizer plants and other equipment of a nonmilitary nature. "If we can't get it from you, we'll get it somewhere else," Khrushchev said. "We've got plenty of rockets," he added. "We want to build up our agriculture."

That Khrushchev was talking about paying in cash—in gold or its equivalent in American dollar credits—is clearly illustrated by his deal with Canada. And, in these terms, trade with Russia begins to make sense, each deal taken separately and examined for its credits and debits in terms of the national interest.

Selling foodstuffs to Russia can be handled by private trading under Government license. Private traders have tried to sell both butter and grains to the Soviet Union in the past, but arrangements could not be worked out. Russia's trade arrangements are tricky. Congress is always on the alert and Government officials are timid in their interpretation of the rules and regulations on granting export licenses.

The truth is that there is probably no great future in trade with Russia. She does not have much she can supply us to create the dollar credits to buy here—unless, as now seems evident, she is willing to pay in cash.

Nor does it make much sense to supply the Soviet Union with samples of superior American machinery which she can copy in her own version. This is being made clear to Khrushchev.

The Russians like bilateral trade. Three- and four-way multilateral deals that make possible the exchange of goods between many countries aren't part of the Russian way.

But it may be possible to sell part of America's great supply of surplus foodstuffs to the Communist world, and Canada has shown us the way. This is an initiative which shouldn't be lost out of fear of building up our competitors. In fact, it might not be a bad idea if Russia and China were in the end to find themselves dependent in an important degree on the vastly superior agricultural genius of the United States, being unable, as they are, to organize their own agriculture satisfactorily under communism.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think this is a decision the President of the United States will have to make, and the sooner he makes it, the better. I can see much greater advantage in selling wheat to Russia than in withholding it, especially when she is willing to pay us in gold or convertible currency. We have a great surplus of wheat which we cannot use, and we can use dollars to better advantage than we can our surplus. So long as our allies are going to sell wheat to Russia, why not the United States?

SS "AMERICA" PREVENTED FROM SAILING

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, twice in the last month the ship SS *America*, which travels across the Atlantic carrying passengers, has been laid up by the intervention of a union. The first occasion when this ship was stopped from leaving its port was September 14. On board the ship were 956 passengers. They spent the night aboard, waiting for the ship to sail, but the ship lay there, immobilized, because the members of the union refused to work.

Within the last 2 days this same ship again was barred from making a trip.

Thus, in a period of 3 weeks, twice was this liner, sailing under the American flag, prevented from leaving its dock. The owner of the ship, United States Lines, has no dispute with the unions, but there is a fight between two unions, the National Maritime Union, led by Joseph Curran, and the Seafarers International Union, led by Paul Hall. The dispute has evolved out of the presence of one man on the ship who is supposed to be a segregationist. The cause for the stoppage was assigned to the presence of this one man. But the basic fact is that there is a fight between these two labor unions, and with this dispute in progress, the ship has been kept from moving in its regular travels.

My question is, How long shall the American public and the innocent owner of the ship be subjected to the abuses of these two labor unions who have a dispute between themselves, who are unmindful of the rights of the passengers and of the rights of the American public, and are bringing to the owners of the ship economic destruction?

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 2 more minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My colleagues may be interested in knowing that the ship the SS *America* was built 22 years ago. The Federal Government subsidized its building by putting up $5,861,000.

Each year the taxpayers of the United States subsidize the operation of the ship in the sum of $4 million. Under the law, the taxpayers of the United States pay the difference in wages that the company has to pay for American labor and what it would have to pay if it hired foreign labor.

I repeat—$5,861,000 in subsidy was paid in the building of the ship; $4 million a year subsidy is paid for paying members of the union who twice stopped the ship from sailing in the last month.

Why this inordinate power in these unions? The U.S. Government could not stop that ship from sailing. Two combating unions are able to do so.

These labor leaders will come to the Commerce Committee one of these days, and the labor unions will be there, asking for increased privileges. This deed of theirs should not be forgotten. What they are doing should be ended, and it should be ended soon, if the American Government is to be supreme and organizations are to be subjects of the Government, amenable to its laws, and, over and above everything else, answerable to the dictations of sound morality.

To those labor leaders, rights of others mean nothing. The rights of others are subordinate to their desires. I cannot subscribe to such conduct and would feel delinquent in my duties if I did not raise my voice in protest. Tomorrow I will introduce a bill making unlawful a strike caused by a dispute between two or more unions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Wasteful and Senseless," published in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of September 28.

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

WASTEFUL AND SENSELESS

The capriciousness of the maritime unions and the stranglehold they exert on this Nation's merchant marine are sharply shown in the case of the liner *America*. For the second time this month the U.S. Lines has had to cancel a scheduled sailing because the *America* was the victim of interunion strife.

On September 15, minutes before the liner was to sail for Europe, the National Maritime Union crewmembers walked off because the company would not summarily remove an engineer whom they accused of racial discrimination. Losses of $650,000 in passenger revenue and $350,000 in crew wages resulted and 1,895 passengers were stranded.

On September 25, the arbitrator for the NMU and the company ordered, after a hearing, that the unlicensed crew, represented by NMU, sail. The engineer was to be transferred to a freighter and promoted to chief engineer. The Marine Engineers Beneficial Association at once intervened and assailed company capitulation to the NMU.

Such reckless use of union power, such irresponsible union feuds with their senseless and costly results, will do more to bring collective bargaining into disrepute than anything the enemies of labor can do.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized to debate the pending bill. I understand that the morning hour has not been concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have another item of morning business.

A TALK WITH VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I noticed in the issue of Parade magazine for September 29, 1963, an excellent article, in the form of questions and answers, entitled, "A Talk With Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON: The Latest Word."

This particular article deals with important legislation before the Congress relating to our scientific achievements and research in the field of outer space. The distinguished Vice President has been a leader in promoting U.S. Government activities in the field of space research; and I believe that the editor's note on this article fully states the degree to which the Vice President has devoted his time and attention to this work. The editor's note reads:

Five years ago this week the United States entered the space race. Father of the legislation was Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON who today, as Vice President, heads the National Aeronautics and Space Council. In an exclusive interview with Parade's Fred Blumenthal, the Vice President answers some tough questions about the space program—where we stand today, and what space means to your future.

I ask unanimous consent that the article relating to Vice President JOHNSON be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A TALK WITH VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON—THE LATEST WORD

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—5 years ago this week the United States entered the space race. Father of the legislation was Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON who today, as Vice President, heads the National Aeronautics and Space Council. In an exclusive interview with Parade's Fred Blumenthal, the Vice President answers some

tough questions about the space program—Where we stand today? and, What space means to your future?)

Question. Mr. Vice President, with all our needs on earth, can we afford to spend $20 billion to go to the moon?

Answer. We can't afford not to spend it. Only the United States and the U.S.S.R. have the resources for extensive space exploration. If we are to lead the free world and insure our own security, we must be first in space. This does not mean that we must neglect other urgent needs. We have ample resources to explore space and do the other things, as well.

Question. But why go to the moon? Wouldn't it be wiser and less expensive to concentrate on near-earth space?

Answer. Most of the cost of the moon program involves development of big rockets and massive ground facilities to build, test, and launch them.

Putting a man on the moon is the focal point of an effort to insure that the United States becomes preeminent in all aspects of space science and technology. It is a challenging and dramatic objective, but most of the activity leading to it—in both the Gemini and Apollo programs—will be conducted in near-earth space. From the moon program comes essential and much needed scientific knowledge which America must have. Should we have it as soon as we can get it, or sit by while others pass us by?

Question. What about military requirements? Is there any danger that they are being neglected?

Answer. We have a substantial military space program and most of what NASA is doing can form the basis for military applications, if they are required. For example, the ability to inspect or intercept a potentially hostile satellite requires the ability to maneuver and rendezvous in space—something we will learn in these programs.

It is important to remember that our country has too often neglected new scientific and technical opportunities. The Wright brothers flew the first airplane at Kitty Hawk, but when World War I began, the French had 1,400 airplanes; the Germans 1,000; and the U.S. Army only 23. Dr. Robert Goddard flew the first liquid-fueled rocket in the United States in 1926, but it was the Germans who used his ideas to drop the V-2's on London.

Question. Former President Eisenhower and others have suggested that we are trying to go too fast. Could we save money if we slowed the pace?

Answer. In these long-range endeavors, Fred, there is an optimum pace. To speed it up or slow it down increases costs. I think we are now moving at the optimum pace.

More important, however, we are in an international competition in which our freedom is at stake. We don't know the strength or intentions of the Russians, so we can't ask how little we can do and win, but how much we can do to make sure to win.

Question. If space leadership is so vital, how well are we doing to achieve it? Haven't we had a lot of failures?

Answer. Certainly we have had failures, but the Russians had them last year on many space shots, including attempts to reach the Moon, Venus and Mars. Look at our own record. In 1958, only 5 of our 13 launches were successful. As of today, our ratio of successes to failures is better than 6 to 1—and we've been to Venus.

With a sustained effort we will get to the Moon—and before the decade is out.

Question. The British radio astronomer, Sir Bernard Lovell, hinted after a recent trip to Russia that the Soviets might be interested in a joint program to go to the Moon. What is your reaction to this?

Answer. We already have arrangements to cooperate with the Soviet Union in some space activities and will always be willing to explore ways to extend this cooperation. We must be very careful, however to make sure that any overtures made regarding further cooperation do not cause us to lower our guard. I am unaware of any Soviet proposal of a joint venture on a substantial scale.

Question. What do you think the Russians had in mind recently when they orbited two cosmonauts at once?

Answer. Many have assumed that they were trying to join two spacecraft in orbit. With their big rockets, they may well do this before we do. More likely, they were testing their ability to precisely time and guide the launching of a spacecraft to intercept and inspect another one already in orbit. This would enable them to inspect some of ours.

Question. What of the future? How will our space effort benefit our citizens who are paying the bills?

Answer. Inevitably, as with other major research programs, the scientific and technical knowledge gained will benefit everyone. Our space efforts are teaching us to manage the large research and development efforts of the future. They are broadening the base of university research and graduate education throughout the Nation. There will also be many direct benefits, particularly in weather forecasting and communications.

Question. At the end of 5 years in space, how do you view the progress we have made?

Answer. I think it has been remarkable, especially considering our late start. All the major items needed to go to the moon are already under development. We have had four successful tests of the first stage Saturn I rocket. We have had great success with our communications and weather satellites. The Mariner II flight to Venus and the guidance correction on Syncom II were probably the two most spectacular engineering achievements in space to date.

I think we are ahead of the Russians in our scientific program, and well on our way to overtaking them in manned flight, as well.

Question. One final question, Mr. Vice President. What is our ultimate destiny in space?

I don't know, nor does anyone else. Columbus didn't find what he was looking for, but I think we're all pretty glad that he took that voyage. Einstein, when he produced the formula $E=MC^2$, didn't know that it would change the course of history.

I am sure of one thing—the benefits which will flow from our venture into space will be beyond anything any of us could imagine.

Until now, in space, no shot has been fired in anger. Thank God. My hope is that, in the years ahead, the conquest of space will encourage peaceful cooperation among nations and become a substitute for war.

In the hostile environment of space there are challenges all mankind must share. We—all nations, that is—should go out there together, hand in hand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope, as my colleagues read this article, that they will also be fully aware of the importance of our continued activities in the vital area of space research, and that, despite any talk of pooling our resources with the Soviet Union in the area of the so-called lunar probe or moon shot, we will not retreat from our position of leadership in space research and peaceful exploitation of outer space exploration. This means that we must have the money and the space and research facilities to accomplish the task.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Many Members of the Senate have asked me about the legislative program. Am I correct in my expectation that the plan for today is to vote on the extension of the Civil Rights Commission?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the plan.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And, after disposition of that measure, will the Senate take up two bills relating to fisheries?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. The two bills are on the desks of Senators. One deals with fishing vessel construction and the other with fishing in U.S. territorial waters. They are Calendar No. 457, S. 1006, and Calendar No. 479, S. 1988. Action on those bills is scheduled for today, following action on the extension of the Civil Rights Commission.

IS CONSERVATISM DYNAMIC?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech entitled "Is Conservatism Dynamic," delivered by Mr. Gerald J. Skibbins, of Opinion Research Corporation, before the Conservative Club of Montclair, New Jersey, on August 24, 1963.

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

IS CONSERVATISM DYNAMIC?

(An address to the Conservative Club of Montclair, Montclair, N.J., August 24, 1963, by Gerald J. Skibbins, research executive, Opinion Research Corp., Research Park, Princeton, N.J.)

The conservative movement in America is bristling with controversy, political fireworks, new ideas, splinter groups of all kinds, and a crying need for definition of its basic characteristics, roots, ideology, and purpose. In speaking before the Central New Jersey Conference of Conservatives last fall, I attempted to define the 10 marks of the conservative.[1]

In this paper, I plan to outline the 10 marks briefly, then move on to current public controversy in the following areas: the far right reactionaries, liberals and conservatives, conservative desire for war, conservatives and foreign aid, will conservatives compress the Federal Government?, a strange shift in public opinion.

These 10 marks of conservative political thought in America are:

1. SELF RESPONSIBILITY

The conservative believes that each individual citizen possesses the total responsibility for his life, his obligations, and the consequences of his actions and beliefs.

2. A BELIEF IN THE MORALITY OF PROFITABLE ENTERPRISE

In the long run, earned profits are the surest sign of responsible behavior by all who make up a legitimate enterprise in a free society. Any person can demonstrate the morality of profits to himself by working hard for a year and achieving the goal of having money left over in his savings, after all his expenses and obligations have been satisfied.

3. VOLUNTARISM

Conservatives believe that if individual rights and the choosing of goals are kept in the people's hands, this Nation has its best guarantee of progress, peace, economic growth, and justice for the individual citizen.

[1] Printed in the Nov. 15, 1962, issue of Vital Speeches.

4. EQUALITY UNDER LAW

Conservative thought demands a legal and political structure which insures free competition, redress for injury, fair trial, equal rights of participation, and the right of a citizen to protect his home and his property. We do not believe in any kind of second-class citizenship, nor in restricting people in any way for reasons of race, color or hereditary characteristics.

5. RESPONSIBILITY FOR SOCIETY

Conservatives are keenly aware of their responsibilities to family, community, State and society, and they discharge them. They pay the bills for our society, keep the machinery of civilization in operation, create new growth, build career opportunities for others, and help those who need help. You will find them managing most effective businesses, charities and constructive associations to advance society.

6. A BELIEF THAT RIGHTS ARE WEDDED TO RESPONSIBILITIES

With the maxim that you can't get something worthwhile for nothing, conservatives affirm that individual freedom, the greatest human right of all, is tied to its twin—our revolutionary responsibility to extend and preserve freedom within and outside our borders.

7. A BELIEF IN THE DISPERSION OF POWER

Our belief in the checks and balances of our republic impel us to regard any concentration of governmental, economic, or social power as dangerous to the society. For this reason, conservatives would cut down any monolithic, arbitrary power over the whole of society whether it resides in the Government, the State, the church, in a company, a union, or association.

8. A BELIEF THAT LIFE ON EARTH CAN BE IMPROVED

A modern conservative recognizes and welcomes change. He wants to get on with the job of figuring out how to deal intelligently with today and tomorrow. He believes in the perfectibility of human society and works for it in a practical way.

9. INSISTENCE ON BALANCING THE BOOKS

In a free society, conservatives believe that individuals, cities, States, the Federal Government, and every kind of industrial and commercial enterprise cannot survive unless they balance their books realistically. Responsible individuals and organizations pay their debts, live within their incomes and provide reserves for their future needs. Irresponsible people court bankruptcy by "betting on the come," or incurring obligations for future generations to pay off. In the last 30 years, our largely liberal Governments have demonstrated this liberal belief that the piper never has to be paid. This cannot work.

10. THE IDEA THAT ACTIONS REFLECT BASIC RELIEFS

If men, organizations, or States oppress or exploit human beings, refuse to behave with honor and integrity, repudiate their debts and commit crimes against their fellows they cannot be treated as equals to those who maintain the constructive values of human civilization. Their actions bespeak their degeneracy. Conservatives would seek to establish social instruments that enable society to deal with spoilers for what they are—the living representatives of the lowest and most destructive human impulses.

These, then, are the 10 marks of the conservative.

I would like to move on in this analysis of conservatism because I feel that many exciting and significant areas remain to be explored. Perhaps the best way to do this would be to take up a number of the expressed fears about the conservative movement and explore their validity. Let us look first at the millstone hanging from the conservative's neck.

THE FAR RIGHT REACTIONARIES

Many Americans squirm when they hear the label "conservative" because they think of pre-World War II isolationism, John Birch Society members, America Firsters, segregationists, Ku Klux Klansmen, and many other little groups who feel that freedom means an extra-legal hunting or hating license rather than a responsible privilege held under law. Let us look honestly at the so-called radical right. First, it is not radical at all. Most of its elements either believe in the ancient rule of force outside the law, or else they merely reflect an ignorant unawareness of their world.

As our society grows more complex and changes before our eyes each day, many citizens—especially those who cannot easily change with the times, or who possess little breadth of human understanding—lose their living courage and succumb to fear. Fear always seeks a scapegoat, and rather than see themselves in the mirror for what they are, these people exonerate themselves by finding something or someone to hate. In the past, this element of fear in our American society has burned witches in Puritan times, held African natives in contempt as slaves and sold them as farm animals, shot American Presidents, hated all foreigners, attacked Wall Street barons in the 1930's, screamed Communist at those who sought new ideas; and today it hates the U.N., big business, the Federal Government, and all taxes. These attacks are actually psychotic projections of people who fear that their world is slipping away forever.

This understandable but unforgivable human error is called reactionaryism and it exists on the far right just as much as it does on the far left.

On the far right, you find people striving to turn back the clock of history, rejecting change and new ideas without thinking about whether they might be constructive improvements in society.

On the far left, you find others rejecting all solutions that do not involve the growth of government—especially the Federal Government—without thinking about whether voluntary or private solutions might be more practical in the long run.

The common denominator phrase that describes the actions of these extremist groups, right or left, is "without thinking." Fear unseats their wisdom and installs hate, distrust, and malice in their hearts. From that point on they think no more, but spew out venom whenever affairs of the day are mentioned. The far right and left are each notable for their inconsiderate and opinionated attacks as well as their basic lack of love for their fellow man.

In contrast, most Americans of conservative political belief are constructively responsible and warmhearted citizens of honor and integrity. They do not deserve to be labeled by the existence of a few noisy reactionaries on the right any more than liberals deserve to be labeled detrimentally by the few wild-eyed Socialists and Communists on the left. This brings us to consider the common ground that might exist between liberals and conservatives.

As we penetrate to essentials of conservative and liberal thought, we find the two camps drawing closer together. This is really not very surprising. After all, we are human beings first, political beings secondarily. Two sincere, thoughtful Americans of largely opposite political persuasion have far more in common than they have in disagreement. This fact may be one of the hidden success secrets of America's political stability.

Aren't we all getting thoroughly sick of the postures of politicos, the bunco of groupthink behavior and the name calling that seeks to label the ins and the outs? In the history of this country, many liberals have contributed greatly to our society. Others will in the future, I am sure.

The true liberal sees the conservative as a necessary component of a healthy American society. He really does not want to exterminate you and I suggest we return the favor. For example, Norman Cousins, the liberal editor of the Saturday Review wrote an editorial entitled "In Defense of the Genuine Conservative," in which he said:

"The term conservative has a specific background and meaning. It stands for stability as opposed to innovation; for restraint as opposed to daring; for the preservation of inherited conditions as opposed to drastic reform. These ideas are not only compatible with a free society; they have an essential place in it, along with genuine liberalism. True conservatism is opposed to liberalism, but not destructive of it. The principle difference between conservatism and liberalism is represented not so much by disagreement over the nature of a free society or its goals as by disagreement over the approaches. Both conservatism and liberalism serve as the twin structural supports of constitutional government."

Mr. Cousins' definition of conservative thought does not quite cover what I see as dynamic, creative, and constructive in the conservative idea. He makes us sound a little stiffish about change or innovation—which he arrogates to the liberal a bit too much. He does not perceive that conservatives are far better managers than liberals; however, his definition is not unkind and it has strong merit in its comprehension of these confluent sources of American greatness.

Having spoken of Mr. Cousins, it is natural to look at an issue which obsesses him—the danger of destroying human civilization by atomic war. Some people have intense fears that conservatives want to go to war.

If we wanted to be snide, we might suggest that the political party which is most closely identified with liberal thinking, led this Nation into two of the worst world wars in history, mismanaged the heart-breaking Korean incident and dropped the first atomic bombs ever used on defenseless citizens. However, this would be too pat and too simple a way to look at the issue. When some Americans think of conservative leadership in connection with American foreign policy, they fear that we are eager to blast Cuba, swap rockets with Russia and invade the Chinese mainland. Again, this is too pat and too simple minded to be true. A conservative foreign policy for this Nation would find more economic means to maintain our strength, would firmly advance the cause of human freedom everywhere in an ideological offensive, would not foolishly grant governments our trust and aid, and would have long since protected the Cuban people from their Batistas and their Castros when such a defense was easy to accomplish. The dunderheaded, myopic incompetence with which our liberal statesman have managed our policy with China, at Yalta, or in the Bay of Pigs, and in many other parts of the world, reveals a basic and inherent inability among liberals. They seem unable to handle the commonsense problems of leadership, and vacillate too much to form a wise, constructive foreign policy. Perhaps liberals are more effective as the loyal opposition than as managers of a government. We can do better by a wide margin. Another fear is that conservatives would destroy foreign aid.

New nations are emerging all over the world. In old nations as well as new, the hand is out and Uncle Sam is generous to a fault. I believe in the Constitution and in its limitations on the activities of the Federal Government.

Nowhere in the Constitution do I find the right of Congress to give the $100 billion

we have passed out to other nations. Congressman EUGENE SILER, of Kentucky, has offered $1,000 in cash to anyone in our executive branch or in the Congress who can point out to him the section of the Constitution which authorizes our Government to appropriate money for the benefit and use of foreign nations. Apparently, there have been no takers. Yes; conservatives believe in the American people and in their innate generosity which has surpassed that of any other people in history. We believe in our power to stimulate true capitalistic growth in emergent nations. Our many private company managements could create this, if they were permitted the opportunity. We do not believe in giving money to dictators, monarchs, and Socialist states who oppress and exploit their people, yet this is what we have done and continue to do as a Nation. It is a blot on our collective honor as human beings and as Americans. Conservatives know their responsibility in this world. Just as no American can truly enjoy the privileges of his citizenship when he knows that others in our midst are denied them; so too, no nation can truly enjoy its freedom when oppressed and enslaved states exist in this world. Conservatives acknowledge the fundamental mission established by the American Revolution; namely, to free all men everywhere so that they might seek their own happiness, their well-being, and their self-respect in a free, lawful society.

WILL CONSERVATIVES COMPRESS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

On the issue of the size of the Federal Government, conservatives believe that most American citizens know something about work—what constitutes a day's honest toil, what wages should buy in performance, and how work must produce something of value to society. I am sure that many competent and sincere Federal executives and civil servants fulfill all these conditions, however, the fact remains that the Federal Government has grown like a giant uncontrollable cancer to infect every limb and organ of the body politic. This Nation simply does not need 2½ million people employed in Federal functions. Our Federal Government engages in a reported 700 businesses which compete with companies which employ the rest of us. These 700-odd businesses are run by Federal managers who pay no taxes, no interest on capital loans, no dividends to stockholders, but some analysts of their records have reported that these agencies have lost $81 billion. To accomplish that requires incompetence on a scale so magnificent as to be beyond argument. Our colossal $300 billion Federal debt and this year's $100 billion budget provide screaming testimony of generic incompetence in current Federal management.

One way to meet this problem might be to amend the Constitution to limit the Federal power to tax, another might be for our Congressmen to initiate an organized effort to appraise each Federal business and function as to its importance to the function of Government; its infringement on citizenship rights; the inherent constructive value it contributes; whether it duplicates other activities, public or private; whether the public value received is worth the expense.

An honest and fair evaluation of this kind—not a punitive attack—would probably result in the retention of useful new and old Federal functions, and the chopping down of inconsequential busywork. I am sure that sincere, devoted Federal employees and executives would support this effort to make sense of their world and to cut down the fantastic waste of public funds they witness every day.

We believe this reasonable and fair approach would result in cutting the Federal annual budget one-third to one-half its present cost to the people. When such true savings are effected, then it becomes possible to reduce the national debt by substantial amounts, and, eventually, to be in a position to cut down the level of income taxation on our citizens. How many Americans would really be against a conservative policy on Government which would result in better, more efficient Government; a healthier, more dynamic business community which would have the funds to grow and create millions of new jobs; more hard cash in the hands of every American family; a dollar bill which steadily rose in its purchasing power.

There are many more issues which require similar consideration from all of us. For example, State and local government employment has zoomed to almost 7 million persons. How can we justify such exorbitant expense in our own communities?

Conservative thought is new, fresh, and has the opportunity to gain strength from all modern and ancient advances in management organization theory, dynamic economic theory, political theory, the social sciences, and the new techniques of operations research and value analysis. We can, if we will, penetrate to the heart of public functions and create a major advance in the art of government. As long as we continue to think creatively, to consider new ideas, and to reach for a greater future for all Americans, we can combine the social and physical sciences in creating a modern government which can truly advance the freedom and fulfillment of mankind. The Nation is ready for a leadership which combines wisdom with balanced perspective and concern for the rights of the individual.

A STRANGE SHIFT IN PUBLIC OPINION

In closing, I would like to give you some extraordinary news from the field of attitude research. My organization [2] has measured the U.S. public's attitudes toward government over the last 17 years. We have trend lines that show the steady drift toward the socialist concept of assigning all responsibilities to the Federal Government. Every time we measured nationwide over these years, we saw the people of this country drifting left.

However, in August of this year, 1963, we completed our work and were shocked to find that the trend left has stopped, and it may be possible that the Nation is actually changing its attitudes in the direction of conservative ideas. The signal is clear to all politicians and candidates for election in both political parties.

This important shift on the part of American people is too small to constitute a major change but it does look like handwriting on the wall.

CONSERVATIVES MAY NOT BE VOICES CRYING IN THE WILDERNESS

In recent months, we have had farmers turning down Federal handouts and control, a flood of citizen protests telling Congressmen they cannot cut taxes without cutting expenses, and a steadily mounting criticism of union leader arbitrariness in shutting down our economy. These are signs that the average citizen is beginning to understand what we are talking about. This is opportunity. Opportunity to speak out, to think constructively, to plan practical political action and to give this Nation the leadership it needs. I mean an executive branch of the Government run by conservatives, with a Congress in which conservative and liberal thought are each well represented. This dynamic combination would spark America to fulfill its basic role as the conscience and the economic mainspring of mankind.

[2] Opinion Research Corp.: "Business Climate Improves," August 1963, the Public Opinion Index for Industry.

"WHY I PREFER LIVING IN A DEMOCRACY"—PRIZE ESSAY BY ARTHUR A. PASQUARIELLO

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in a democracy, the youth of today is the leader of tomorrow. His character and ideals influence the history and destiny of our country.

The thinking of our youth of the moment is a forecast of our strength of the future; and it is most rewarding to have their reasoning—why they prefer to live in a democracy.

The Italian American War Veterans chose just that theme for their 1962–63 essay contest. The several departments of the organization conducted their contest within their areas and the departmental winning essays were entered in a national competition. The contest was under the joint direction of two distinguished Rhode Island educators and brothers, Joseph Leonelli, national commander of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and Dr. Renato E. Leonelli, chairman of the essay contest.

The medal for the national award was won by Arthur A. Pasquariello of 160 Rotterdam Street, Rotterdam, N.Y. A graduate of Schalmont High School, Schenectady, and presently attending Sienna College, young Pasquariello as the good student and good athlete symbolizes the formula of "the strong mind in the strong body" while his character as the good citizen is established by his essay "Why I Prefer Living in a Democracy." I ask unanimous consent that the essay be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHY I PREFER LIVING IN A DEMOCRACY

(By Arthur A. Pasquariello, 160 Rotterdam Street, Rotterdam, N.Y., submitted by Richard P. Gemmett, Contest Chairman, Richard E. Voris Post No. 37, Rotterdam, N.Y.)

I consider myself a very lucky individual. God has blessed me with a land of peace and prosperity—a land of freedom and privilege that will never be denied to me. He has given me the honor of living in the democratic United States of America.

Our democracy had its beginning about 200 years ago. The people of this "New World" had visions of a great country. They dreamed of a land where the people could work as they please, speak and write what they believe, and worship the god of their choice. These "freedom lovers" sacrificed much, even their lives in many cases, to rebel against the mother country and its king, so that they could live in a home of freedom and security, and have no fear of losing them all to a cruel and greedy monarch. The colonists fought superbly and the victory they achieved meant the birth of a land that was to mature into the greatest and most powerful nation in the world.

Many of our people do not realize how well off they really are. They take for granted many of their freedoms, that people of other countries are strictly forbidden to enjoy. Our young people are able to attend schools that are supported, not controlled, by the Government. They are given the freedom to study in any field they choose, and they alone may make this decision. There is no powerful governing body standing over the American teacher telling him what and what not to teach his students.

In the United States, we see no authority forcing our children to accept the idea that obedience to the Federal Government prevails above all else. No, in our schools the children learn of the democratic way of life, where the opportunity is open to everyone to work at the profession of his choice, not the one chosen by the "higher-ups." In the United States, intelligence, wealth, and power are not the factors that start the person on the road to success, but rather potential, initiative, and good hard work.

Our schools do a fine job of developing these basics, and the mature adults they produce are a great tribute to our Nation. As trivial as it may seem to the children attending them, our education system is essential and very beneficial to our country, not only for job training for the future, but to teach the students that our principles of living are best.

To awaken on a Sunday morning and attend the church of your choice is truly a privilege that our people take for granted. Many countries have established an official state religion, and in many cases, they force their people to accept its principles. If these people still desire to worship God in their own way, they must do so in seclusion. The citizens of the United States are able to attend clean and beautifully constructed churches, while in many other lands the people are forced to meet their Creator in cold, dingy caves or dusty, dilapidated barns. We need never be ashamed of our religion, for in our country, the choice of the people ranks above all else, and each individual is able to worship freely and openly.

What impresses me most about our homeland is the way in which its principles and ideals exist in the minds and hearts of the public. Fortunately, we have no class system on our soil where the wealthy, powerful people are saparated from the lowly laboring classes. When walking in the streets, people do not move aside so that the great wealthy one may pass by first. Nor do they fall to their knees in respect when a person of authority enters their home. Our Constitution, the invaluable document by which our Nation is governed, states that all men are created equal in the eyes of God. This does hold true, for most of the population does live on the same economic and social level. There is no extreme wealth or poverty in our country, but an almost national middle class that is able to live a normal and comfortable life.

In our land of opportunity, where a person is given a chance to find success in life, there is a degree of respect for the prominent citizen, but never do we find the downright worshipping of him. In our country a man has to work for his honor.

The strength that exists in our people contributes greatly to the unity and power of our country. This strength is not constructed from just one type of person but by human beings of many different races, colors, and creeds. The French and the English, the Negro and the white, and the Catholic and the Jew make up this intangible force that preserves our democracy. They have all joined together to form one respected individual, the American citizen. The American is given many basic freedoms and, in time, the spirit of love and respect that he develops for his home soil will give him the strength to suppress any attempts to take them away from him. A democracy is not a democracy without people who are willing to stand by it with pride and confidence, no matter what the situation may be. Such a feeling does exist here in our free system of living. I sincerely hope that God sees fit to preserve the American citizen and his rights so that the democratic United States of America can remain a peaceful and prosperous nation, and a wonderful place to live.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the response of the press and the public to the recent administration announcement of a compromise plan for an 11,700 acre Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore shows that support for preservation of the Indiana dunes is strong and widespread. Newspaper editorials have expressed disappointment that the beautiful unit 2 area of the dunes will not be included in the administration plan, but continue to strongly urge favorable congressional action on the park proposal.

Chicago's American, the outstanding Chicago newspaper which has firmly and consistently supported the preservation of the dunes, points out in a recent editorial that the conditions which the Bureau of the Budget says must be met before Federal funds are spent for a Burns ditch harbor may well mean that there can be no Federal harbor. But the editorial correctly points out that the crucial point is whether "the terms of the agreement are honestly observed."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial of September 25 be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Chicago American, Sept. 25, 1963]

COMPROMISE ON THE DUNES

It is not yet possible to pass judgment on the so-called compromise plan approved by the Kennedy administration in the Burns ditch controversy. The plan may represent a gain, though not a victory, for conservationist forces—those who have been fighting to prevent the building of a major lake port for the use of steel plants in the area and to save the dunes land from destruction. On the other hand, it may turn out to be a victory for the steel companies and the Indiana politicians who have championed them. It all depends on how clearly the terms of the plan are defined and how faithfully they are carried out—and on the record, we don't put much trust in the politicians' noble intentions.

The White House program will allow construction of the harbor (which is a defeat, not a compromise, for the conservationists). But it also provides for setting aside 11,700 acres for a Federal dunes park, an important gain. Moreover, it attached two conditions to its approval of the harbor building plan which seem so stringent as to kill off the whole project beforehand.

Since the Indiana port authority and the steel mills can't guarantee to meet these conditions, we must deduce either that they have given up plans for securing Federal money for the port, or that they intend to dodge the conditions. The second possibility seems a lot more likely.

The Federal Government will approve the harbor project and help build it if it is assured, first that one integrated steel mill will be built in the area and that at least 10 million tons of coal a year, exclusive of the steel companies' supplies, will be shipped through it; or second, that two integrated mills will be built and 5 million tons of coal shipped through. ("Integrated" means a plant capable of processing steel all the way from raw ore to a finished product.)

It is extremely doubtful that the Bethlehem and Midwest Steel Cos. can meet these conditions. In accepting them, they and the State government seem to be cutting their own throats.

We doubt that they're really doing so. Loopholes in the plan appear very quickly.

First, the State government is not bound by these terms. It could go ahead and build the harbor—using the Federal Government's approval of the project as an inducement to buyers of revenue bonds—then call on the Federal Government to bail it out when the harbor started losing money. Second, the Indiana delegation in Congress still wields a hefty club over the park lands bill, which is separate from the harbor building measure. By blocking anti-lake-pollution provisions in the harbor bill, for instance, they could make the conservationists' "victory" practically meaningless.

The situation is this: If terms of the agreement are honestly observed, the conservationists have won. But there is considerable evidence indicating that they haven't won yet.

THE RIVERTON, WYO., RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, several weeks ago I introduced a bill which would provide for the reorganization of the third division and Midvale portions of the Riverton reclamation project to compensate for some difficulties that have developed in those two projects. While I am confident that this legislation—S. 2035—can provide a solution for the problems involved, there are those who contend that the easiest solution is to abandon the project entirely.

This attitude has developed partially because of the continued stream of complaints that have issued from certain of the settlers on these projects and from those who are opposed to the idea of reclamation generally.

Mr. President, the Riverton Ranger, a daily newspaper very close to the situation, has published a series of articles and editorials which make a very interesting and vital point concerning this project and the success of the legislation designed to correct existing difficulties. That point is that while there have been many people vocal in their complaints there are many more who have been completely satisfied with the project and are successful on it but have never bothered to defend it or speak up when the project is criticized.

The Ranger has done an excellent job of trying to rectify this situation, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that these articles and editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger, Sept. 10, 1963]

EDITORIALLY SPEAKING: MIDVALE'S INTEREST

The reassurances from the Bureau of Reclamation and from the State engineer concerning the project water rights indicate that the water remains sacrosanct as belonging to the State, and controlled by those with the water rights. State Engineer Floyd Bishop states it directly and simply when he says, "The inclusion of the Riverton project as a unit of the Missouri River Basin program should in no way affect the administration or the control of water under the project."

Bishop said it is provided in the Wyoming constitution that the State of Wyoming, through the engineer's office, has the responsibility for the administration of the waters of the State.

The general plan for the inclusion of the Riverton project in the Missouri River Basin

program has been outlined in the pending legislation. It should be remembered, too, that after the reauthorization is approved by Congress, the negotiation of the repayment contract itself would be done by the Midvale Irrigation District Board, and the Third Division District Board, should they so choose. District commissioners and attorneys can go over the contract word by word to make sure nothing adverse is included in the new contract.

Farmers are concerned that sometime in the future water might be short and a demand made for water needed for irrigation. There seems to be no justification for that fear.

There is a likelihood that water will be short at various times in the years ahead. A better insurance against ill effects from such a shortage would be the improvement of the irrigation works through additional water conservation measures, such as canal lining, so that better use can be made of water available.

A second source of insurance would be the construction of additional upstream storage of floodwaters, both for Midvale, and for the private ditch companies.

Concern over a shortage of water is a real worry. But there seems to be no basis for fears that the water rights, held under Wyoming State law, are threatened by inclusion under the Missouri River Basin program.

With these assurances firmly given, the best interests of Midvale Irrigation District would appear to be served by the district's joining with the Missouri River Basin project. We add our endorsement to the proposal for reauthorization of the Midvale portion of the project as part of the Missouri River Basin project.

[From the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger, Sept. 17, 1963]

EDITORIALLY SPEAKING: FARM EQUILIBRIUM

While most Riverton project farmers are working hard to complete the harvest of what may be a record 1963 crop, testimony is being taken in Washington concerning the future of farming in this area.

For 10 years, since some of the first dreams of veteran homesteaders went sour, the third division of Riverton project has been under a direct attack by a group of articulate settlers. Their voices have been amplified by the Rocky Mountain News and Scripps-Howard newspapers. Their case against Reclamation has gained some credence when constant attention has been focused on errors made by the Bureau.

Throughout the campaign to discredit Reclamation, the main group of farmers who make their living farming have remained strangely silent. Individually, men with faith in farming the Reclamation lands in this area have defended farming in this area. Collectively, work has been done toward a sugar factory. Businesses dependent upon farming have continued to expand, and the good farmers continue to make good. But the success stories remain untold.

The winners in the publicity battle are clearly the spokesmen for third division who are trying to prove that the Government misrepresented the lands offered for homesteads, that their economic plight is the fault of the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Government. They believe they are entitled to recompense for the years they spent trying to farm.

Perhaps it is this hope for a payoff that has kept others who believe in farming quiet throughout much of the long battle. The men leading the battle for third division's closing have tried to create a picture of utter desolation and failure, a failure that they maintain would come because of soil conditions, no matter what efforts they might have made.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that Midvale Irrigation District has been working throughout this time for a program of rehabilitation, drainage, canal lining, and structure replacement on Midvale. This program would cost several million dollars.

Could you imagine a more explosive situation than there is today in Washington? Congress is tired of hearing about the plight of the Riverton project as painted by the third division detractors. They have demanded a solution. Presented as the answer is a program calling for expenditure of several millions of dollars.

Representative HALEY, of Florida, says the lands should be abandoned and let the ducks paddle around. The Bureau's spokesman Johnson testifies that, "without completion of canal lining, drains, and structure rehabilitation, the Riverton project can be expected to deteriorate progressively and rapidly to the point of virtual abandonment."

Riverton people remember the hearings conducted by Senators Hickey, McGee, and Burdick in Riverton at which time no favorable testimony was permitted without strong objection.

Wouldn't it be a hilarious development, if, while most of the project farmers were hauling a record crop to market, Congress decided to take the advice of the third division people and abandon not only third division but the whole project?

Sounds ridiculous, doesn't it, but to read the headlines, hear the speeches of the critics, one would think there's no good side to tell about reclamation farming around Riverton. If any farmers are doing well on Midvale or third division, it might be well to speak up, before the case is so badly overstated that something drastic and calamitous takes place.

It would be good for morale if some farmers would tell this newspaper a success story about farming to help restore the equilibrium.

[From the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger, Sept. 20, 1963]

EDITORIALLY SPEAKING: IT'S CATCHING

While the decision is being made relative to the future of third division, and while farmers of Midvale Irrigation District debate the merits of the reauthorization of the project under the Missouri River Basin plan, there are going to be many different opinions expressed. The only sure winner apparently so far in the deal is the attorney.

When one settlement proposal a few months back called for an appraisal and judgment by a court, the objection was raised at that time that the country would be flooded with lawyers trying to get the cases.

Joe Hickey, the former Senator, said in Washington this week, that the courts should have an opportunity to review any settlement with landowners. The farmers selling out 10 to 12 years work would want to be in a position to deal on a private sale or appeal the settlement. But it might be that the only real winner in the case would be the lawyers.

While it's the vogue to sue, it's surprising that someone hasn't considered a suit for defamation and slander. The farmer who has spent his life farming on Midvale, for example, and now contemplates selling his place to realize a return on all the money he's plowed back in his business, might be shocked to find out how much the value of his farm has shrunk following a nationwide barrage of publicity portraying the whole Riverton project as a dead horse, and the other names rather loosely applied.

At least a half dozen "second-coming-size" headlines have appeared on the front page of the Rocky Mountain News, (thanks in part to the prompting of those in third division with the pipeline to the editor's ear), portraying in head and story the Riverton project as worthless.

One of the requirements of a slander or libel suit is the ability to prove damages.

The man who thought he had a good farm and who should have plenty of buyers might well be able to prove that the value of his real estate has dropped through the nationwide campaign of vilification. The third division boys may have intended to apply their main heat for the roasting of the Bureau of Reclamation whom they are now suing through Joe Hickey.

But the torch has been rather loosely applied and many innocent bystanders have been scorched. This suing malady is catching. Can't you see the headline in the Denver Post now—in their "second coming type"—"Riverton Project Farmers Get Off Their Dead Horse, Sue RM News for Slander."

[From the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger, Sept. 19, 1963]

D. LOCKHART DEFENDS FARMS HERE

A new blast of adverse publicity about the Riverton reclamation project has brought reaction from several quarters. One third division farmer's story is told in an accompanying article.

With new headlines on papers across the United States calling the Riverton project a "dead horse," and with the 10 years of battle between some of the third division farmers and the Bureau of Reclamation, new comment is expected.

One Midvale farmer is planning a series of stories to rebut arguments put forth in favor of the inclusion of the project in Missouri River Basin.

Another farmer has volunteered, with his banker, to show how he went from zero assets to $120,000 worth on a project farm in a few years.

Another man is pointing out how project lands, partly because of the rain of adverse publicity, will sell for only $100 to $125 an acre. He says a good farmer can oftentimes make that much in 1 year off the farmland.

Following is a letter to the editor submitted by Missouri Valley farmer Don Lockhart.

"A letter to Riverton project farmers:

"Your project is a 'dead horse.' If you didn't know it before, from the frequent times you've been told you know it now. And, it must be pretty bad, if they can smell it in Congressman HALEY's State of Florida.

"When will you be ready to stand for a count? I've heard your opinions as you talk to each other, but that's as far as it goes. Are you afraid of making someone angry? Or, do you think there's a chance you'll get in on the 'cake cutting' if there is one?

"This is my opinion of the facts as they have been stated and as I think they actually are.

"Stated: Riverton project is a 'dead horse,' beset by bad engineering and poor soil.

"As I see it:

"Every western irrigation project no matter how successful has some abandoned lands. Everyone of them works. I believe we are only going through the same growing pains the old projects experienced.

"Stated: Bureau of Reclamation lied.

"As I see it:

"That's being real blunt but if it has to be yes or no, they did. Not any more than a real estate man or the Canadian Railway, or a farmer selling out.

"Any man who came into the Valley when I did (1950), had to drive by abandoned land, white with alkali, to get to the new units above Pavillion. Any settler of the 1930's could have told what the lands were if anyone had asked for an opinion.

"Any man who came into the valley when new settlers all made statements of experiences and available capital. Most of us stretched a point here and there.

"Likewise, all the settlers were servicemen. Any serviceman should have had experience enough with the Government's word.

"Stated: Midvale project can never pay off:

"As I see it:

"Under conventional bookkeeping methods it cannot. Under a wider concept, one taking into account humans involved, new wealth created, total business generated, it doesn't lack too much of being paid off now.

"As a summary I believe the project is worth our support. The money asked for to do 'rehabilitation and betterment' work, while not being repaid directly by Midvale would be repaid by Boysen power. That to me is no skin off Florida's nose unless it couldn't get it to dredge out a harbor or build a breakwater. (Those funds generally are nonreimbursable.) The money then would be raised in Wyoming and spent to Wyoming betterment. How often can you say that of Federal expenditures?

"Much of the present problem is economic. Two of every five farmers doing business in the United States in 1950 are gone. Broke, or at least squeezed out. Few of them had the added expense of all new buildings, fences, irrigation structures, a line of machinery and at least 1 year of no crop. Project homesteaders had those added expenses."

[From the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger, Sept. 19, 1963]

THIRD DIVISION FARMER GIES WORTH UP FROM $800 TO $80,000

North Pavillion Farmer Ted Gies, after 13 years of work on his farm in the much-publicized third division of Riverton reclamation project, still plans to make his home and his living on third division.

Although situated on land classified as unfit for farming, Gies has seen his tiny nest egg of $800 cash and an old truck loaded with a few pieces of furniture grow to a present value of $80,000.

From $800 to $80,000 in 13 years is a record to be proud of. Gies and his wife admit they have mortgages and debts.

"But who hasn't these days?" Gies said philosophically.

Gies has been one of the few voices raised against the onslaught of publicity which has pictured the Riverton reclamation project as a mistake. Following an invitation in the Riverton Ranger to successful farmers to tell their story to try restore the equilibrium between the good and the bad, Gies came forward with this information.

Gies made application for a homestead along with the hundreds of other veterans after World War II who swarmed to the new land openings on third division of Riverton project.

He drew No. 22, and by the time 5 ahead of him withdrew, he had the 17th choice on the new land openings. He looked first at a homestead in Hidden Valley, but decided instead on his present place in north Pavillion.

Gies farm is the first one north out of Pavillion, unit No. 69. His original unit had 161½ acres of land with 112 acres irrigable. In the land reclassification of 1953 when the amendment and exchange act was passed for the relief of third division farmers, Gies found all of his land reclassified as class 6 land, lowest there is.

He considered buying his neighbor's farm, the Lloyd Montgomery place, which had 32 acres left after the reclassification.

But in 1954 he paid $1,800 for the Ralph Steers place 12 miles away, buying the improvements. He gained 58½ irrigable acres.

Gies still has faith in the drainability of his own farm. He feels that drains properly placed and on the right grade could improve his land. This year Midvale Irrigation put a concrete irrigation chute across Gies' farm, and that has helped dry out his land.

Gies' success has been partly due to his dairy operation. He raised alfalfa seed through 1958. One year he had a record production of 2,676 pounds of seed from 1 acre. The 1953 crop was the best, but in 1954 and 1955 he grossed $46,000 from his crops, mainly seed.

"Like most everyone else, we stayed in seed production 2 or 3 years too long," Gies said. For all the years he has been farming on his place, his gross income has averaged $14,000.

Both Ted and his wife have worked hard on the farm. He doesn't believe a man can make a go of farming by working at an outside job.

Gies looks with envy at some of the better farms in third division, wishing he had been able to apply his toil to the better land, rather than just his own.

But with his dairy operation, which now includes 60 head of cattle, including some Brown Swiss, Holstein, and Guernsey, Gies is confident he can make a good living.

"We came here in 1950 to make our home and we still believe we can do it. All it takes is some hard work," Gies said.

Does he want a settlement? Gies said he supposes he would have to sell out if the project is shutdown. But he doesn't think that's necessary.

The Gies family includes three boys, Theodore F., an honor junior geology student at the University of Wyoming; Alan, a junior at Pavillion High School; and Burl, a 7th grader at Pavillion.

The Gies family just bought a brand new red car. Their other one was worn out, and it was good for the morale, during a time when a major effort is being made to picture the Riverton project as a worthless wasteland.

[From the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger, Sept. 20, 1963]

HUFFMAN SAYS: USBR DIDN'T MISREPRESENT

"I am a contented and happy man. I have a good ranch, a good wife, and a happy family.

"For 10 years I have suffered the humiliation of seeing a small group of people tear down what I have been working hard to build up for 15 years.

"I don't seek any personal publicity, but I cannot remain silent any longer in the face of this terribly distorted picture."

Speaking was Stanley Huffman, seated in the living room of his comfortable ranch home near Ocean Lake off the 8-Mile Road.

Huffman was referring to the many recent blasts leveled at the Riverton reclamation project during hearings before the Irrigation Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee early in the week in Washington.

Laid out on a coffee table before Huffman were all of the documents and pamphlets he had received prior to and during his homesteading of his farm on 8-Mile Road in 1948.

"We homesteaders were given a very thorough briefing on every aspect of farming these new lands, Huffman said. "I believe the Bureau of Reclamation was as honest with us as they could be."

Huffman told of being taken out on the land by Floyd Moore, then with the USBR, and looking at the land. He selected his unit, which was No. 57 on the Bureau's mimeographed list.

Both Moore and Alfred D. Perkins (still with the USBR here) advised Huffman that his farm unit was one of the poorer ones. According to the soil classification of that time it had no class I land, 29.2 acres of class II, 63.9 acres of class IV, a total of 124.6 acres of irrigable land on the 160-acre unit.

THOROUGH BRIEFING

"The Reclamation was very thorough with us," Huffman said. They gave him a booklet entitled "Your New Home" which he still has.

Within the booklet was another pamphlet, from the University of Wyoming extension service, which advised on soil conditions. This booklet stated that the soil needed organic matter and that it would take considerable time to build up. The University of Wyoming bulletin also advised that livestock were necessary to make the unit pay. It advised on crops.

The farmers were warned of seep problems, of alkalinity in the soil. They were told they should have at least $5,000 available to be successful in starting their new farm. Most of them didn't have anything like this money.

The USBR bulletin advised that lands were in a raw state, low in organic material, and that even with proper farming practices it would be several years before the land would become economical.

The USBR bulletin advised that it would take 3 to 5 years of growing and plowing under of alfalfa and clover to build up the soil. They recommended strongly plowing under the green material.

"How many settlers have followed this advice?" Huffman said. He has.

The USBR told the settlers that their income would be low, that they would barely make expenses, let alone a big profit. The Bureau warned of the high cost of farm machinery and other things.

The Bureau bulletin listed what could be expected as ultimate crop yields—20 bushels of dry beans an acre, 10 tons of beets an acre, 350 bushels of potatoes an acre, 40 to 45 bushels of oats and barley an acre, 25 to 30 bushels of wheat an acre, 2 tons of alfalfa hay an acre, 120 pounds of alfalfa seed an acre, 300 pounds of clover seed an acre, and so on. All of these figures are considerably below the averages now being grown on the Riverton project.

Huffman has himself far exceeded these goals in the crops he grows.

CAME FROM OREGON

The Huffman family came to Riverton from Oregon. He had farmed on the Yellowstone project near Sidney, Mont., and in eastern Oregon. He saw good and bad farms on both these projects.

"They are still reclaiming land on older projects," Huffman said. "I have seen land that 25 years ago was absolutely worthless, on these older projects, that today are beautiful places."

He and two other prospective homesteaders looked over the USBR material during the evening of their first day here. The other two decided it wasn't good enough for them and left. Huffman stayed, and has never regreted it.

He gave up his school teaching in Oregon, and knowing that his early years would be lean, he secured a job as an English teacher in Riverton High School from then Superintendent Les Jensen.

"We were poor as a church mouse when we moved into our tar paper house. We slept on camp cots. We were in hock to the FHA. We had children aged 1 and 2 years old and another on the way," Huffman recalls. And he signed his official papers for the homestead on Friday, February 13, 1948.

The Huffmans' first winter on the place was the famous winter of 1949. It snowed so hard they had to shovel snow off the roof, which leaked like mad.

"But the good Lord must have been looking after us," Mrs. Huffman recalls, "because it leaked everywhere except on our bed."

Huffman is a firm believer in a large unit of land, a diversified livestock operation in connection with it. And he has made his farming practices work.

From an absolute zero start (Huffman says he didn't have a pot to put beans in when he arrived) he has built up a net worth of nearly $120,000, figures substantiated by his bank.

His place is now fully fenced and cross fenced. He has a concrete-lined ditch. His 1,320-square-foot home has a full basement, three bedrooms, and a fireplace.

Huffman started in 1948 with his 160-acre unit. Since then he amended onto the 160-acre Bob Heumier farm when Heumier left the project in 1954; he bought the Jim Van Trump place in 1954, purchased from the USBR a vacant 160 acres never homesteaded, bought another contiguous vacant unit, and is leasing two units owned by Bill Skelton (originally homesteaded by Jim Broyles and Dale Hobbs).

TOTAL, 1,120 ACRES

Thus he is farming a total of 1,120 acres. Of this amount only 268 acres are classified as irrigable, 200 on Huffman's own farm. As a further example, the Hobbs place has 31.7 acres classified as irrigable, but he has farmed 120 acres.

Huffman is raising 3-4 ton hay on land that has been condemned as worthless.

He points out that you can swamp out any land with poor irrigation practices.

"This land will produce with proper management," Huffman states emphatically.

Interestingly enough, except for a couple of old drain ditches on the Van Trump place, there are no drain ditches on Huffman's place. And he is constantly reclaiming more and more land, that at one time was hopelessly seeped out. Huffman believes that much of the seepage comes from the canals and laterals, and not from the judicious use of water in irrigation.

"Everything I have has come from this land—fences, my home, lined ditches," Huffman states.

He has a beautiful garden, and his farm records show that it has been worth $500 a year to him. In the 15 years he has been on the place this would be $7,500, or nearly enough to buy the fencing on the place.

He has a fine shelterbelt of a mixture of cottonwood, Chinese-elm, ash, cedar, spruce, and Russian-olive. It won a prize, 10 years ago as best in the State.

His orchard is a sight to behold, and produces apples, crabapples, and even grapes.

The Huffmans buy their groceries with the $600 a year they make off selling the eggs from their 200 white leghorn chickens.

SUMMER FALLOWS

Huffman believes in summer fallow. He has about 80-100 acres continuously in fallow and rotation. He controls his weeds in this manner.

A piece of acreage he has in fallow this year, raised 15 bushels of oats in 1950, but raised 120 bushels in 1960.

"After I put in my concrete slip form ditch on this field the seep stopped dead," Huffman says.

He believes in conservation of equipment and is building his own maintenance shop for $600. He will improve his feeding arrangement this winter.

He raised 150 acres of hay this year. After the first two cuttings he will let his sheep harvest the third cutting—and the weeds.

Farming is hard work, and steady. In 15 years of irrigating up to 600 acres, Huffman has missed setting his water at night only once. "You control seep by controlling your water," he says.

Huffman has a Ranger alfalfa seed field, much of it originally seeded 15 years ago from which he expects a 500-600 pound per acre seed crop this year.

His 400 ewes brought him 500 lambs this May. He never feeds them any hay or grain, but fattens them in the field. The sheep have been in a cornfield now for about a month. Later he'll turn the cattle into the cornfield, then bring the sheep back. "Because of weather I had to feed only 3 days last winter," he says.

Huffman raised purebred dual purpose (milk and beef) red polled cattle. His sheep are a cross between Hampshire and Rambouillett, and his bucks are Hamps and Suffolk.

He has 20 acres of beautiful oats harvested on land he has reclaimed on the Van Trump place, now producing a crop for the first time in many years. He raises some potatoes, too.

He kept 39 head of cattle and their 32 calves on 30 acres of pasture all summer long, a pretty good record for the pasture. And he has had 100 percent life on his calves this year, didn't lose a one. Pasture is a combination of brome grass and alfalfa.

In one of the 60 acres of corn he has, Huffman (always experimenting) has planted alfalfa with the corn. "It ought to work," he says.

Huffman keeps his steers 18 months, before sale, so far has kept all his cows while building up his herd of 100.

The Huffmans have five children, Stanley 16, Dan 15, David 14, Benjamin 10, Susan 9, and Mark 2. His wife's name is Eileen.

COLLEGE FUTURE

Each of his boys gets a purebred heifer after completing each year of school after the eighth grade. And he pays the boys wages on the farm. Stan figures that by the time his boys get ready to go to college they'll have a $2,000 start. And he hopes some of them come back to the farm.

"Wyoming has been awfully darned good to me," states Stan Huffman. "I've raised a nice family, have eaten good, and have a good car."

GOLD STAR MOTHERS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on September 29, the American Gold Star Mothers, Inc. observed Gold Star Mothers Day. This day highlighted the weekend of activities which brought hundreds of Gold Star Mothers to Washington.

Mr. President, my acquaintance with Gold Star Mothers stems back to the 80th Congress with Public Law 80-306. I am very proud that this bill which provides a gold star lapel button for widows, parents and the next of kin who lost a beloved one on the battlefield, was the first bill of mine to be enacted by the Congress of the United States. In my judgment, these lapel pins are a very small but fitting tribute to the mothers of these fine young men as an expression of the Nation's deep appreciation for the sacrifices made by those whose memory all of us cherish. Our Nation is free today only because these fine young men have made the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. President, we Americans are in debt to these mothers for even more than the fact that they have lost their sons to a national cause. These mothers have given both time and effort in working in veterans hospitals throughout the country. Every year, the Gold Star Mothers donate thousands of hours of their time to comfort the sick and cheer the lonely in veterans hospitals scattered throughout the country.

Mr. President, this year, to show my deep and continuing interest in honoring the loved ones of those who have given their lives to preserve our Nation, I have introduced a bill which would provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who have lost or lose their lives as a result of cold war incidents. It seems to me that this small lapel button, a symbol of both sorrow and pride, would be a fitting expression of gratitude to the members of the families of men who have made the ultimate sacrifice during active cold war conflict.

Mr. President, may I take this opportunity to wish the Gold Star Mothers well and to let them know that we as a Nation are indebted for their many contributions.

PROPOSED VISIT OF MARSHAL TITO TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on September 24 before the Senate I spoke out vigorously in opposition to the proposed visit of Tito to the United States. I am confident that I am not alone in my views as is evidenced by correspondence that has been received by me on that subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dealing with this particular subject and signed by officials of the Slovenian Dramatic Club LILIJA, of Collinwood, Ohio.

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

Hon. Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Permit us to address this letter to you in the hope that you would voice your protest against the recent invitation extended by President Kennedy to Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia for a visit at the White House.

A reception of Communist Dictator Tito by our President would be an insult to all communism enslaved nations and all decent Americans. It would make a mockery of our democratic principles to welcome the creator and strongman of this Communist police state. This country of ours is the stronghold of democracy and freedom; a symbol and guarantee of liberty; a hope of all those millions who in the slavery of all forms of communism suffer and pray to be someday delivered from this evil.

Regardless of any past differences between Belgrade and Moscow, Tito is and will be a Communist who will in all important decisions always side with the Soviets. He is also a ruthless man who is responsible for the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of men, women and children during the revolution, and a massacre of 12,000 men of the Slovenian National Army, as well as over 100,000 anti-Communist soldiers from Croatia and Serbia. This happened during May and June of 1945, right after the end of the war. Mass graves in the forests and caves of Kocevski Rog in Slovenia alone contain close to 100,000 victims.

This is the true face of Marshal Tito. Our native land is soaked with blood of martyrs whose only crime was that they were opposed to the Communist slavery and wanted their country to be free and democratic.

If President Kennedy wants to live up to his words—and we hope—his convictions, then he will not disgrace the dignity of his high office and the good name and dignity of our country by greeting on our soil the

butcher, who is responsible for beastly massacres that can only be equaled to those of Hitler and Stalin.

We know your deep convictions and firm stand against communism, Senator, and we trust that you will do everything in your power to prevent this shameful meeting from taking place.

Sincerely yours,

SLOVENIAN DRAMATIC CLUB LILIJA,
AUGUST DRAGAR, *President*
FRANK HRIN, *Secretary*.

ANTITRUST REVISION COMMISSION RECOMMENDED BY WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EXPORT EXPANSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of my major concerns in introducing, along with Senators HARTKE, COOPER, and BREWSTER, S. 1255, which would create a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws, was the impact which the present, long unreviewed structure of our antitrust laws is having upon our international trade. Much evidence has been coming to light that the drive being conducted by one part of our Government to increase our exports and thereby ease our balance-of-payments problems is being contradicted by the drive of another segment of the Government to enforce an antitrust structure which in large part does not contemplate either our balance-of-payments problems or our export drive.

The White House Conference on Export Expansion held on September 17 and 18 highlighted this conflict. Committee Eleven of the conference, consisting of many of the most distinguished participants in the conference, was charged with considering antitrust aspects of export expansion. The committee concluded that the conflict was of such magnitude that it could not possibly propose substantive revision of the antitrust laws in the 2 days allotted to it and stated:

> It is for this reason that the committee expresses its approval in principle of Senate bill 1255 providing for a Government commission to explore in depth all of the problems associated with the application of the antitrust laws to foreign commerce, as well as the exemption provided by the Webb-Pomerene Act. Only such a commission, given adequate staff, financing, facilities, and support can expect to report adequately upon the problems which have been assigned to this committee.

The committee also found that the balance-of-payments problem is so pressing that it felt it must make some suggestions immediately to alleviate the difficulties by administrative action within the existing antitrust structure and also outlined some typical examples of concrete problems faced by American firms operating in foreign trade.

I believe the committee has performed a valuable service which should be of great assistance in identifying the extent of the antitrust-export conflict and in bringing about a broad scale review of the antitrust laws in the light of the present and future needs of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee's report be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

COMMITTEE 11—ANTITRUST ASPECTS OF EXPORT EXPANSION

Chairman: Alonzo B. Kight, Borg-Warner International Corp.

Vice Chairman: Claude L. Ganz, Dynamo Industries Inc.

Liaison Officer: Peter T. Jones, Deputy to the Secretary of Commerce.

How does U.S. antitrust law affect the export expansion drive? Are there recommendations for policy and other changes? What has been the effect of foreign cartels and monopolies? What are the implications of price differentials in domestic and foreign markets?

The problems involved in antitrust law in connection with export expansion are numerous and difficult. They are beyond the ability of any committee to solve in the course of two sessions lasting less than 1 complete working day. The committee, therefore, realizes that the most significant thing that it can do is to submit a few recommendations dealing with some of the major problems with which members are familiar. We recognize that we have necessarily omitted reference to other problems which will be of equal or greater significance.

It is for this reason that the committee expresses its approval in principle of Senate bill 1255 providing for a Government commission to explore in depth all of the problems associated with the application of the antitrust laws to foreign commerce, as well as the exemption provided by the Webb-Pomerene Act. Only such a commission, given adequate staff, financing, facilities, and support can expect to report adequately upon the problems which have been assigned to this committee.

WHAT MAY BE DONE NOW

The problems facing the United States in the development of its export trade are immediate. The balance-of-payments problem is acute. The country cannot afford to wait for one or more years while the problem is explored in depth. We, therefore, conceive it to be our duty to make recommendations for whatever steps can be taken immediately, or in the near future.

In our consideration of the problem we have found it impossible to separate export from oversea investment. Investments, joint ventures, licensing of patents and know-how, are all important to the export trade of the United States. The members of the committee are unanimous in their judgment that every business would prefer to manufacture in the United States and export its products abroad where it is at all possible to do so. Foreign investments, joint ventures, and licenses are entered into after it has become clear that these ventures offer the only practical means of expanding business abroad. The alternative is not foreign manufacture or exports. It is foreign manufacture or nothing. We are also in agreement that foreign investments, joint ventures, and licenses are ordinarily followed by an expansion of exports both immediately and in the long range.

Accordingly, we have divided this report into two parts. In part I we recommended those steps, although we agree their effect will be limited, which can be taken at once within the framework of present laws and which will benefit the export trade of the United States. In part II we have set forth certain examples which are typical problems faced by U.S. businessmen operating abroad.

PART I—ACTION WITHIN PRESENT ANTITRUST LAWS

The Committee expresses its appreciation to U.S. Assistant Attorney General William Orrick and Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, who participated in part of the Committee's discussions. Mr. Orrick stated that he would approve the extension of the Government's "railroad release" (advance clearance) procedure, now used in merger cases, to problems arising under the antitrust laws as applied to foreign commerce. We believe that although such clearances are not a complete answer, the institution of this practice would help to relieve the anxieties of business faced with antitrust uncertainties in their proposed foreign operations.

Five steps outlined

We believe that such a program requires at least five elements:

1. There should be an announcement of this clearance procedure by the Department of Justice, or jointly by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. The announcement should spell out clearly for the benefit of interested businessmen precisely the steps that must be taken in order to invoke the procedure and to obtain a meaningful clearance from the Department.

2. The clearance should state clearly the matters covered and not covered so that the applicant may know what has been cleared and what has not been cleared.

3. It should be a term of the clearance that it will remain in effect until revoked and for a reasonable time thereafter, which reasonable time to be specified in the clearance letter, and should inform the applicant that the clearance will not be revoked or modified without giving the applicant an opportunity to show cause why it should not remain in effect.

4. The clearance should state specifically that while it is in effect and for a reasonable time thereafter, specified therein, no proceeding, civil or criminal will be brought by any Government agency under the antitrust laws in respect of matters covered by the clearance against the party receiving the clearance or against persons acting in concert with him and relying upon the clearance.

5. The Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice have concurrent jurisdiction over many of the antitrust questions that may arise in the course of export trade. We believe that it would be undesirable to require businessmen to obtain dual clearances. Therefore, we believe that in the interest of efficient administration clearance should be granted by a single agency, which clearance should be effective for all antitrust prosecutions, both civil and criminal.

Rule of reason

There is a vast gray area in the interpretation of the antitrust laws. Such an area is to some extent inherent in legislation which has a scope and flexibility found to be desirable in constitutional enactments. One of the basic premises of the antitrust laws since 1911 has been the "rule of reason." Reasonableness is by its very nature not a fixed concept and what may have been reasonable in one era and under one set of economic conditions is not necessarily reasonable under another.

We do not suggest that it is the duty of the enforcement agencies to do anything other than to enforce the antitrust laws, but the interpretation and the application of the antitrust laws today, although the words of the legislation have not changed, are not the same in scope and meaning as they were two generations ago under different economic conditions and in a different world environment. We would also suggest that an unreasonable restraint as applied to international commerce does not necessarily have the same meaning as an unreasonable restraint as applied to domestic commerce.

We believe, therefore, that the question of what is an unreasonable restraint of trade deserves reconsideration by the enforcement agencies, and that particularly in determining what is an unreasonable restraint of trade both for the purpose of granting clearances and for the purpose of prosecution the enforcement agencies take into account the economic problems of our era, including in such consideration those problems which have been developed by the increasing complexity and sophistication of international trade as well as the economic problems of the country as a whole.

PART II—TYPICAL EXAMPLES

The U.S. antitrust laws discourage and in many cases prevent U.S. companies from entering or retaining profitable foreign markets for exports either directly or through licensing and joint ventures. Foreign manufacturers are far more free to take full advantage of the opportunities. A few typical problems faced by U.S. businessmen operating in foreign trade are given in the following examples:

An American company decides to appoint an agent or distributor for its product in France. The best agent or distributor available supplies a line of similar goods and is also an important customer because it incorporates the American's components in its finished product. The American company desires to assure itself that its merchandise will not be returned to the United States as part of another product in competition with its own line. Under present antitrust laws an agreement preventing reexport to the United States would be in violation of our antitrust laws.

U.S. firms cannot limit the territories in which licensees or foreign joint ventures will operate without risking, in most cases, violation of U.S. antitrust laws. Therefore, they may run into competition from their own licensees or joint venture partners in their traditional U.S. markets.

For instance, company A makes sophisticated electronic equipment in the United States and wants to license engineering know-how in England. The license agreement includes provisions for the export of machinery and components from the United States. Under U.S. antitrust laws they cannot deny the licensee access to the U.S. market. Company A decided not to license and to forgo substantial engineering fees and export sales because of the danger of building a competitor in its own home market. On the other hand, a foreign firm may often control the markets of its licensees and can establish a licensee outside without concern for competition in its home market. Under the present antitrust laws, the American company is clearly at a disadvantage.

Seeks joint venture

Company B, a U.S. firm, wants to set up a joint manufacturing venture in Japan involving the export of supplies from the United States. On invesitgation they cannot find a legal way to prevent the Japanese company from shipping to the U.S. market. They abandoned the project resulting in a loss of potential license and export sales income to the United States.

Company C wants to acquire an interest in an Italian firm for the purpose of promoting U.S. exports. They find the otherwise well suited Italian company has agreements which with the participation of the U.S. company would be in conflict with U.S. antitrust laws. Company C is forced to drop the project and is unable to expand its exports as planned. A foreign company is under no such restrictions.

U.S. company D, which wishes to do business in country X (a member of the Latin American free trade area) finds that the local government requires it to participate in a joint venture which has monopolistic overtones, prohibited by the U.S. antitrust laws. The company refraints from doing this and the obvious result is loss of income to the United States.

Companies X, Y, and Z make somewhat the same product for the U.S. market. Each is interested in entering the Peruvian market with local manufacturing supplemented by the export of components from the United States. The market is small and can support only one plant. One U.S. company cannot afford to set up in Peru with the threat of competition from the other two. Two companies from Europe can join hands and lock up the market. The obvious result is more income lost to the United States.

Attached to this report is a statement by David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corporation of America:

"The basic difficulty which the U.S. antitrust laws impose on American business aboard is that they do not permit us to compete on equal terms with foreign business.

"This tends to discourage investment and participation by American business in foreign enterprises. It therefore reduces American income from abroad.

"When an American company competes abroad with a foreign company it must comply with the foreign law to which the foreign company is subject. But our courts have held that the American antitrust laws have extraterritorial effect. As a result, the American company also must comply with the American law, from which the foreign company is immune. To illustrate, American companies encounter obstacles under our antitrust laws if they participate with other American companies or with foreign companies in joint research, development or marketing programs abroad, or in the allocation of foreign marketing areas with such companies. Foreign companies are not faced with these obstacles.

"Instances of these inequalities appear in a staff report and memorandum of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary issued in 1955 pursuant to Senate Resolution 61 of the 84th Congress. I agree with the opinions contained in that report showing the difficulties encountered by American business abroad because of the foreign application of our antitrust laws.

"The net result is that foreign revenues, which American companies could obtain, go to foreign competition.

"I fail to see how it is in the best interests of the United States to place such restrictions on American business abroad. I believe that American business abroad should not have to follow two different sets of rules. Let us require that, subject to our national interest, our businessmen follow only the rules of the country in which their business is transacted. In England, an American company should follow English law; in France, French law, and similarly in other countries. To require more places American business at a serious competitive disadvantage.

"To any who might contend that this could in some instances adversely affect American business, I believe that American businessmen would be sensitive to those matters which would adversely affect their business.

"In addition, because this subject clearly affects the national interest, I suggest that consideration be given to creation of an organization to deal with it, with representation from the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, the Defense Department, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Trade Commission. This organization would have authority to grant clearance from the extraterritorial application of our antitrust laws wherever the American company involved believed this was in its best interests and could demonstrate that such clearance would not adversely affect the national interest."

ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND CONFERENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, an extremely important event is taking place in Washington this week—the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund.

More than 700 finance chiefs from 100 countries are meeting for the next 5 days to discuss the major issues which confront the IMF today, the most important being—in terms of its potential impact on the future growth of the free world economy—the long-term adequacy of international credit.

The United States and nine other key industrialized countries, the "Paris Club," are expected to be requested by the IMF to undertake a lengthy study of the need to reform the existing international monetary mechanism. The IMF indicated that it will conduct its own year-long study of the liquidity question.

There is little debate regarding the adequacy of international credit for the present. But there is growing belief that not long from now the world may run into a shortage of credit to finance rapidly growing international transactions which, if allowed to happen, would act as a break on the expansion of the U.S. economy as well as the economies of other free world countries.

President Kennedy, in his address to the opening session of the IMF conference yesterday, confirmed a significant change in U.S. policy, foreshadowed by Under Secretary of the Treasury Roosa's article in the October issue of Foreign Affairs, by accepting the idea that there might be a problem regarding the adequacy of international credit for the long term and by endorsing the creation of international machinery to cope with it.

I am pleased to note that the New York Times in a September 30 editorial endorses the need for this appraisal.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's address, and the New York Times editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 1, 1963]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

(The text of President Kennedy's address at the meeting of the International Monetary Fund yesterday.)

Mr. Dillon, gentlemen: This is the second time that I have had the opportunity to welcome you to Washington and I do so with the greatest pleasure and satisfaction. Yours is a very vital role in the defense of the free world. Your contribution to financial and economic stability among the nations of the world is essential and the results of these efforts will determine in a very large measure whether or how much each nation can use its resources, generous as they are, in the best interests of all of our people.

Since I last met with you, we have suffered the loss of one of the great leaders of the International Monetary Fund, Per Jacobsson. He served the Fund with skill and dedication.

He combined a great deal of wisdom with good humor. We will miss him, but the indelible mark that he left upon your work and upon the monetary systems of the world and upon the IMF will continue to guide us.

To his successor, Mr. Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, I extend best wishes as he now guides the Fund. We are grateful to France for releasing him for this service. His broad talents and experience equip him admirably for the heavy responsibilities which now press upon him.

I am glad, too, that the Bank was able to find a talented successor to Mr. Eugene Black. Mr. Black's genius helped give this institution the best reputation any bank or banker can have, a reputation of combining prudence with constructive generosity. I am pleased that Mr. George Woods has been selected to sustain this tradition.

NEED 20 YEARS AGO

Twenty years ago, when the architects of these institutions met to design an international banking structure, the economic life of the world was polarized in overwhelming, and even alarming, measure on the United States. So were the world's monetary reserves.

The United States had the only open capital in the world apart from that of Switzerland. Sixty percent of the gold reserves of the world were here in the United States. The war-torn nations of Europe and the Far East faced difficult tasks of reconstruction with depleted and inadequate capital resources. There was a need for redistribution of the financial resources of the world and the financial strength of the free world. And there was an equal need to organize a flow of capital to the impoverished and underdeveloped countries of the world.

All this has come about. It did not come about by chance, but by conscious and deliberate and responsible planning. Under the Marshall plan and its successors, liberal assistance was given to the more advanced nations to help restore their industrial plant, and development loans were given to less developed countries. In addition, private American capital was made freely available, and there was a steady liberalization of our trade policies. In this effort, your institution, and more recently a growing number of industrialized countries, have made an increasingly important role.

We are now entering upon a new era of economic and financial interdependence. The rise of trading blocs such as the Common Market offers new and greater challenge for trade liberalization. The United States has prepared itself to take advantage of those opportunities by legislation permitting an unprecedented reduction of trade restrictions and trade barriers. Our gold reserves are a healthy but not excessive 40 percent of the world's holdings.

EQUILIBRIUM GOAL

Largely as a result of these changes, this Nation today is engaged in an effort to bring our international accounts into equilibrium, and to maintain the necessary strength behind the dollar. This is not merely, I believe, in our interests. It is in the interest of all those who have placed their faith in the dollar.

To this end we have taken several steps to reduce the drain on our balance of payments. First, we are making a major effort to increase our exports in the flow of trade between the United States and other free nations.

Secondly, we are initiating further savings in our oversea dollar expenditures.

Third, we are seeking to slow down the very rapid increase in oversea demands on our capital markets as well as to retard the outflow of short-term capital resulting from interest-rate differentials.

Fourth, we intend to maintain stable prices and to increase the attractiveness of investment here in the United States.

We do not seek by precipitous acts to improve our position at the expense of others. We do seek by comprehensive effort, consistent with our international responsibilities, to reduce outflows which are weakening our capacity to serve the world community. In short, every nation in the world has a direct interest, for the dollar is an international currency, and the security of the dollar therefore involves the security of us all.

COOPERATIVE ACTION

The operations of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, and the International Development Association all play important roles in this effort. Their techniques of cooperative action and the availability of their resources permit capital to be deployed around the world in the most effective and efficient manner.

In a special message to the Congress on the balance of payments, I announced that the United States had for the first time entered into a standby arrangement with the Fund. The attendance of all of you at this meeting underscores the extent of world involvement in these institutions and the determination for so many nations to work together for mutual strength. We have been able to do this in so many fields and we have done it, it seems to me, with such success in recent months and years that I am confident that that intimate association will continue to grow and to prosper.

During the past year many of you have cooperated either through the international organizations or through your own central banks in an improved approach to the problems of foreign exchange and gold markets.

Credit facilities and reserve-holding techniques have been improved. The international monetary systems met with ease the Cuban crisis last autumn, the strains upon sterling early in 1963, and the evidence that our payments situation had not developed as well as we hoped in the first half of this year.

This performance has benefited every nation, large and small, but success should not, I believe, be an encouragement to inaction. This Nation—the United States—must continue its efforts to meet the balance-of-payments problems now confronting us, and we must all assure ourselves by preparations now that we will be ready to meet the international monetary problems of the future.

STUDIES TO BEGIN

I am pleased to learn that studies of these problems and of appropriate measures to deal with them are about to be launched. There is a sharp distinction, however, between long-term questions of international liquidity and the current problems of international imbalance. We do not intend to neglect the latter while pursuing the former.

This Government considers our tax reduction and reform program which has recently been approved by one House of the Congress to be the most important action that Congress can take now to improve our long-range position.

It should help attract capital investment, improve our ability to sell goods and services in world markets, stimulate the growth of our economy and the employment of our people, give greater freedom to monetary policy and play a vital supporting role in our determination to achieve equal rights and opportunities for all of our citizens.

In other areas including the interest equalization tax, and the other steps that I have noted, and the forthcoming trade negotiations, we are proceeding in our efforts to bring our payments into balance.

We are proceeding with caution. We are fully aware of the effects of our actions on our friends, but no one should confuse caution with any lack of determination. We are determined to do whatever must be done in the interest of this country and, indeed, in the interest of all to protect the dollar as a convertible currency at its current fixed rate.

We are determined—and I believe in your interest as well as our own—to maintain the firm relationship of gold and the dollar at the present price of $35 an ounce, and I can assure you we will do just that.

PATIENCE REQUIRED

We recognize that the reserve position of other countries is a mirror image of our own; and as the United States moves toward equilibrium, it will be more difficult for others to increase their reserves.

Some nations will be more handicapped than others, but no nation should be forced to make drastic alterations in its domestic and trading policy because of shortrun movements in its reserve position. The United States, therefore, stands ready to support such measures as may be necessary to increase international liquidity.

Patience will be required in working out these matters. The balance of payment is not a problem to be cured by a single all-purpose medicine. Each country is challenged to find the appropriate blend of fiscal, monetary, trade, and other policies that will enable interest to play its proper role in sustaining rather than straining the system of international payments.

But patience is not the enemy of progress, and I think the last 20 years have provided impressive proof of the benefits of international financial cooperation. We are linked so closely together; our economies are tied so intimately. It is so essential that all of our people benefit and prosper that I am confident that you gentlemen who occupy a position of high responsibility, working intimately together, can maintain our system so that we remain its master. For us to move in an opposite direction, of course, would be not only distressing but inimical to our common interest.

The men who gathered at Bretton Woods 20 years ago were criticized by both those who said that no institutions were needed and those who said nothing useful could be done. Their effort and the success which crowned it are a warning both against pessimism and excessive self-satisfaction.

SEES CONTINUED GAIN

Today we all believe in the achievements of intelligent cooperation; and under the wise and imaginative leadership of the Governors here assembled, I feel sure this cooperation can be enlarged and extended.

There is no more important group, it seems to me, in the free world than you gentlemen who are here; no group it seems to me bears greater responsibility. If you are able to conduct your affairs with success, it benefits all of the people all around the globe and, therefore, we regard this meeting as perhaps the most important that takes place in our capital this year.

Your success will make possible all of the great efforts of the free world which have made such an astonishing and, I think, dazzling effect upon international relations and the security of the West. Our role, therefore, I regard as essential, and we believe in the achievements of a determined and intelligent cooperation which will benefit all of our people.

I look forward in the years ahead to continued expansion toward the goal of economic health for all nations, for this goal—second in urgency to the quest for peace, only to the necessity of peace—is surely indispensable to the free world.

Ladies and gentlemen, I greet you with great satisfaction and we wait on your deliberations with great hope and confidence.

Thank you.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 30, 1963]

REFORMS IN FINANCE

The free world's finance ministers and central bankers, assembled in Washington for the annual meetings of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, have reason to be satisfied with the performance of both institutions. Since their creation in 1944 both have responded creatively to the challenges of a fast-changing world. The Bank has been an effective pioneer in the field of development finance; the Fund has taken on the role of mainspring in the world's monetary mechanism, erecting a series of defenses against disruptive currency movements.

After 19 years of growth and success in forging expedients, satisfaction should not give way to complacency. A thorough appraisal of the Fund and Bank, with a view to initiating long-range reforms, is essential. There is no present crisis to preoccupy and distract this effort. Mr. George Wood of the Bank and M. Pierre-Paul Schweitzer of the Fund, the new and able men who took over the heads of their respective institutions during the past year, now have the opportunity to go beyond consolidating the gains of their predecessors.

The Bank ought to expand and strengthen its affiliate, the International Development Association, which makes long-term loans that do not meet the standard required by the Bank itself. An even more vital, and infinitely more difficult, examination confronts the IMF. It must see to it that countries suffering from balance-of-payments problems are given sufficient time to take corrective measures without resort to steps that could either harm internal growth or disrupt world trade. This goal means new arrangements to insure an adequate supply of international liquidity, arrangements that can somehow retain the disciplines imposed by the balance of payments without curbs on growth.

These are ambitious objectives. But ingenuity and boldness have characterized the IMF and the Bank from their beginnings. This is the time to start another examination of the same sweeping nature that led to their birth. They must be prepared to assume far greater responsibilities for maintaining the stable growth of the world economy.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention also to an article in the Sunday edition of the Washington Post written by Prof. Robert Triffin, one of the foremost advocates of reforming the IMF into a world central bank with the power to create credit. The Triffin plan, along with plans proposed by Edward Bernstein, Max Stamp, and the British Chancellor of the Exchecquer Maudling and others, have been widely discussed for years.

In this provocative article Professor Triffin, on the eve of the annual IMF Conference, once again calls for an institution empowered to create international credit to aid world economic growth on a noninflationary basis. Professor Triffin believes that such a central reserve institution would lead to a more rational use of credit than is possible through bilateral and uncoordinated arrangements among central banks.

The IMF by announcing a year-long study of the liquidity question has clearly recognized that the future is close enough to begin a thorough appraisal now. The concurrent study by the 10 leading members lends great weight to this exercise. Without the support and approval of these key countries, particularly the United States, such a study would be meaningless.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Professor Triffin, and a pertinent article from the Wall Street Journal of September 30 be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1963]

FUND WILL CONSIDER FISCAL REFORM STUDY

(By Robert Triffin)

(Professor Triffin, author of "Gold and the Dollar Crisis," is a leading authority on international financial systems. He proposed the European Payments Union in 1947 and negotiated for its subsequent establishment. The Triffin plan, a proposal for endowing the International Monetary Fund with the power to create credit or liquidity, has been the subject of widespread discussion since its appearance in 1959.)

A long overdue proposal for a study of the ways in which the tottering financial system of the Western World may be reformed, will be given top billing this week at the meeting of the International Monetary Fund here.

With so many willing parents, some offspring can be confidently expected, but the pregnancy promises to be long and difficult. There is virtually no danger of premature birth, but rather the opposite. The monetary doctors may find it extremely difficult to eschew entirely the use of tranquilizers. Recent and tragic precedents should warn them, against the temptation to ease their job at the risk of malformation of the child.

Despite such dangers, there are reasons for hope. Considerable progress has been achieved in the last 3 years toward an agreed diagnosis of the problem and even toward a clarification of alternative approaches to a viable solution.

The vulnerability of the present gold exchange standard to speculative capital movements was recognized at the 1961 IMF meeting in Vienna, and a long list of bulwarks have been erected since then to protect it. Secretary Roosa has done an admirable job in steering to success the difficult negotiations that this entailed.

CENTRAL BANKERS CORRECT

The longer run threat posed by a potential shortage of international reserves, or liquidity, is no longer denied, even though central bankers remain somewhat suspicious of its exploitation by politicians seeking in international monetary reforms an escape from the "healthy" disciplines imposed by balance-of-payments pressures upon irresponsible, inflationary, national policies.

About 60 percent of world reserve increases have been fed in the last 5 years by the continuous piling up of dollar balances—U.S. short-term debts, in the hands of foreign central banks. This, plus the U.S. gold losses, accounts for nearly 80 percent of reserve increases outside the United States, which average more than 8 percent a year over the period, and still a much higher rate for the major reserve holders of Western Europe.

Central bankers are correct, therefore, in contending that there is no worldwide shortage of liquidity today and that the most urgent problem is to bring an end to the persistent U.S. deficits of recent years. They now admit, however, that a problem is bound to arise if and when the reequilibration of U.S. payments dries up, at the source, three to four-fifths of the reserves currently created. They insist, on the other hand, that negotiations and agreements on new sources of liquidity creation would be premature, so long as they can be abused in supplementing an already excessive rate of reserve growth, and financing the perpetuation of U.S. deficits.

The Gordian knot will be cut this week by launching a study group on the long-range reforms required for the satisfactory performance of the international monetary system. Actual negotiations and commitments will presumably be postponed, until the elimination of current U.S. deficits transforms the potential liquidity shortage into an actual one.

So far, so good. I see nothing wrong in the tentative agreements outlined above, but I hope that the proposed study will throw further light into some still obscure corners of the great debate.

The first is the link between our current balance-of-payments problem, that of the British, and the question of international monetary reform itself. The sharp reversal of short-term capital movements from large and growing net inflows up to 1959 to even larger and persistent outflows since 1960 accounts for about two-thirds of our recent deficits.

The major—although not the only—factor of explanation undoubtedly lies in the speculative rumors unleashed by the flareup of gold prices in London, in October 1960, and entertained ever since by the enormous and ever-growing size of our short-term indebtedness to central banks. Speculators are far less confident than the experts in the permanence of the cooperative spirit which has restrained so far any massive conversions of such debts into gold, and continue to regard a gold revaluation, or a gold embargo, or exchange controls as a possible—even if not probable—outcome of this situation.

AN ESSENTIAL COMPONENT

International monetary reform should focus initially on a removal of such a threat to the stability of the dollar and to the present structure of world reserves, rather than on increasing present liquidity levels or financing future dollar deficits. The impact of such action on speculative expectations and short-term capital movements would constitute a major contribution to the elimination of these deficits themselves, and should be regarded as an essential component—along with the measures already adopted or announced by the administration—of any program aiming at that objective. Evidence for this diagnosis cannot be presented here, but has been summarized in my recent article in "The Banker" of London.

My greatest concern about the fruitfulness of the forthcoming debate, however, is that the reforms most easily negotiable may avoid the central problem of a rational adaptation of the process of reserve creation to the legitimate needs of the world economy, and perpetuate in fact the root causes of future crises and instability.

To leave the process of reserve creation to be determined by such haphazard factors as gold production in a country threatened by civil war, the whims or policies of the Kremlin, the state of nerves of gold speculators, the size of United States and United Kingdom deficits, and the waves of central bankers' confidence in the dollar or the pound can hardly be the best way to run the world monetary system.

Yet, we shall continue to hear plausible slogans urging us "to prefer evolution to revolution, to build upon existing institutions, etc.," and damning as utopian attempts "to set up a world central bank in advance of a world government" even the most and practicable steps toward a more orderly system of reserve creation. To preserve intact all the present roots of instability in the system, and merely add to them

additional and overlapping gimmicks such as new quota increases, general arrangements to borrow à la Per Jacobsson, bilateral swap agreements and medium-term or nonmarketable currency loans à la Roosa, and mutual currency accounts à la Maudling, would give birth to a thalidomic monster rather than to a healthy and vigorous child susceptible of normal growth in the world of tomorrow.

The alternative to such a dreary prospect is to clarify the main directions along which a rational, long-range solution should be sought, before negotiating the transitional adaptations and compromises that may prove necessary in the short run.

First and foremost, the institutional machinery to be created should make it possible to adjust the overall pace of reserve creation to the full noninflationary potential and requirements of world economic growth.

This would entail the continued use of reserve media other than gold as a component of central bank reserves in proportions that would be geared to legitimate liquidity needs of a growing world economy.

Reserve assets other than gold should not be held, as they are now, in a form that exposes creditors to the risk of unilateral devaluation by debtors, and debtors to the risk of sudden or massive liquidation by the creditors.

Among the many ways in which the principle could be implemented, the simplest—though not necessarily the easiest to negotiate—would be for each country to hold the bulk of its reserves other than gold in the form of deposit balances with the IMF.

This would facilitate the achievement of still another objective of a rational world monetary organization: to use the world's thirst for reserves as a means for providing stabilization and—indirectly—developmental loans in support of national policies that promote noninflationary economic growth. The holding of reserve assets other than gold inevitably entails the granting of credit to the debtor. Deposits held with a central reserve institution would permit a more rational distribution of this lending power than the bilateral, precarious holdings of national currencies through the uncoordinated decisions of several scores of central banks.

DELICATE QUESTIONS

Practical negotiations along these lines will admit—and even require—multiple adjustments to take account of past traditions, institutions, and habits of mind, and also of unyielding, but fast-changing, political realities.

The IMF machinery may prove too rigid, complex and cumbersome to serve as the only channel for the implementation of the above suggestions. Particularly delicate questions would be raised by the management of its vastly expanded lending capacity, especially in view of the small voting power wielded in its executive board by the major creditor countries of Western Europe. Moreover, the development of the European Economic Community is most likely to entail major institutional changes in the European monetary system, and similar trends may also accompany the development of regional economic cooperation in Latin America, Africa, etc.

A decentralization of the IMF machinery would overcome both of these difficulties. The Paris agreements of last year may give a cue to the institutional framework most likely to prove acceptable in the forthcoming negotiations. An agreement among major reserve holders—particularly the United States, the European Community, and the United Kingdom as leader of the sterling system—would encompass the bulk of world reserves, and serve as an anchor—and a model—for the arrangements to follow with other countries.

The forthcoming debate will be dominated by the necessity for reaching a compromise between the initial negotiating positions of the reserve currency countries—the United States and the United Kingdom—on the one hand, and the major reserve currency holders of continental Europe, on the other.

The Posthuma plan, on which EEC discussions have been centered for the past year, might provide the most reasonable way to guarantee the key-currency countries against sudden liquidation of their debts while protecting the holders against the arbitrariness and inflationary potential of the present system. It would, however, have to be pruned of its excessive automation which makes it so objectionable—and rightly so—to most central bankers, and the complexity of which led one of them to describe it as requiring the setting up of an "electronic" exchange standard.

Any such agreement among the major industrial powers would certainly be beneficial to other countries as well, but some effort should be made to avoid a mere logrolling exercise and the conflicts of interest in which it might bog down. Some uninstructed delegates, jointly appointed by other countries, might help elevate the debate and focus it on the long-range requirements of the world at large, as well as on those of the major creditors and debtors of the outworn key-currency system.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 30, 1963]

WORLD BANK, IMF OFFICIALS FACE THREE BIG ISSUES AT JOINT CONFERENCE THIS WEEK

WASHINGTON.—More than 700 finance chiefs from the United States and other non-Communist countries meet here this week to swap opinions on three big and largely unrelated questions having to do with money:

Can the United States cure its balance-of-payments deficit, and if so, how soon?

U.S. dollar ills aside, what, if anything, ought to be done to strengthen the free world's collective defenses against crippling international payments problems now only dimly foreseeable?

What new wrinkles can be devised for spurring the flow of investment from industrial nations to the underdeveloped areas of the world?

LITTLE POSITIVE ACTION EXPECTED

Very little in the way of positive, formal action on these issues is expected from the 5-day joint annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and its affiliates which gets underway here today. The two organizations will admit enough new members to bring their membership over the 100 figure and will expand their governing boards to provide representation for the new nations admitted. Both will also hear for the first time from new figures taking over top jobs, and President Kennedy will address the organizations today.

But there also will be enough significant public policy declarations, enough candid conversation in hotel corridors, and enough specific, if informal, action to influence the course of future international financial collaborations in a number of meaningful ways.

In conjunction with the meeting, the United States and nine other key industrial nations are expected to announce a year-long study of the need to reform existing international payments mechanisms to insure adequate "liquidity" for expanding international trade and continued economic growth without constant interruption by balance-of-payment deficits. Liquidity is the total supply of gold, convertible currencies and credit in central banks.

Simultaneously, the IMF disclosed it will conduct its own liquidity study. The fund's new managing director, former Bank of France official Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, said the IMF will spend "a great part of the coming year" studying the payments question.

OPTIMISTIC REPORTS EXPECTED

To improve the climate for these studies, President Kennedy and Treasury Secretary Dillon are expected to give reasonably optimistic reports on American efforts to halt the excess in U.S. payments overseas over receipts of all kinds from foreign countries. This balance-of-payments deficit threatens U.S. gold holdings by placing in foreign countries dollars which can be turned in for the metal. Officials said preliminary estimates of the payments trend in the third quarter indicate some improvement from the $5.2 billion annual rate of the second quarter, by far the worst of any period during the current 4-year-old dollar crisis.

The United States is sensitive to suggestions that it might be pushing for reform of the international payments system as a means of obtaining emergency help for the dollar. Mr. Kennedy probably will stress that a variety of U.S. internal measures are counted on to reverse the payments trend well before the international financial community could get around to overhauling the monetary fund or creating new instruments for international currency bolstering.

The likelihood is that a good deal of controversy will develop not only over the course of the U.S. payments problem but also over the need for further measures to improve the international machinery. European central bankers make no secret of their view that the United States ought to practice still greater internal discipline, through higher interest rates or other measures, to restrain the dollar outflow. Only Britain, Japan, and, more cautiously, the United States have indicated much support for serious efforts to revamp current payments procedures and mechanisms.

The current outlook is for arguments on these questions to get underway in earnest as a 10-nation group gets down to studying the matter formally. This group, embracing the United States, Canada, Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Japan, is a sort of industrial elite within the IMF; 2 years ago it combined to create a $6 billion supplemental reserve to enlarge the IMF's capacity for bailing out member nations suffering payments difficulties.

A key element in the coming year of study is certain to be the role played by Mr. Schweitzer, a lean, intense career Government financier who succeeded the late Per Jacobsson earlier this year. Mr. Schweitzer plainly leans toward the side of the more conservative elements, including the management of the IMF itself, which believes that present facilities for expanding liquidity are ample for as far ahead as anyone can see. But he indicated in a press conference his view is that there isn't any harm in studying the matter.

IDLE RESERVES

The third question confronting the Bank and delegates involves what might be called an excess of liquidity—the nearly $1 billion in idle reserves piling up at a steady rate at the World Bank. This institution lends money for economic development and promotes technical assistance for economic planning by backward nations. It also operates an affiliate, called the International Development Association, created to lend money to hard-pressed emerging nations on much more lenient terms than the Bank.

The World Bank's new chief, former banker George Woods, circulated to Bank officialdom in advance of the meeting a memorandum raising the question of whether the Bank's reserves aren't larger than needed as protection against defaults and, if so, how this

money could be put to better use. The Bank's less developed members are eager to to see it made available somehow on the easiest possible terms. Many Europeans would have liked to have seen some of this money turned over to IDA, instead of requiring the Association's more industrialized members to put up more money this year to keep it in business. But the decision was made for the United States and other IDA countries to raise another $750 million to finance the organization over the next 3 years. And so the question remains what to do with the World Bank reserves.

Mr. Woods apparently is interested in expanding the Bank's lending role to permit it to lend to private industry; it does have yet another offshoot, the International Finance Corporation, which lends to private industry on a modest scale and only with a guarantee of the loan by the government concerned. Mr. Woods is said to think in terms of a change in the Bank's charter to allow it to lend to private industry without a government guarantee. There is talk too of widening the Bank's area of operation, to include education, for example; at present the Bank deals almost wholly with large-scale economic development projects such as dams, ports, or irrigation projects. Although the Bank isn't likely to make any decisions this week, it is, like the IMF, likely to allot more time to intensive study of its major problems.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, ONONDAGA COUNTY, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Onondaga County, N.Y., favoring the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1963.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 303 DIRECTING THE CHAIRMAN OF THE ONONDAGA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO FORWARD A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963 TO SENATOR JACOB JAVITS, SENATOR KENNETH KEATING, AND REPRESENTATIVE R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

Whereas the Board of Supervisors of Onondaga County has consistently sought to promote civil rights; and

Whereas racial justice is the goal of our democracy, and this goal has not been fully realized in our county, State, and Nation: and

Whereas civil rights laws have been effective in our State, and civil rights laws to define and promote proper moral courses of action between people of different races, creeds, and color; and

Whereas we members of the legislative body of Onondaga County wish to promote in every way possible civil rights in our county, State, and Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we of the Onondaga County Board of Supervisors support in principle the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1963, which seeks "to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a community relations service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes"; and be it further

Resolved, That we as the legislative body of Onondaga County request our Federal legislative representatives, Senator JACOB JAVITS, Senator KENNETH KEATING, and Representative R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, to actively support in principle the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1963 and to vote for the legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senator JACOB JAVITS, Senator KENNETH KEATING, and Representative R. WALTER RIEHLMAN by the chairman of the Onondaga County Board of Supervisors; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the members of the Onondaga County Board of Supervisors, shall actively support in principle this legislation and foster the provisions of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1963 in our own county and thus rededicate ourselves to the cause of civil rights.

I, Frank W. Conway, do hereby certify that the foregoing was duly adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Onondago County, N.Y., this 3d day of September 1963, a quorum being present. Witness my hand and the seal of this board this 4th day of September 1963.

FRANK W. CONWAY,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Onondaga County, N.Y.

PREJUDICE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, today is October 1. Neither House of this Congress has yet acted on the one legislative proposal which appeals to the conscience of America—a proposal which seeks to guarantee the right of every American to a vote, to an education, to employment, and to service in public places throughout the Nation without arbitrary discrimination.

This legislation seeks to provide the equality of treatment and of opportunity for all our citizens which was intended in the Emancipation Proclamation, the 14th and 15th amendments, and the 1954 Supreme Court decision.

We cannot continue to respect ourselves, nor be respected by others, until each American enjoys an equal opportunity to make his full contribution to the future—until ours is truly one Nation with liberty and justice for all.

The final solution to this pressing national problem will require the full cooperation of every branch and level of government and of every citizen.

In a recent issue of the Baltimore Sun, there appeared a report of an interview with Senator DANIEL INOUYE, my colleague from Hawaii.

Mr. President, I found this article interesting and moving. It has occurred to me that the experience of the people of Hawaii in the successful integration of many races and strains, can teach us much in our effort to find solutions to the very difficult problems which exist in others of the 50 States.

I take this opportunity to pay tribute to our newest State for its achievement in this area. I am proud to have served in both House and Senate with my good friend and Hawaii's distinguished representative, DAN INOUYE.

I ask that the report of his interview referred to above be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

PREJUDICE: THERE'S NO WORD FOR RACE IN HAWAII

(By Muriel Dobbin)

In the Hawaiian vocabulary there is no word for race. To the Hawaiian—who may be of Oriental, Polynesian, Korean, European, or Filipino ancestry—a man is simply light or dark.

"They would describe a Negro as one with the color of a blackberry, and this would be meant as a friendly description," said Honolulu-born Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE, of Hawaii, which he believes to be the most peacefully integrated State in the Union.

The Senator, who is the first American of Japanese ancestry to sit in Congress, displayed Oriental tranquility and patience as he compared the racial problems in other States with those remaining in Hawaii.

Settling in an armchair in his office on Capitol Hill, Senator INOUYE dexteriously lit a cigarette with his left hand. He lost his right arm during combat in France and Italy in World War II; he enlisted as a private and rose to captain. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, Bronze Star, and Purple Heart with two oak-leaf clusters.

HAWAII'S MIXTURE

The Democrat from Hawaii admits he misses his native State, and it is one of his favorite topics of conversation. "I am not claiming that Hawaii is a racial paradise," he emphasized, "but I feel that we have taken more steps toward better understanding than any other section of the United States.

"To say that the Hawaiian population is a mixture is an understatement. It consists of about 40 percent Japanese, Chinese, and Filipino, 35 percent European origin, 25 percent Polynesian, some Puerto Ricans, and only 1 percent Negroes—yet our first woman mayor is a Negro.

A FORM OF SEGREGATION

"Hawaii has come a long way, when you think of the conglomeration of people we have. They did not come from the elite classes of their respective ethnic groups, either. My maternal grandparents came to Hawaii to work as field hands, laboring long hours for small wages. This situation applied to many of those who came to Hawaii. So there was a large segment of the society made up of men and women who were ill educated, of little means, and who had been brought up in a tradition of class segregation."

There had been clashes between the different groups in Hawaii, he conceded. "But this was usually brought about by the language barrier, and by fears, usually those unfounded fears which are the cause of prejudice. When people don't know another group, they fear it."

At one time the Hawaiian school system was virtually segregated, although not in the same manner as schools in some mainland communities, he recalled. "Our so-called segregated schools were known as English standard schools. They were supported by public funds, but admission required that children pass both a written and an oral examination, which made it almost impossible for youngsters of a plantation background, whose parents still spoke their native tongue."

Beginning in the early 1940's, it took Hawaii about 12 years to develop a truly integrated school system, said Senator INOUYE, and this was done gradually, class by class, year by year. "It was the judgment of the authorities that to integrate the schools abruptly at that time would have been chaotic," he explained.

LABOR RIOTS YEARS AGO

The Senator gazed thoughtfully at the aquarium of tropical fish in a corner of his office. "We had race riots of sorts in Hawaii, back in the early 1900's, when one ethnic group was pitted against the other in labor strikes," he recollected. "But you must keep in mind that due to the political situation elsewhere, the Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans were natural enemies at that time."

Senator INOUYE's infrequent but warm smile appeared as he spoke of what he considered one of the most important factors leading to the present almost complete integration in Hawaii. "The Polynesians," he said affectionately, "are a remarkable people, and we owe them so much.

"They have one great virtue, and that is love. The word 'aloha,' which we consider most sacred, means not only hello and goodby, but also 'I love you.' These are people who practice love. If you are a stranger yet are hungry, they will give you the last morsel of food from their icebox and open their home to you. This feeling of brotherly love has slowly spread through the community in general."

INTERMARRIAGE AND EDUCATION

The Polynesians were living in the same circumstances and coping with the same problems of lack of education, fear, and poverty, he said, yet they were willing to share with everyone. "As a result, we have few pure Hawaiians. They were the first to intermarry—white, yellow, black, or brown, to them it was not distasteful. It was a good thing."

Another contributory factor to Hawaiian integration was the educational system, he added. "Ours might not be the finest, but it provided education for children whose parents and grandparents had never had it. That played a great role in bringing about understanding."

The Senator became nostalgic. "I had a happy childhood," he said. "Perhaps one reason was that it was a more simple life than that of many children today. That aquarium, for example. When I was a kid, if I wanted an aquarium, I went to a stream for a fish or two, begged an empty mayonnaise jar from the grocer, and that was my aquarium."

STILL SOME PREJUDICE

Friendship on an integrated basis was another of the intangible lessons he learned as a child. "In school I sat next to kids who were Chinese, Hawaiian, Filipino, European, and Puerto Rican. We got to know each other pretty well. That way you don't have fears about people," he said.

There is still some racial prejudice in Hawaii, he admitted. "But much of it is individually suppressed. The people of Hawaii are gentle by nature; perhaps they are more sensitive to the feelings of others. There are, for instance, no signs in restaurants which refuse admission to certain persons."

The Senator's introduction to southern segregation came when he spent 13 months in Army training in Mississippi during World War II. He still remembers the day that his company commander addressed the regiment. "He said it distressed him to have to tell us this, and he knew it would distress us to hear it. He knew we in that regiment—the men were all Americans of Japanese ancestry—were fighting two battles, one against nazism, and the other to combat prejudice and prove that Americanism was a matter of mind and heart, and not of color or race."

BACKS KENNEDY ON RIGHTS

"But he had to tell us that the Mississippi authorities had decided to consider us as white, so when we saw signs reading 'white' and 'colored,' we should follow the former. He added that however we felt, we should remember we had to win the battle against nazism first."

Senator INOUYE, stressing his support for President Kennedy's civil rights legislation, said he believed the people of Hawaii could demonstrate that the mixing and integration of all kinds of persons was not something to be feared.

But he felt strongly that, in the end, integration must be achieved through the efforts and wishes of the people. "You cannot continually depend on legislation to solve problems. That can go only so far, and after that you must leave it to community action."

For example, he said, if the public accommodations provision became law, restaurants would be forced to admit Negroes. "But they are still likely to be shown to a table beside the kitchen door, and to receive slow service and cold soup. When people become accustomed to seeing them, they will lose that hidden fear which is at the root of much prejudice. Then the headwaiter will begin putting the Negro at a table next to the dance floor."

ADDRESS BY DANIEL F. FOLEY, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Daniel Foley, the newly elected national commander of the American Legion, delivered an inspiring acceptance speech at the Legion national convention recently concluded at Miami Beach, Fla.

He reaffirmed the faith of the Legion that—

> Governments are instituted among men to promote peace and to preserve the inalienable rights of man as a creature of God.

Calling attention to the American Legion as one of the great stabilizing factors in American life, he noted well that—

> History has revealed to us time and again that the course of extremism, either to the right or to the left, is the course of failure.

In recent years, we have heard much about discovering American goals. Such statements often are made as if we do not have any goals, and will have to manufacture some. Therefore, I applaud very much Dan Foley's emphasis on the point that the task is one of rededication and rediscovery "of America herself in the light of her great history." Mr. Foley noted well that the "problems of yesterday are not necessarily the problems of today or tomorrow."

The problems are indeed new; but the basic ideals of America and its goals of peace with justice, the achievement of security with freedom, and the exercise of power with compassion, are as sound for today and tomorrow as they were for yesterday.

With wise caution that we must remember that communism has not abandoned its aims of conquering the world with its ideology, and that we must maintain a strong moral and material guard against it, Mr. Foley expressed a hope for progress. Speaking of the nuclear test ban treaty, he said:

> It would * * * be our fondest hope that the Soviets have entered into this agreement in all sincerity and that they will live by its terms. We would hope that it might even lead to the exploration of other areas of agreement to further ease the cold war tensions.

His message of "hope" while "keeping our powder dry" is good advice.

There are many passages of sound advice, thoughtful reflection, and inspirational dedication in Mr. Foley's address, which I commend to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY DANIEL F. FOLEY

My fellow Legionnaires, for me, this is the most thrilling moment of my life, and I cannot find words to adequately express my deep gratitude and appreciation for the devoted assistance of my many, many wonderful friends in the ranks of the American Legion who have helped to make this moment a reality for me.

I also believe this to be a moment of truth for me—for I have campaigned for the high office of national commander of the American Legion for some 2 years. During this period I have been telling my fellow Legionnaires how I will propose to discharge the great responsibilities which accompany this office. The time for talking is over—the time for action is at hand.

I am proud for my department, I am grateful to all of you who have afforded me this opportunity to serve. I am humble in the knowledge of the tremendous work to be done this year, and I am confident that with your help and with God's guidance that it shall be done.

This convention of the greatest of all veterans' organizations, which now draws to a close, has given me direction for the year ahead. By your deliberations and the mandates which we have adopted here, I believe we have given all of America new cause to look to the American Legion to chart a true course along the path toward preservation of our basic freedoms and the great American heritage that is ours.

We have here reaffirmed our faith that governments are instituted among men to promote peace and to preserve the inalienable rights of man as a creature of God. We have here, through the various resolutions of our several commissions, determined what we believe to be the most effective policies for achieving the objectives of all of our fine action programs which have proven their worth through the years—not only for the benefit of the veteran population, but for the benefit of all Americans.

History has revealed to us time and again that the course of extremism, either to the right or to the left is the course of failure, and that to follow such a course has brought about the downfall of many men, of many governments, yes, even of entire civilizations. During my formative years, as I watched the activities of the American Legion in my home community, then in my early years as an American Legionnaire observing the work of my own post and its members, I became thoroughly convinced that this was the type of organization with which to cast my personal lot if I wished to offer some tangible service to my God, to my country, and to my fellow man.

I firmly believe this American Legion of ours to be the greatest stabilizing factor in America today, and I believe that through close adherence to the principles, policies and programs of the American Legion that America and the free world will be better prepared to fight and to win the struggle with the forces of atheistic communism.

The American Legion has a glorious past and an even brighter future, and I pledge to you my very best efforts to help us to realize that bright future. We have not even scratched the surface of our potential, and within the next 2 weeks I will be off on a

tour of 21 regional membership conferences to help convince other eligible veterans that we can do well with their help in this endless battle to keep forever free the land they already have fought to protect.

It is my fondest hope that this year may mark the beginning of a new era in the life of the Legion where courageous men and women with brave hearts rededicate themselves to service in the high cause of freedom. We shall realize that objective if we, as Legionnaires, remain true to the principles which brought us together nearly 45 years ago.

I look forward to my term of office as a year of rededication—a year of rediscovery, if you will, not just of the principles of the Legion, but a year of rediscovery of America herself in the light of her great history and of action to safeguard and preserve our priceless heritage in these momentous times in which we live.

The problems of yesterday, Legionnaires, are not necessarily the problems of today or tomorrow. Yet, if we are aware of our past we cannot help but be better prepared to live today and to face tomorrow. The solutions to the problems of yesterday may not be applicable to the problems of today, but knowledge of the past and the sacrifice that was required to solve the problems of other eras will give us new wisdom and courage to cope successfully with the problems of our own times. A rediscovery of America and of ourselves is, I believe, an essential element to successful living today.

The American Legion constantly is rediscovering itself through a continual process of reevaluating the problems with which we are concerned in order that we may approach those problems on a realistic basis, in keeping with our times, and that we may make a constructive contribution to the growth of our free society.

First, and most importantly, we must concern ourselves with the preservation of that society and history has taught us that, in order to do so, the Nation's defenses must be maintained at adequate strength and the very finest quality to deter the threat of aggression.

Because the Soviet Union has been willing to become a party to a partial nuclear test ban is no evidence that communism has abandoned its long pronounced objective of world conquest. It simply means that, for the time being, it does not best serve the cause of communism to engage in an all-out nuclear arms race.

It would, of course, be our fondest hope that the Soviets have entered into this agreement in all sincerity and that they will live by its terms. We would hope that it might even lead to the exploration of other areas of agreement to further ease the cold war tensions. This we will believe when it comes to pass for the Communist record of shattered treaties and agreements is one of the most infamous in the annals of international relations.

Again we are reminded of our past and of a famed quotation from history as we look to the solution to a modern day problem. The quote I have in mind is "Keep your powder dry."

In our day this simply means the maintenance of defensive forces unsurpassed by any potential attacker. This is a policy that the American Legion has advocated since our founding days—it would have served us well in other days. This is the policy which the American Legion advocates today, for it will serve America well today.

The Communists have shown no inclination to decrease pressures now being applied to our sister republics to the south. Red Cuba, just some 90 miles from where we are gathered, is the springboard for introduction of propaganda, sabotage, and potential open revolt in some areas of the hemisphere. This can mean only that America must exert her best efforts to maintain hemispheric solidarity, and the American Legion believes this can best be achieved by the elimination of Fidel Castro and his government.

Our defenses must go beyond the military and into the area of people, for they must be designed to last beyond the lifetime of this audience. The American Legion, through its great Americanism programs, seeks to build a stalwart citizenry for tomorrow.

We believe that if we give our youth the proper guidance that they will discover the basic principles for which America stands while we are rediscovering them for ourselves, and that in so doing they will find the will and the way to defend the freedoms we solemnly pledge that they shall inherit from us.

We cannot and we shall not abandon our sacred obligation to defend and preserve the rights and privileges of the widows and orphans of our deceased comrades. We shall continue to fight for them as we shall carry on the battle on behalf of the disabled veteran and those who by reason of advancing years can no longer adequately discharge their responsibilities to their loved ones. Our legislative-rehabilitation program must be geared to meet the changing needs of the veteran population.

The problem of the aged and aging veteran may well be one of the most serious with which we have ever come to grips in the entire history of our rehabilitation program. But we propose to meet this problem head on, and one of our high priority objectives of the coming year will be the establishment of a Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

All these great ideals, my friends, will have no tangible value if we should lose our freedoms, and as your national commander for the coming year, I commit our organization to this pledge.

"Though the forces of atheistic communism may beat with all their fury on the breasts of liberty, this Nation shall endure strong in justice. This Nation shall prosper, rich in compassion. This Nation shall stand down through the corridors of time, secure in freedom."

May each of us as individuals and as an organization so conduct our lives and affairs that we might continue to contribute significantly to the high cause of freedom. In so doing, we shall glorify God, bring honor to our country, and contribute to the establishment of a just and lasting peace throughout the world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MRS. ELIZABETH G. MASON—EXTENSION OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 3369.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3369) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the report issued yesterday by the Commission on Civil Rights is another major contribution to better understanding of the Nation's civil rights problems.

The chronicle of civil rights denials set forth in the Commission's report makes it evident that monumental challenges still lie ahead in the struggle to make the promises of the Constitution a reality for all Americans.

The Commission can be of tremendous assistance in the future in helping America overcome these injustices. This report, like the others the distinguished members of the Commission have presented, is compelling evidence of the need for a permanent extension of the Commission and enactment of a meaningful civil rights bill during this session of Congress.

One shocking fact revealed in this report is the extent to which the Federal Government continues to subsidize segregation. I strongly endorse the Commission's plea to the President that he direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and other agencies to insist upon and enforce a policy of nondiscrimination in all federally assisted programs. It is unconscionable and unconstitutional for Federal officials to approve the expenditure of Federal tax funds in any manner which makes the Federal Government a silent partner of segregation.

This aspect of the Commission's report illustrates the important function it has served as a civil rights watchdog. Almost every Federal agency has an internal control system for accounting purposes, but many agencies have been extremely lax in making an accounting to the Commission for the way they handle Federal funds. The Commission has repeatedly called attention to this situation, in its present report and in its previous reports.

In doing so, it may have upset some officials who do not want to be distracted by the Constitution in spending the taxpayers' money. The Commission's report should be required reading for everyone of these officials, and I hope the President will see fit to issue the directives recommended by the Commission.

Let us also take heed in the Congress of the urgent conditions which exist and give this subject of civil rights the prompt and diligent attention it deserves. This report makes it obvious that we have already delayed action beyond any reasonable period and that we must give civil rights the highest priority in the days ahead.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending amendment, to extend the life of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for 1 year. The subject has been debated, and Senators understand it well. However, I wish to make three points, which to me are critically important.

First, in Congress we talk about staffing congressional committees adequately, to give them an opportunity to dig into the processes of government in order to do their job intelligently and adequately. When we have an opportunity like this, in an extremely complex field, with an enormous range of details which

must be analyzed and digested and authoritatively set forth in such a critical issue as this, which the Civil Rights Commission does for us, we certainly should not jettison it. The Commission represents one of the finest staff agencies in the Federal Government that Congress has formed to find the facts in an authoritative way.

Second, I value it highly because it has southern members. It is extremely important that the tradition of having southern members on the Commission which was established by President Eisenhower, be carried on by President Kennedy and by succeeding Presidents; so that when we get a report from the Commission, we will have in it the southern point of view as well.

One of the most gratifying things about the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's report, which it is required to make at the close of its term, and which we received yesterday, is that it is unanimous. The southern members are distinguished men in their own communities. I refer to President Storey, of the Southwestern Legal Foundation at Dallas, Tex., and Chairman Rankin, of the Political Science Department of Duke University. In their unanimous report, they say:

> Finally, we must state that survival of the honorable doctrine of States rights imposes coterminous obligations. It is shortsighted indeed to force citizens of the State to look to the Central Government alone for vindication of rights about which there is no substantial disagreement. As we have said on so many occasions: Civil rights carry with them civil responsibilities. So, too, States rights carry with them State obligations to all its citizens.

Here is expressed what is the basis of the argument made by people like myself: If it is said that there should not be Federal legislation on civil rights because the States will look after their own, including the rights of citizens as citizens of the United States, the answer is that for 110 years the States have gone the other way, in endeavoring to pursue segregation themselves with State laws which are unconstitutional.

There are southerners on the Commission. I hope there will always be. This is a very good thing in terms of fair evaluation of the facts which are found, and the determination of what the American people ought to do in the light of the facts.

Third, all of us have faith in the conscience of the country. Without regard to my own civil rights views or to the views of any other Senators, I hazard the guess that all Senators, even from States which consider segregation a part of their social order or social pattern, have faith in the conscience of the country and in the sense of fairplay of the American people in their dedication to the ideals of freedom and justice.

This issue cannot be acted on without having the facts available. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is the one agency which in a consolidated way can ascertain and digest the facts.

The Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice does not stand in this place. It is, essentially, a prosecuting agency, as it should be. A prosecutor cannot make a complete analysis of the facts. It cannot engage in hearings. It must save its materials for the courts. On many occasions it cannot disclose the things that it has found, because for a prosecutor to do so would be contrary to the canons of legal ethics. It is not an agency which can give to the public information upon which the public conscience and the public judgment can act.

This is critical to our country. In my opinion, there are two ways of attaining justice in terms of segregation and discrimination; one is by law, and the other is by an aroused conscience on the part of the American people. In order to act intelligently, in the American tradition, the American public must have the facts. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission has done an extraordinary job in digesting and putting forward the facts. In addition, it has given skillful consideration to its recommendations. The report issued by the Civil Rights Commission is one of the most extraordinary documents I have ever seen issued by any governmental agency.

To bear out what I mean about the conscience of the citizen, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement issued by 53 Birmingham lawyers in regard to the tense situation in that city. In part, they said:

> A citizen's obligation to obey the law cannot be modified by an election or by personal preferences because the law exists to protect all—minority and majority alike.

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

FIFTY-THREE LAWYERS URGE BIRMINGHAM AMITY

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., September 28.—Fifty-three Birmingham lawyers issued a public statement today calling for obedience to decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court and an end to violence.

The statement said that a decision by the Supreme Court was "the law and must be obeyed." It went on:

"A citizen's obligation to obey the law cannot be modified by an election or by personal preferences because the law exists to protect all—minority and majority alike."

Most of those signing the statement were young lawyers who have successfully campaigned for a change in the city government and are known here as the more liberal members of the Birmingham bar. However, a few older, more conservative lawyers were among the signers. The signers made up about one-sixth of all white lawyers in Birmingham.

COURT RULING CITED

The statement followed several weeks of racial violence and bombings here. It referred specifically to a decision on September 6 by U.S. Circuit Judge Walter P. Gewin.

The judge overturned a petition supported by Gov. George C. Wallace asking that school integration in Birmingham be rescinded because of the possibility of violence.

The statement said:

"The rule of law is essential to our way of life. The law as announced in decisions of the courts is sometimes unpopular. In America the public has the right, protected by our courts, to criticize court decisions.

"Each of us has on occasion felt that a particular case should have been decided differently, but whether we agree or disagree with the result, in each case the Court decision is the law and must be obeyed.

"The Supreme Court of the United States is the highest in our judicial system and its decisions upon questions arising under the Constitution are the law.

"As Judge Walter P. Gewin of Tuscaloosa states in his opinion of September 6, 'the question is now not approval or disapproval of the law but whether the law and order and educational practices will prevail over violence.'

"As lawyers we subscribe to the following principles:

"No man is above the law.

"Courts cannot permit violence or delay or deceit of the law.

"Without law and obedience to its rule neither this city nor this State nor this Nation can survive.

"A citizen's obligation to obey the law cannot be modified by an election or by his personal preference because the law exists to protect all, minority and majority alike."

Following are the names of the lawyers who signed the statement:

J. Vernon Patrick, Jr., George Eyuard, Jr., Thomas C. Majjar, Jr., Charles Majjar, Ervin H. Levy, William W. Conwell, David N. Brooks, James L. Permutt, E. M. Friend, Jr., Karl B. Friedman, John S. Foster, Douglas P. Wingo, Charles Nice, Jr., Jerome A. Cooper, George B. Longshore, Don M. Jones, George R. Stuart 3d.

Also, Shuford B. Smyer, George A. Mitchell, Richard Bite, A. Berkowitz, Eugene Zeidmen, Izas Bahakel, George Whitcher, Claire A. Witcher, Marvin Cherner, W. F. Pritchard, Bruce Robertson 3d, Robert H. Loeb, Paul Johnston, Frank Dominick, Manly Yerlding, George Taylor, Kenneth Howell.

Also, Arnold Lefkobits, William A. Jackson, C. H. Erskine Smith, Charles A. Speir, A. Lamar Reid, David Vann, William G. West, Jr., Harold Apolonsky, Charles Cleveland, Eric Embry, James Fullan, Ray Lange, Stanford Skinner, Perry Asman, Robert S. Gordon, Sam Tannenbaum, Ed Ledford, and Robert Esdale.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, that is the way in which the American mind can determine what it wants to see our Government do. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission is absolutely indispensable to that process.

Finally, there is no glossing over the fact—and even an empty Senate Chamber does not gloss over it, because it is pretty well taken for granted that this measure will pass—that the situation is extremely tense so far as the civil rights struggle is concerned. We are really engaged in a battle of forces. Will the forces of Government act in time, and effectively enough, so that the people will not feel that they must take the law into their own hands and repair to the streets instead of to the courts?

This process must be couched in terms which make it practical, terms which relate themselves to experience and to the question whether what little we have already done is adequate or successful, even to a limited extent, or whether it is inadequate. In all these respects the U.S. Civil Rights Commission is extremely important.

First, the Commission gives us in its latest report an evaluation of what our laws to secure the voting right have meant. We find that they have not meant very much.

In 5 years the amount of participation by Negroes in voting has risen from 5.1 to 8.3 percent in 100 counties in the South, where a survey was made to determine whether the provisions

with respect to the right to vote were adequate as they were extended to Negroes.

In the same report the Commission covers a wide range of other matters and gives practical recommendations for legislation upon which Congress can act, with the knowledge that they have not appeared yesterday, and based upon factual considerations that have been tried out in the field. That is an indispensable service to Congress and to the Nation. I do not know what we would do without the Civil Rights Commission. It even seems to me it is just as essential for those who are against civil rights legislation as it is for those who favor it to have such a commission, so that there may be an authoritative statement at the highest Government level as to what are the facts and what ought to be the remedies.

I end as I began upon this subject. I observe again that distinguished southerners serve on the Commission. I am sure that southerners will continue to occupy an important place on the Commission. This is an extremly vital challenge to the Commission's work. It is extremely vital to the country to have this opinion asserted on such critical questions.

In view of my long-term support for the Commission, I am proud to see in the report this year that in the large group of recommendations and important conclusions of fact the Commission is unanimous, including the views of the southern members.

I hope that shortly the Senate will extend the Commission for at least 1 year. Personally, I think it is a great mistake to extend the Commission for only 1 year. I think it should be extended for a few months, and then have the question of its permanent establishment and its expanded powers considered when the entire civil rights question is debated. As it is, the Commission is neither fish nor fowl. Nevertheless, it is essential that the Commission be continued.

Last night a plea was addressed to the employees of the Commission not to quit; that the Commission and the country need them.

Therefore, if this 1-year extension is the best we can get—and apparently it is, at this stage—without prejudicing the fight which is coming on the omnibus civil rights bill, to make the agency permanent and to strengthen its powers, I hope the Senate will approve the amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I opposed the creation of the Civil Rights Commission as provided for in the Civil Rights Act of 1957. I likewise opposed a 2-year extension of the Commission which was granted in 1959. Even more emphatically did I oppose an additional 2-year extension of the life of the Commission enacted by Congress in 1961. Today we are confronted with two amendments to H.R. 3369, an act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason. One amendment purports to make permanent the Civil Rights Commission in the executive branch of the Government and to vastly broaden the scope of its duties. The other amendment would extend its life for 1 year, without any change in its duties and powers. I am opposed to both of these amendments, particularly in regard to the first. In my judgment, it is essential that this Senate take a long and considered look at the implications behind the amendment before it takes any precipitant action either to extend the life of the Commission for a time certain, or forever, and to give to it these new, novel, and all-comprehensive additional powers and duties.

Leaving aside for a moment any consideration of the so-called civil rights issue, the establishment and development of the Civil Rights Commission presents one of the most perfect examples of how the seeds of Federal bureaucracy are first planted and then grow and develop into a labyrinth of tentacles that extend the Federal power into every area of human relationship in the life of individual citizens of this country. The day is fast coming when no individual in the United States can hope to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as guaranteed by our Constitution without having some Federal agency or agent holding the hand and looking over the shoulder of the private citizen, the business establishment, or the corporation and telling one and all exactly what he can and cannot do to enjoy "freedom and liberty" under our system of government. The big brothers of bureaucracy are intent upon regimenting and straitjacketing the economic, political, and even the social life of every State and community throughout the length and breadth of this country. The Civil Rights Commission has demonstrated beyond question, by its past activities, that if it becomes a permanent agency it will develop into the greatest irritant ever designed in modern Federal bureaucracy.

Consider, Mr. President, the simple language investing the powers and duties of the Commission as originally founded:

(1) Investigate allegations in writing under oath or affirmation that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote and have that vote counted by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin; which writing, under oath or affirmation, shall set forth the facts upon which such belief or beliefs are based;

(2) study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; and

(3) appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

These powers and duties were contained in an act which was concerned solely and alone with providing means of further securing and protecting the right to vote. It is crystal clear from the legislative history of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 that if this Commission had a primary duty, that duty was to concern itself with investigating allegations, under oath or affirmation, regarding the deprivation of so-called voting rights. The Commission in its 6 years of existence has roamed so far afield from its original purpose that it is sometimes hard to recognize the baby that was born in 1957. Its reports to the President and the Congress have covered a universal list of subjects and areas ranging from the ownership and control by an individual citizen of his own private property or private business, through employment practices of individuals and corporations; the lending policies and practices of practically every kind and character of financial institution in the United States, to a complete social integration of the white and colored people in these United States.

The membership of the Commission, which once had some degree of balance as to the divergent points of view held by many in this country, both on basic issues of constitutional law and the differences of opinion held by individuals in regard to fundamental social, economic, and political issues, has now developed into a cohesive unit which spews forth an unending series of fantastic and unconstitutional recommendations which would destroy our republican form of government as we have known and enjoyed it since the founding of our country. It now proposes to receive legal sanction for the unauthorized activities in which it has previously engaged by adding to its existing powers:

(4) Serve as a national clearinghouse for information and provide advice and technical assistance to Government agencies, communities, industries, organizations, or individuals in respect to equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, transportation, and the administration of justice.

I submit, Mr. President, that the powers contained in the above carry with them the blueprint for the complete socialization of this country, and will result in this Commission attempting to completely regiment the daily life and activity of every citizen of every State; every local official, and every corporate and business enterprise. The vanity and conceit of these Commission members and their staff is beyond human comprehension. From their own words they consider themselves to be the fountain of all knowledge—the final authorities on the meaning of the Constitution. As if possessed with the wisdom of Solomon, they think they can solve and direct the most intricate problems of human relationship. In truth and in fact, their past hearings, investigations, and recommendations have accomplished nothing but to stir up strife and discord in every area of human relationships upon which they have touched, and to create a climate of confusion and consternation. The Commission has become the agent and tool of one single minority pressure group composing roughly less than 10 percent of the population, and in order to further what it considers the "rights" of this pressure group, it will destroy and emasculate the rights of all other citizens and create a situation where, under Federal law, the minority will be a privileged class and the majority will be the underprivileged class, without retaining any constitutional rights, privileges, or immunities.

To express this in another way, the Commission is apparently dedicated to destroying the civil liberties of individual citizens upon the excuse that civil regimentation by Federal personnel is a protection of civil rights against State interference.

The staff director of the Civil Rights Commission, testifying before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, explained the need for the newly sought powers contained in the existing amendment in this language:

The Commission already performs a limited service of providing information to Government agencies, organizations, and individuals in dealing with civil rights problems. The difficulty is that as long as these efforts are necessarily subordinate to the performance of the factfinding and reporting function of the Commission, a function mandated by law, only a very small part of the Commission's resources can be devoted to them. S. 1117 would add information and assistance to the specific duties of the Commission and would enable the agency to concentrate its operations upon those areas which most need attention.

I deny that the Commission, under the present statutory mandate, performed only a limited service in providing information to Government agencies, organizations, and individuals in dealing with civil rights problems; but it is obvious that if Congress gave to the Commission the additional powers proposed in this amendment, that with an increased budget and an expanded staff it could vastly increase its meddling and needling of Government agencies and organizations in dealing with civil rights problems. The infamous Gesell report and the McNamara directive implementing this report in the armed services is a prime illustration of how an outside group can force its ideas upon a Government agency to the point where it strikes at the very heart of this Nation's power to defend itself from outside aggression. No department is more sensitive or vital to the preservation of this country than is the Defense Establishment, and when these do-gooders and social planners attempt to impose their social reforms on the Armed Forces, it is time for Congress and the people to put a halt to it. This type of activity will be compounded if the Civil Rights Commission is given this vast extension of scope and power. Mr. Bernhard explains how this will be done in this language:

The President pointed out in his civil rights message that the Commission "has advised the executive branch not only about desirable policy but about administrative techniques needed to make these changes effective." In many areas of Federal programs, the problem has not been the absence of policy so much as difficulties in implementing adequately rules and regulations requiring nondiscrimination.

Here is where the new activity of the Civil Rights Commission would come into play. This Commission claims that it has both the wisdom and the ability to devise for the agencies and the organizations the necessary rules and regulations that can implement so-called policy. I also take it that the Commission feels that this new power would make it the "appropriate machinery" to do the following:

The Commission has recommended in several of its reports on education, employment, and housing, that the Federal Government obtain assurances that its funds will be expended only for nondiscriminatory purposes. Such recommendations are best implemented by establishing appropriate machinery within the executive branch for securing and supervising agreements that Federal money will be expended for the benefit of all citizens without regard to race. When this is done, experience has demonstrated that Federal funds are distributed on an equitable basis without impairing the operation of the program. As policy has developed in the area of Federal operations there has been a growing need for advice from a competent source on the substance and administration of Federal civil rights requirements.

Mr. President, to me the ever recurring use of this term "policy" is inexplicable. Whose policy? What policy? As long as this Congress exists as a separate branch of the Government under the Constitution, it and it alone is the agent which can create and delineate "policy" under the Constitution. The extreme limit to which the Supreme Court can go is to interpret the policies delineated by Congress and determine whether or not they are consonant with the mandates of the Constitution. The Supreme Court is not a policymaking body, and if the division of powers is to be maintained, it can never become one. If it is to arrogate unto itself the legislative power that is vested in this Congress, then we are confronted with the novel situation where there are two policymaking bodies under the Constitution. If the President of the United States, limited by the Constitution to a mandate that he will take care that the laws be faithfully executed, arrogates unto himself the function of a policymaker and legislates policy by Executive orders, then confusion is compounded, and we have three agencies which devise the "policy" of the United States. I challenge both the staff director and members of the Civil Rights Commission to point to one line in any statute or law now in existence in the Statutes at Large which sets forth a policy that would permit the Commission or the President, or any governmental agency, to say how and to whom federally appropriated funds can be given and to whom they can be withheld.

Mr. Bernhard then turns to another area. He states:

Similar needs for assistance exist on the State and local levels. In the North, there are increasing demands for governmental action to deal with school segregation, racial housing practices, and discrimination in employment. State and local governments are seeking information and guidance in drafting ordinances and adopting effective policies to deal with these problems.

I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that the last thing that State and local governments want is for an agency such as the Civil Rights Commission to meddle in their local affairs and give them any information, guidance, or assistance of any kind or character to deal with their local problems. I read with interest in a recent newspaper dispatch from Boston that the Boston School Committee told the Attorney General of the State of Massachusetts and the Governor that they neither wanted nor required any advice and assistance from these State officials in regard to the problems with which they were confronted within the Boston school system, and assured both the Governor and the Attorney General that they were competent and capable of solving their own problems without this State interference. How would this school committee react if the Civil Rights Commission of the Federal Government attempted to stick its nose into their purely local situation?

Here are other areas in which the Civil Rights Commission desires statutory authority to do what it has already been doing without legal sanction:

In areas where no formal governmental machinery has been established, there may be an even greater need for Federal assistance, so that racial disputes can be resolved in a rational and peaceful manner, rather than through violence. For example, the continuing protest against exclusion of Negro citizens from public facilities suggests the desirability of a forum for representatives of business, civil rights organizations, and Government to seek means for implementing a policy of equal access to such facilities. As more employers and unions turn their attention to the need for developing merit hiring and training programs, they find a need for advice and assistance. And community organizations in many localities are just beginning to come to grips with the question of how to afford equal access to housing without suffering the upheaval of stable neighborhoods which frequently occurs when real estate speculators are permitted to purvey misinformation and stimulate panic.

Here again the omnipotent and allwise Civil Rights Commission is declaring itself capable and competent to enter these additional areas and solve all the problems of human relationship. By and large, Mr. President, the Civil Rights Commission devoted most of its activities during its 6 years of life to collecting misinformation in regard to the Southern States and basing most of its original recommendations to Congress on proposals that would cure so-called abuses of civil rights in the South. When one considers the areas in which it now proposes to enter, there is no State in the Union that is not going to be put under the scrutiny of the Civil Rights Commission. There is no area of human relations with which they are not going to tamper. This newly sought power would create a permanent agency which will be the apex and the capstone in a form of federalism that is undreamed of in the history of this country. I can testify as to how it works, from bitter experience. My State has probably been the greatest single target of the present Commission. We are evidently the subject of a special report, which has not yet been released to the public. This I will discuss later. We have managed to survive and develop in spite of the Civil Rights Commission—not because of it—and I can assure you that we will continue to manage our own political, economic, and social affairs irrespective of the Civil Rights Commission. But from experience, I would not advise the elected representatives of other States of this Union to deliberately

expand the scope and power of an agency that is sooner or later going to turn on their people and subject them to the same degree of harassment, meddling, and interference as the people of the State of Mississippi have already experienced. In all sincerity, Mr. President, I have attempted to devote this part of my discourse to the horrors of Federal bureaucracy and to the folly of creating a Federal agency and giving it powers which transcend constitutional limitations and permits it to roam the length and breadth of this land as a devoted zealot to a limited point of view which has become dedicated to curing what it calls an illness in the body politic by attempting to kill the patient.

Mr. President, the 1961 report of the Civil Rights Commission to the President and the Congress, transmitted in September of that year, was so detailed and voluminous that it could not be properly digested and analyzed at the time the debate took place in the Senate to extend the life of this Commission to September 30, 1963. Most of the President's recommendations to Congress that are contained in his so-called Omnibus Civil Rights Act of 1963 (S. 1731) are to be found in one portion or another of the Commission's recommendations. Some of the Commission's recommendations have been implemented by the use of executive orders. The details of the report and recommendations are startling to the casual reader; alarming to the careful student, and frightening to those who believe in the maintenance of the system of government created by the Constitution of the United States. The recommendations would create a limitless Central Government, restricting the freedom and destroying the liberties of individuals, and controlling and usurping the essential functions of the State and local governments. If the recommendations set forth in this report should be adopted, the following would result:

First. The administration of justice by all local and State law enforcement officers and courts would be usurped, supervised and regulated by the Federal Government. Federal control would extend from the first telephone call by a citizen asking police protection through the arrest, arraignment, indictment, trial, sentence, and imprisonment of the criminal. Civil and criminal penalties would be held over the heads of every State and local law enforcement officer in the United States.

Second. The Federal Government would take over from State and local authorities all steps in the election of local, State, and Federal officials, including all voter qualifications, the registration of voters, the counting of votes, the establishment of voting districts for State and Federal elections, the establishment of electoral districts for the election of State and Federal legislators, with civil and criminal penalties for any action or inaction which Federal personnel claim to be arbitrary.

Third. A Federal agency would be created to supervise the administration of all grammar schools, high schools, and colleges in the United States supported by local and State funds—four members of the Commission wish to extend this to private educational institutions; every local board of school trustees in the United States could be required to file periodic reports with the agency; conformity to the desires of Federal personnel would be forced by civil and criminal penalties; Federal employees would be sent into the local school districts as "social workers" and "technical workers"; Federal bodyguards would be provided "to protect the school board members, supervisory officials, and teachers from bodily harm, harassment, intimidations and/or reprisals by officials or private persons"—it is not specified whether these bodyguards would be Federal marshals or Federal troops. Although the present recommendation is limited to the field of race, the ultimate result is stated in the negative on page 48 of volume 6:

> In any such Federal action taken, it should be stipulated that no Federal agency or official shall be given power to direct, supervise, or control the administration, curricula, or personnel of an institution operated or maintained by a State or political subdivision thereof.

The fact that the Commission's recommendations concerning voting and enforcement of State criminal laws are not limited to matters of race foreshadows similar unlimited recommendations in the educational field. Once the pattern is set, the negative will become affirmative, the exception will become the rule and Federal personnel will direct, supervise, and control the administration, curriculums, and personnel of all grammar schools, high schools, and colleges in the United States.

Fourth. In the field of business and industry the Commission recommends that the Federal Government take over the relationship of employer and employee to be manipulated, controlled, and regimented in accordance with the desires of Federal personnel through the establishment of a Federal agency to police and control—with civil and criminal penalties available—all employment created or supported by Government contracts or Federal aid funds, all federally assisted training programs, activities of all labor organizations, all State agencies receiving any Federal assistance. The present recommendations are limited to the field of race.

Fifth. Finally, there has been recommended by the Commission and already tentatively effectuated by Executive Order No. 11063 issued by President Kennedy on November 20, 1962, a Federal takeover of homes and homebuilding whereby the all-pervading hand of Federal personnel—having available civil and Criminal remedies to bring about their desires—is about to grasp by the throat homeowners, realtors, building and loan associations, banks, financial institutions engaged in the mortgage loan business, local public housing authorities, contractors, developers, and the governing authorities of municipalities. How tight the squeeze will be is to be determined by Federal personnel. This Federal action will invade all phases of homeownership including, in the words of the order, "the sale, leasing, rental, or other disposition of residential property and related facilities—including land to be developed for residential use—and the occupancy thereof." Federal personnel will be looking over the shoulder of every citizen when he buys land to be developed for residential use, buys or builds a home, rents a room in his home, or sells his home.

All of this is in the name of civil rights. All of this will result in the wholesale destruction of civil liberties. Now that the Federal Government is using its financial power to bring about political and sociological ends consonant with the desires of the political party in power, there is no reason to believe that the exercise of this power will end with matters of race. The foot is in the door. The shadow of the past and present is thrown upon the future. The end is not yet. The Commission itself points toward the end of the trail on page 97 when it says:

> Currently, the Commission has made a number of recommendations for Federal action, but these by no means exhaust the needs or possibilities for improvement.

Tens of millions of Americans have financed their homes through lending institutions and/or through loans to which the Federal Government has given financial support in varying degrees. The Commission says on pages 63 and 64:

> The Federal Government has been without question the major force in the expansion of the housing and home finance industries. * * * The present study emphasizes the extensive nature of the Federal contribution. The private housing and home finance industries, through which governmental housing assistance largely reaches the American people, rely heavily on that contribution. * * * At the end of 1960 the Nation's nonfarm home mortgage debt stood at $160 billion. More than 60 percent of this amount ($100 billion) is held by financial institutions that are benefited in varying degrees by the Federal Government and closely supervised by one or more of four Federal regulatory agencies—the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. National banks (regulated by the Comptroller of the Currency), and Federal savings and loan associations (regulated by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board) operate under Federal charters and are subject to the exclusive control of the Federal Government.

The report points out that these institutions have assets in excess of $890 billion. Heretofore conditions attached to such financing have been largely upon a reasonable business basis. The tremendous power thus placed in the hands of Federal personnel should not be perverted to bring about political and sociological ends desired by the political party then in power. Yet, this is the very end sought by the Commission on Civil Rights and by Executive Order No. 11063 issued by President Kennedy on November 20, 1962, as a result of the Commission's recommendations.

What will happen to homeowners, realtors, building and loan associations, contractors, banks, municipalities, professional persons and others in this field is foreshadowed by the recommendations of the Commission and the provisions of Executive Order No. 11063,

which include a directive that Federal personnel through the "departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government take all action necessary and appropriate" to enforce the dictates of the Federal Government concerning race—part 1 of Executive Order No. 11063:

(a) in the sale, leasing, rental, or other disposition of residential property and related facilities (including land to be developed for residential use), or occupancy thereof, if such property and related facilities are—

(i) owned or operated by the Federal Government, or

(ii) provided in whole or in part with the aid of loans, advances, grants, or contributions hereafter agreed to be made by the Federal Government, or

(iii) provided in whole or in part by loans hereafter insured, guaranteed, or otherwise secured by the credit of the Federal Government, or

(iv) provided by the development or the redevelopment of real property purchased, leased, or otherwise obtained from a State or local public agency receiving Federal financial assistance for slum clearance or urban renewal with respect to such real property under a loan or grant contract hereafter entered into; and

(b) in the lending practices with respect to residential property and related facilities (including land to be developed for residential use) of lending institutions, insofar as such practices relate to loans hereafter insured or guaranteed by the Federal Government.

To enforce these determinations of Federal personnel, all executive departments and agencies involved are authorized to:

(a) cancel or terminate in whole or in part any agreement or contract with such person, firm, or State or local public agency providing for a loan, grant, contribution, or other Federal aid, or for the payment of a commission or fee;

(b) refrain from extending any further aid under any program administered by it and affected by this order until it is satisfied that the affected person, firm, or State or local public agency will comply with the rules, regulations, and procedures issued or adopted pursuant to this order, and any nondiscrimination provisions included in any agreement or contract;

(c) refuse to approve a lending institution or any other lender as a beneficiary under any program administered by it which is affected by this order or revoke such approval if previously given.

In addition the Attorney General is authorized to institute civil or criminal proceedings in case of "violations of any rules, regulations, or procedures."

The strong dissent filed to recommendation No. 3 concerning housing by Hon. Robert G. Storey, Vice Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights, former president of the American Bar Association and head of the Southwestern Legal Center in Dallas, Tex., is a masterful statement of the situation faced by the American people today. Such recommendation No. 3 appears on page 75 and is as follows:

That the Federal Government, either by executive or by congressional action, take appropriate measures to require all financial institutions engaged in a mortgage loan business that are supervised by a Federal agency to conduct such business on a nondiscriminatory basis, and to direct all relevant Federal agencies to devise reasonable and effective implementing procedures.

While this dissent is specifically limited by Mr. Storey to recommendation No. 3 in the field of housing, in my opinion it applies to the entire massive effort of the Federal Government under the cloak of civil rights to gain control of all five areas of housing, employment, education, voting, and justice encompassed in the Commission's report. Mr. Storey's dissent appears on pages 75 and 76 and is in part, as follows:

While I am fully agreed that it is not in keeping with American principles that a person be denied a housing mortgage loan solely on the basis of his race, religion, or national origin, I am, nevertheless, very much opposed to further intervention by the Federal Government into the affairs and policies of private financial institutions. It is important to recognize that under democratic capitalism there must be a realm of institutional autonomy. Private financial institutions, even where their activities are in part already regulated by the Federal Government, are primarily business institutions and not institutions for social reform. * * *

What constitutes the appropriate sphere of governmental intervention in private institutional financial policies may be a relative matter, but some separation must be kept between political, social, and economic affairs. Every increase in Federal supervision of the economic life of the Nation for the purpose of achieving certain specific social objectives automatically diminishes the function that the free competitive market discharges under democratic capitalism. In the long run, this can lead only to autocracy.

Recommendations, such as this, for increasing Federal control assume a totally powerful National Government with unending authority to intervene in all private affairs among men, and to control and adjust property relationships in accordance with the judgment of Government personnel. It is at this level that a more serious and obvious weakness arises, for political employees are seldom absolutely objective. It is impossible to keep Federal intervention from becoming an institutionalization of special privilege for political pressure groups. This must lead eventually not to greater human freedom but to ever-diminishing freedom.

Therefore, a great deal of caution is needed before succumbing to the politically tempting suggestion of resorting to the Federal Government for increased control. Reliance on the Federal Government for the solution of all problems of discrimination can bring about only a weakening of confidence in the capacity of the institutions of a free economy to serve democratic values. I am firmly of the belief that in the majority of instances a free economy is better able than the Federal Government to work out fairly the problem of discrimination in mortgage loans. This, in turn, will halt the tendency to shrink freedom of private enterprise to smaller dimensions.

The issue here is much more than the technical problem of devising new controls to deal with financing minority housing. It is the issue of freedom versus authority. The success of a democratic free enterprise economy depends as much on what the Federal Government does not do, or does not have to do, as on what it does.

Do we now live under a government of laws, or a government of men? How far will the executive department go in taking over legislative functions? Congress has repeatedly refused to require racial integration in Federal housing. It has never granted that authority to the President. Yet President Kennedy issued, without legislative authority, Executive Order No. 11063; and he did so in the face of repeated congressional denial thereof.

I have just begun to scratch the surface of the reasons why the Civil Rights Commission should be allowed to die sine die today without affirmative action by the Senate on either of the amendments to extend its life which have been submitted. If and when the omnibus civil-rights bill reaches the floor of the Senate, I assure you, Mr. President, that I will state in great detail, and with particularization, the manifold reasons why I am opposed to making this Commission a permanent body and increasing the scope of its powers and duties.

The proposed extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission is a part of the President's request which now is being considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee. As chairman of that committee, I do not believe it should be bypassed in this way and prevented from giving its essential consideration to this grave subject. That is an additional reason why I oppose the pending amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment which calls for continuation of the Civil Rights Commission. It has served the Nation well and faithfully. Yesterday, the Commission on Civil Rights submitted to Congress its third biennial report since its establishment 6 years ago. The report comes to us at a time when our moral fiber as a nation is once again being put to the test. As the months of 1963 have unfolded, the legacy of slavery has brought upon us new and terrible reminders that there are among us some who are not yet free. Our public conscience has slowly been aroused to a new sense of the urgency of correcting our public deeds and our public policy toward our fellow citizens. The test we face has never been more directly or more plainly put to us, as makers of public law, than it is by the report submitted to us by the six good men who compose this Commission, which Congress itself created. The recommendations made in their report cover virtually every issue which is now daily finding its way onto the front pages of our newspapers: voting denials, which we thought we had corrected; inadequate, unequal, and racially stigmatized education, about which our courts issued correcting decrees almost a decade ago; job discrimination based upon race, at a time when public tax dollars have come to reach into virtually every sector of our economy; housing restrictions, which are crippling the benefits that Congress believed it was bestowing with its unprecedented support of slum clearance, urban renewal, and private homes; continuation of two kinds of justice in too many places; racial segregation in hospitals built with funds appropriated by Congress; public affront and insult, instead of public service, in places licensed for public accommodation. The list prepared by the Commission is long, specific, and honest.

Apart from its timeliness, perhaps the most important thing about this report

is that its recommendations are unanimous. Six good men—southerners, northerners, lawyers, teachers, black, white, Republicans, and Democrats—have put before this Congress the challenge of our time. It is time we asked ourselves whether we are big enough, honest enough, or, if nothing else, scared enough to seize that challenge for once, and to rid this Nation of the most unfortunate part of its past, and whether we are prepared to act as brothers, to heal wounds, to strengthen our own decency. The Commission has given us a strong dose. Perhaps it shocks us less today because we have heard the cries of pain and anguish of our fellow Americans. Perhaps we are finally ready for the strong medicine we have known we must take, but somehow have failed each year to take.

In the weeks immediately ahead, Mr. President, each of us will have the chance to rise above party, to rise above region, to rise above our fears, and to agree upon a course of action that either will restore self-confidence and self-esteem to our Nation, or will return us to our fears. I believe Congress and the Senate can meet the test of our time, if they will but do so.

Mr. President, during the last few days, I have heard many things said about the Civil Rights Commission, some good and some bad. I want to remind Senators what a revolutionary concept this Commission was when it was created and what an outstanding job it has done in a most difficult situation. It is not easy to point out to a nation which prides itself on being the land of the free that whole peoples have been denied the right to vote, a chance to go to a decent school, and an opportunity to find a job a man can be proud of. It is not popular to point out that the God-given freedoms set forth in our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence have yet to be extended to substantial portions of our people.

No one likes to be criticized, Mr. President; but certainly the only way anyone ever improves himself is by recognizing that he is not perfect.

When we are told where we are wrong, when we are told that in this country, both North and South, there are places where democracy does not apply, then, and only then, can we work up the courage and the determination to do something about it. Mr. President, I believe the Civil Rights Commission has pointed out what needs to be done; and now it is up to Congress and the people of the United States to do something about it.

I believe the Commission has done an excellent job. To those who work for the Commission, I wish to say that, although this measure will serve to extend the life of the Commission for 1 year, it is my great hope and expectation that before that year is out we shall pass the President's civil rights bill and shall give the Commission a more satisfactory extension so as to allow it to complete its pioneering and necessary work.

An editorial published in this morning's issue of the Washington Post presents a powerful and persuasive argument for this agency's perpetuation. The Commission has pointed the way for constructive action in the field of civil rights here in Congress and throughout the Nation. The Commission's recommendations are sound, and represent urgent business for American democracy. I commend the Commission. I ask that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

SLOW PROGRESS

The latest, and perhaps final, report of the Civil Rights Commission affords the most powerful argument possible for the agency's perpetuation. Whether one agrees with its recommendations or not, the report is a storehouse of information about race relations in the United States. To read it is to understand the resentment and impatience and unrest among Negroes all over the United States today and to recognize the imperative need for drastic and dramatic change.

There has been progress in the extension of civil rights to Negroes during the past few years; but it has been dishearteningly slow and grudging. The Commission made a study, for example, of the right to vote in 100 counties of 8 Southern States. In 1956, the last year before the enactment of legislation to secure the right to vote, about 5 percent of the voting age Negroes in the 100 counties were registered to vote; despite the subsequent passage of two civil rights acts and the bringing of 36 voting rights suits by the Department of Justice, Negro registration in these counties has risen to no more than 8.3 percent today.

In another area, education, the Commission found that nearly 10 years after the Supreme Court decision in the school segregation cases, Negro schoolchildren still attend segregated schools in all parts of the Nation. The Supreme Court's order continues to encounter the most stubborn resistance on the part of most southern school boards. "Even token desegregation usually has come only after a lawsuit is threatened or prosecuted," the report declares. "The Commission has found no evidence that this resistance is dissipating."

The most hopeful aspect of the civil rights situation, in the Commission's judgment, is an increased awareness of it throughout the Nation. Two observations by the Commission seem to us of great significance. One is that "the civil rights problem cannot be solved piecemeal." It is idle to say employment opportunity or the franchise or education is the key to Negro emancipation. No single key will suffice. All the doors must be opened at once.

Secondly, the Commission concludes that "government alone, at whatever level, cannot hope to solve the Nation's civil rights problem. The issue is too fraught with moral implications to be capable of exclusively legal solutions." We think this is profoundly right. The problem presents a challenge to the religious and educational and civic leaders of the American people. It is a problem that can be solved only through an awakening of the American conscience. This is the supreme task of leadership.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also call to the attention of the Senate an editorial published today in the New York Times. The editorial is entitled "The Urgency of Civil Rights." This editorial expresses strong support for the administration's civil rights program and for the extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE URGENCY OF CIVIL RIGHTS

That most useful Supreme Court phrase, "all deliberate speed," entered the language of civil rights nearly 10 years ago. Apart from school desegregation, it today has special urgency in respect to two interlocking legislative proposals before Congress. The first is the administration's civil rights program; the second is extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission.

The Congress is not so overworked that it cannot handle both a tax bill and a civil rights bill in the same session. This ought not be a question of either/or. Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, who has garnered southern applause by casual remarks that civil rights should be a matter of States' rights, now declares that a tax bill and a civil rights bill would be too much for Congress this year. Why should this be so?

Months of research and long hearings are not still required on the administration's civil rights bill. What is at issue here already is a part of the fabric of American life—for whites. The research has, indeed, been spread across the front pages every year in the accounts of violence in Little Rock, Ark.; in Birmingham and Montgomery, Ala.; in Orangeburg, S.C.; in Americus, Ga. These places and others bear a message for Congress: that Federal legislation is imperative now to prevent bloodshed and lawbreaking in the name of States rights; that the broadly defined guarantees of citizen equality under the Constitution must be underscored in their particular aspects by a civil rights program of law.

Closely related to the specifics of the omnibus civil rights bill is the need for prolonged life for the Civil Rights Commission. This body's valuable reports have unearthed the facts of second-class citizenship in many places, North and South; its recommendations have frequently served as a spur to action. The Civil Rights Commission has been a useful thorn in the conscience of the Federal Government. It should not be allowed to die.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several articles relating to the report of the Civil Rights Commission and certain excerpts from the report.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Oct. 1, 1963]

RIGHTS UNIT ASKS STIFF GUARANTEE OF NEGROES' VOTE—COMMISSION URGES UNIFORM REQUIREMENTS AND SEEKS ENFORCEMENT PENALTIES—CONGRESS GETS REPORT—BROAD PROGRAM IS OFFERED TO ERASE DISCRIMINATION—FINDINGS UNANIMOUS

(By Marjorie Hunter)

WASHINGTON, September 30.—The Commission on Civil Rights called today for uniform voter-registration standards and other sweeping changes to erase racial discrimination.

The proposals appeared certain to arouse new opposition among southern lawmakers, already threatening a filibuster in Congress over the administration's pending civil rights legislation.

In addition to uniform voter standards, the Commission recommended a fair employment practices law, authority for the Attorney General to institute legal action to desegregate schools and elimination of racial discrimination in various programs supported by Federal funds.

The Commission's third biennial report, submitted to the President and Congress, differed from previous reports in these major respects:

For the first time in its 6-year history, the Commission's findings and recommendations to Congress were unanimous. Previously, white southern members on the Commission had dissented from some proposals.

Also for the first time, the Commission said it was able to report "an atmosphere of hopefulness" in the civil rights struggle.

But the Commission warned against complacency. It reported:

"The present conflict has brought about some progress, but it has also created the danger that white and Negro Americans may be driven even further apart and left again with a legacy of fear and mistrust. These new hopes and dangers have transformed the American civil rights struggle."

To wipe out discrimination, the Commission recommended legislation and executive action in nearly all fields of conflict—employment, education, voting, health facilities, urban areas, the Armed Forces, and agencies of justice.

MAJOR PROPOSALS

Among the major recommendations were the following:

A fair employment practices law, assuring the right to equal opportunity in employment assisted by the Federal Government or affecting interstate commerce. The authority to issue orders and institute action would be vested in a single administrator in the Department of Labor.

A law requiring schools that assign pupils on the basis of race to adopt desegregation plans within 90 days. The Attorney General would be authorized to institute legal action upon failure of schools to do so.

Elimination of racial discrimination in vocation education programs, manpower training programs, and hospitals built under the Hill-Burton Act of 1946.

Authorization for the Attorney General to intervene in or initiate civil proceedings to prevent denials to persons of any rights, privileges, or immunities guaranteed by law or the Constitution.

Denial of Federal funds to school districts in impacted areas (such as areas surrounding military bases) unless all children in the districts are assigned to schools without regard to race.

The Commission also called on President Kennedy to get the Navy to do more to assure equality of opportunity for Negroes.

VOTING STANDARDS SOUGHT

Some of the most far-reaching proposals were in the field of voting rights.

The Commission recommended uniform standards of qualification for voter registration, limiting disqualifications to age, length of residence, legal confinement, judicially determined mental disability, conviction of a felony, and failure to complete six grades of formal education or its equivalent.

To back this up, the Commission recommended that the President be authorized to order an investigation into any political subdivision where 10 or more persons file sworn affidavits alleging discrimination in registration.

If action is found to be warranted, the President would be authorized to appoint a Federal official to act as a temporary registrar.

The Commission recommended that, if all else failed, Congress reduce representation in the House proportionately by the number of citizens denied the right to vote on the basis of race or color.

TWO SOUTHERNERS CONCUR

Underscoring the demand for uniform voter standards, a concurring report was filed by the Commission's two white Southern members—Robert G. Storey, of Dallas, former dean of the Southern Methodist University Law School, and Dr. Robert S. Rankin, of Durham, N.C., head of the department of political science at Duke University.

The two native southerners said they had opposed similar proposals in the past because they had believed voting rights could be secured "without disturbing, even temporarily, our long-standing Federal-State relationships."

But they noted that "the evil of arbitrary disfranchisement has not diminished materially" and progress toward equal voting rights is at a virtual standstill in some areas.

For these reasons, they said "we have concluded sadly but with firm conviction, that without drastic change in the means used to secure suffrage for many of our citizens, disfranchisement will continue to be handed down from father to son."

CRITICIZES SLOW PROGRESS

The entire Commission was critical of the slow progress in securing voting rights through Federal litigation. However, it praised efforts of the Department of Justice in seeking to handle the matter in this way.

"After 5 years of Federal litigation, it is fair to conclude that case-by-case proceedings, helpful as they have been in isolated localities, have not provided a prompt or adequate remedy for widespread discriminatory denials of the right to vote," the Commission reported.

"At this time in our history," the Commission said, "we must fulfill the promise of America to all this country's citizens, or give up our best hope for national greatness. The challenge can be met if the entire Nation faces its responsibilities."

The Commission noted that in 1956, the year before passage of legislation to secure voting rights, about 5 percent of the voting-age Negroes in 100 counties in 8 Southern States were registered.

Today, the Commission continued, the most recent statistics indicate that only 55,711, or less than 8 percent, of the 668,082 Negroes of voting age in those 100 counties have access to the ballot.

The eight States in question are Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

SCORES CURBS ON PROTESTS

The Commission was critical also of efforts of some States and localities to limit the right to free assembly and expression of grievances.

While noting that some racial demonstrations might have exceeded the boundaries of free speech and might have interfered with peace and order, the Commission said that cases it had studied had shown that most of the protests "have been peaceful and orderly and well within the protective guarantees of the first amendment."

The Commission said that there had been only limited employment of Negroes as policemen, prosecutors, judges, jurors, and other agents of government. It called for Federal grants-in-aid to assist localities in recruiting and training qualified Negroes for agencies of justice.

In surveying the educational picture, the Commission concentrated largely on problems created by de facto segregation in the North and West. In past reports, the emphasis was almost entirely on segregation in southern schools.

The Commission noted that nearly 10 years after the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision of 1954, Negro schoolchildren still attended segregated schools in all parts of the Nation.

"In the South, most schools continue to be segregated by official policy. The Commission has found no evidence that this resistance is dissipating," the report stated. "But in the North and West," the Commission continued, "school segregation is widespread because of existing segregated housing patterns and the practice of assigning pupils to neighborhood schools.

"Whether this northern-style segregation is unconstitutional has yet to be considered by the Supreme Court, but the contention that it runs counter to the equal protection clause is being vigorously asserted."

It found the status of Negroes in the military services generally satisfactory but said that the Navy lagged behind the Army and Air Force.

The Commission also, like the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, which issued a report last June, stressed the adverse impact of discrimination against Negroes in areas near military installations.

Unlike the earlier report, which suggested the closing of military bases in areas practicing discrimination, the Commission limited itself to endorsing sanctions against segregated off-base installations.

However, it recommended abandoning Reserve Officers Training Corps programs at schools and colleges practicing racial discrimination.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has issued a memorandum calling upon local base commanders to discuss desegregation of facilities with the implicit threat of sanctions if desegregation is not achieved.

Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, has denounced the McNamara memorandum as an attempt to use the military forces for political and social reform. It has also aroused criticism and complaints in many Southern communities.

Comparing desegregation in the various services, the Commission said that Negroes in the Army accounted for 11 percent of total personnel; in the Air Force and the Marine Corps 8 and 7 percent, respectively, and in the Navy, less than 5 percent.

It said that Negroes constitute slightly more than 3 percent of all Army officers, in comparison with about 1 percent in the Air Force and 0.3 percent and 0.2 percent respectively in the Navy and Marines. The Navy and Marines lag not only in the numbers of Negro officers but also in the ranks they achieve, the report noted.

The Commission also reported on urban area problems. It termed the solving of these urban problems "the challenge of the sixties" and suggested Presidential awards of merit for individuals and groups seeking to solve the problems on a local level.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 1, 1963]

COMMISSION SAYS CONFLICT THREATENS TO WIDEN U.S. RACIAL RIFT

(By James E. Clayton)

The Civil Rights Commission said yesterday that there is now an "atmosphere of genuine hopefulness" in the Nation's race relations, but "no cause of complacency."

It said incidents in 1963 have increased awareness of civil rights problems and brought some progress. But the present conflict, it said, "has also created the danger that white and Negro Americans may be driven even further apart and left again with a legacy of hate, fear, and mistrust."

The six-man Commission's views were contained in its report to the President and Congress submitted on the last day of its legal existence. Many of its employees have already made plans to take other jobs while Congress debates a measure to extend the Commission's life for another year.

RECOMMENDATIONS MADE

Included in the Commission's report was a long series of recommendations that, if adopted, would put much greater Federal pressure on States and cities to move forward on civil rights problems. Several of its previous proposals, denounced as radical

when made, are in the administration's civil rights bill this year.

The Commission said it could no longer agree with those who argue that voting by Negroes is the key to civil rights progress. It said the intent of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 to let Negroes vote freely has been frustrated through the South. Major changes are now needed in Federal laws dealing with education and housing as well as with voting, the Commission said.

But it added that the racial issue "is too fraught with moral implications to be capable of exclusively legal solutions." The United States needs a "rededication in deeds, not in words, to the basic principles upon which it was founded," the report said.

The two Southern members of the Commission, agreeing for the first time with all of its recommendations, also attached a short statement calling on States to meet their obligations as well as to talk about States' rights.

The two, Robert G. Storey, president of the Southwestern Legal Foundation at Dallas, and Robert S. Rankin, chairman of the political science department at Duke University, said:

"We must state that survival of the honorable doctrine of States' rights imposes coterminous obligations. It is shortsighted indeed to force citizens of the States to look to the Central Government alone for vindication of rights about which there is no substantial disagreement * * * States' rights carry with them State obligations to all its citizens."

OTHER MEMBERS

The other members of the Commission are John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University; the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University; Erwin N. Griswold, dean of Harvard Law School, and Spottswood W. Robinson III, former dean of the Howard University Law School. Robinson is the only Negro Commissioner.

Among the Commission's many recommendations were:

That Congress pass a law requiring every local school board to publish, within 90 days, a plan for desegregating its schools.

That the President call a White House conference of educators and civil rights experts on how the Federal Government can help localities give all children an equal educational opportunity.

That Congress take away from the courts and give to the President power to appoint Federal officers to register prospective voters in counties where discriminatory practices are used to keep Negroes off the voting lists.

That the Defense Department act to see that Negroes have the same opportunities as other Americans to serve in the Navy.

That military commanders undertake a vigorous program aimed at assuring equality of treatment for servicemen in off-base housing, education, and public accommodations.

That Federal funds be cut off for job retraining and vocational education programs in States where segregated, discriminatory practices are observed.

That Congress authorize the trial in Federal courts, rather than in State courts, of persons charged with State crimes if the attitude of local officials indicates the State courts will not protect their civil rights.

REGISTRATION GAIN SLOW

The Commission's 268-page report also said that in 100 key counties in 8 Southern States, the number of Negroes of voting age who are registered to vote increased only from 5 to 8.3 percent in the last 7 years.

In the field of education, the Commission said the resistance of southern school boards to desegregation does not seem to be dissipating and that segregation exists in the school systems of many Northern and Western States as well.

Turning to health facilities, the Commission said Negro patients and physicians in many cities, including Washington, are denied services at facilities that have received Federal grants. It said that more than $2 billion in Federal funds has been spent since 1946 under the Hill-Burton Act, much of it on segregated hospitals.

The Commission said that it had looked into desegregation demonstrations in Birmingham, Baton Rouge, Jackson, and Memphis and decided that State and local officials clearly violated the constitutional rights of the demonstrators. It also found that Negroes are often barred from participating in the agencies of justice, as policemen, lawyers, and jurors.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Oct. 1, 1963]

TEXT OF PREFACE TO CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION'S REPORT

WASHINGTON, September 30.—The Commission issues its third biennial report to the President and the Congress at a time of increased awareness of the Nation's civil rights problems. Sharpened controversy and quickened hopes have accompanied this new awareness. A sense of futility has given way in recent months to indignation and an avowed determination to see revered principles translated into the practices of everyday life without further delay.

Long before this Commission was established in 1957, the doctrine of equal opportunity had been firmly embedded in the law. It was eloquently stated in the Declaration of Independence and reaffirmed in the Bill of Rights and the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution. It has since been implemented in a series of judicial decisions which affirm without qualification that racial segregation in any aspect of public life violates the Constitution. Federal Executive action and State and local legislative action during and following World War II further enlarged its application and, for the first time, established administrative machinery to implement it.

Yet, as the Commission was to learn from 6 years of study and investigation in all sections of the Nation, the civil rights of citizens—particularly of Negro citizens—continued to be widely disregarded. The Commission also learned that the long denial of equal opportunity has inflicted deep wounds upon the Negro community.

Until recently, however, the growing discontent of Negroes did not manifest itself in overt action compelling the Nation's attention. Thus it was possible for other Americans to believe that the activities of civil rights organizations did not reflect any strong dissatisfaction on the part of the Negro community at large.

FINDS ILLUSION SHATTERED

The events of 1963 have shattered this illusion. Negroes throughout the Nation have made it abundantly clear that their century-old patience with second-class citizenship is finally at an end. The Nation, in turn, gives evidence of recognizing that the current civil rights crisis constitutes a grave challenge.

This Nation was founded on the ringing affirmation that all men are created equal. It has traditionally served as a haven of freedom in a world plagued by oppression. It gave freely of its sons to "make the world safe for democracy," and again to save it from the racial madness of Hitler and his allies. It assumed the leadership of the free world in the perilous postwar era. Clearly such a nation cannot continue to deny equality to Negro and other minority groups without compromising its integrity and eroding the moral foundation that is its greatest strength.

Although the Nation's struggle to redeem the promise of its ideals is primarily a domestic problem, it is also of worldwide concern. To our friends, the vitality of our ideals is a measure of the strength and reliability of the Nation whose leadership they have accepted. To the new and uncommitted nations, most of which are nonwhite, America is what it practices, not what it professes. To our enemies, our civil rights record provides a wealth of propaganda to help persuade neutral nations that America practices hypocrisy.

SEES NATION MOVING

America needs a rededication in deeds, not in words, to the basic principles upon which it was founded. It is now 100 years since this Nation, lagging behind the civilized countries, abolished slavery. Yet today, the descendants of those freed slaves still suffer from customs, traditions, and prejudices that should have died with the institution in which they flourished.

The Nation now appears to be moving toward the eradication of slavery's lingering aftereffects. There is a growing realization that a great effort will have to be made to achieve this end. At the Government level, such an effort must embrace action against all phases of racial discrimination in public life. As the Federal Government has learned, the civil rights problem cannot be solved piecemeal. The studies and reports of this Commission have provided much material to show that all facets of the civil rights problem are inextricably interrelated, and that none can be solved in isolation.

To the southern Negro, born in a sharecropper's cabin, educated in segregated schools designed to prepare him for a Negro's traditional station in life, and wholly dependent economically on the white community, the right to vote may be nonexistent in practice, even though it may have been repeatedly vindicated in legal theory.

The President's latest civil rights proposals deal with education, employment, and public accommodations, as well as with voting. They give evidence that the executive branch recognizes the imperative need for dealing with the civil rights problem as a whole. Furthermore, there appears to be an increasing determination on the part of the Federal Government to use all the instruments at its disposal to secure the rights of citizens. A start has been made toward assuring that public money will not be spent in ways which foster and support racial discrimination. Affirmative programs are being considered which would enlarge educational and economic opportunity for all.

State and local governments have also been increasingly active in the protection of the rights of their citizens. Laws, ordinances, and Executive orders now protect various aspects of civil rights in 34 States and numerous cities. All this the Commission views with gratification.

STORE OF LATENT GOOD WILL

Yet government alone, at whatever level, cannot hope to solve the Nation's civil rights problem. The issue is too fraught with moral implications to be capable of exclusively legal solutions. A full mobilization of America's moral resources is required at this crucial time. The Commission firmly believes that the Nation has a great store of latent good will on the subject of civil rights. If this good will can be made effective, our civil rights problem can be solved.

At this time, there is indication that the Nation at large is awakening to its responsibilities in the current crisis. An increasing number of religious and civil leaders have clearly expressed their views and those of their organizations. The President has provided guidance in public speeches and private meetings with leaders of business, labor, the professions, and women's organizations. These efforts have evoked some positive response, and the Commission urges that they be continued and increased.

For the first time, then, the Commission is able to report an atmosphere of genuine hopefulness. But if there is reason for hope, there is no cause for complacency. There is a broad gulf between the abandonment of enforced segregation and the achievement of a society in which race or color is not a factor in the hiring or promotion of an employee, in the sale of a home, or in the educational opportunity offered a child. The present conflict has brought about some progress, but it has also created the danger that white and Negro Americans may be driven even further apart and left again with a legacy of hate, fear, and mistrust.

MORE IS REQUIRED

These new hopes and new dangers have transformed the American civil rights problem. Since its organization, this Commission has gathered the facts about denials of civil rights and suggested remedial actions. Now more is required. Many communities are bewildered by the magnitude of their civil rights problems, the existence of which was officially denied or only dimly realized in the recent past. Many seek guidance and assistance in developing corrective programs and establishing the lines of communication that made such programs possible.

A number of this Commission's State advisory committees have rendered highly effective assistance to their communities despite a lack of staff and funds, but this is not enough. Guidance and assistance are urgently needed. If this Commission is assigned the function of a national civil rights clearinghouse, in accordance with the President's request, it will be able to offer such help.

In the present circumstances, the need is to translate findings into effective action at the local, State, and Federal levels. The Commission believes, therefore, that its fact-finding and reporting functions must become a part of a larger and more comprehensive effort to meet this Nation's most urgent domestic problem.

At this time in our history, we must fulfill the promise of America to all this country's citizens, or give up our best hope for national greatness. The challenge can be met if the entire Nation faces its responsibilities.

CONCURRING STATEMENT

In the following concurring statement, two Southerners on the Commission on Civil Rights—Robert S. Rankin, of Duke University, Durham, N.C., and Robert G. Storey, head of the Southwestern Law Center, Dallas—explain why they now join in recommending strong voting rights proposals similar to ones they opposed in past years:

"The right to vote is the cornerstone of our democratic society. A citizen's respect for law rests heavily on the belief that his voice is heard, directly or indirectly, in the creation of law. And his sense of human dignity depends on his receiving the same treatment at the registrar's office and at the voting booth as is accorded to his fellow citizens. Yet, today, thousands of citizens—of the United States and their respective States—have no effective right to vote in parts of seven Southern States.

"We have never questioned the legal and moral right of qualified citizens to vote. Our past disagreement with proposals such as those in which we now join was concerned with means, not ends. In 1959, and again in 1961, there was reason to believe that the right of every qualified citizen to vote, irrespective of his color, race, religion, or national origin, could become a reality without disturbing, even temporarily, our long-standing Federal-State relationships. We had hoped that an increasing awareness of the 14th and 15th amendments would bring about a greater acceptance of their commands. Moreover, new legislation embodied in the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 remained at that time untested."

URGE DRASTIC CHANGE

"Now, 2 more years have passed since the most recent of these acts. The evil of arbitrary disfranchisement has not diminished materially. The responsibility which must march hand in hand with States rights no less than the civil rights has, as to the right to vote, often been ignored. Progress toward achieving equal voting rights is virtually at a standstill in many localities. For these reasons we have concluded sadly, but with firm conviction, that without drastic change in the means used to secure suffrage for many of our citizens, disfranchisement will continue to be handed down from father to son.

"The present proposals set exacting standards at the same time as they provide for a flexible attack on discrimination in voting so that the disruption of traditional Federal-State relationships will be only so great as is necessary to achieve the necessary constitutional goal of equal voting rights for all our citizens.

"Recommendation 1 limits voting qualifications to those which are as objective as is possible in dealing with such a complex matter. At the same time it recognizes most of the qualifications which the individual States have found necessary to preserve the sanctity of the ballot. Thus, in contrast to the similar proposal made in 1961, Recommendation 1 permits States to exclude as electors persons who have not achieved a sixth-grade education or its equivalent, and persons who have been judicially declared mentally incompetent.

"Recommendation 2 provides for the appointment of local Federal officials as temporary voting registrars in localities in which 10 or more individuals state in writing and under oath that they have actually attempted unsuccessfully to register to vote, and that they believe that they were denied registration because of their race, color, religion, or national origin. Significantly, these registrars would serve only so long as the President deems necessary.

"Recommendation 3, calling for enforcement of the representation provisions of section 2 of the 14th amendment (the allotment of House Members), is expressly made a last resort. We are fully aware of the apparent unwillingness of Congress to make use of this provision of the Constitution, and we pray that this recommendation will never have to be acted upon. We do think, however, that the voting problem is sufficiently urgent today to warrent its consideration.

"Finally, we must state that survival of the honorable doctrine of States rights imposes coterminous obligations. It is short sighted indeed to force citizens of the State to look to the central government alone for vindication of rights about which there is no substantial disagreement. As we have said on so many occasions: Civil rights carry with them civil responsibilities. So, too, States rights carry with them State obligations to all its citizens."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Oct. 1, 1963]

PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

VOTING

1. Limit State voter disqualifications to age, length of residence, legal confinement, judicially determined mental disability, conviction of a felony, and failure to complete six grades of formal education or its equivalent.

2. Authorize the President to order investigation into any political subdivision where 10 or more persons file sworn affidavits alleging discrimination in registration. If investigation warrants action, the President would be authorized to appoint a then-existing Federal official in that State to act as a temporary registrar.

3. In event first two recommendations proved ineffective, Congress would be expected to enforce section 2 of 14th amendment by reducing representation in U.S. House proportionately by number of qualified citizens not allowed to vote.

EDUCATION

1. Require every school board maintaining schools to which pupils were assigned on basis of race to adopt a desegregation plan within 90 days. If the board failed to do so, the Attorney General would be authorized to institute legal action.

2. Authorize Civil Rights Commission to provide technical and financial assistance to school districts seeking help on problems resulting from school segregation or desegregation.

3. Suggest that the President call a White House conference of experts to discuss how the Federal Government can assist in solving the problem of giving all children an equal opportunity in education.

4. Amend the urban renewal law so that it not impede local efforts aimed at eliminating or reducing racial imbalance in schools in or near the renewal area.

EMPLOYMENT

1. Establish a right to equal opportunity in employment that is assisted by Federal Government or which affects interstate commerce, with authority to institute action vested in Administrator in Department of Labor.

2. Require that federally assisted vocational programs be nonsegregated.

3. Enforce nondiscrimination in selection and referral of trainees for training classes.

4. Establish vocational programs for persons who lack educational prerequisites needed to qualify for technician and other courses and provide manpower funds to permit training in functional literacy and basic work skills.

5. Permit the Federal Government to make arrangements for manpower, literacy, and work skill training with education agencies other than State vocational agencies which cannot provide such training on a nonsegregated basis.

6. Direct that affirmative steps be taken to insure that employment, directly or indirectly, generated by Federal loan, grant, or aid programs to be open to qualified persons regardless of race, creed, color or national origin.

HOUSING

No recommendations.

JUSTICE

1. Empower the Attorney General to intervene in or initiate civil proceedings to prevent denials to persons of any rights, privileges or immunities guaranteed by law or the Constitution.

2. Enact a program of grants-in-aid to help States and local governments, upon their request, to increase the professional quality of their police forces.

3. Make local governmental units employing officers who deprive persons of their rights jointly liable with the officers.

4. Permit removal by a defendant of a State civil action or criminal prosecution to a district Federal court in cases where the defendant cannot, in State court, secure civil rights because of State laws or acts of individuals administering the laws.

HEALTH FACILITIES AND SERVICES

1. Refuse approval of applications for grants under the separate-but-equal provision of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946.

2. Refuse approval of applications for Federal funds under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946 when plans call for duplicate facilities to be used on a racially segregated basis.

3. Assure that grant recipients comply with the nondiscrimination requirements of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946.

URBAN AREAS

1. That the President encourage resolution of civil rights problems at local level, possibly through the form of Presidential awards of merit given annually to persons and organizations.

ARMED FORCES

1. That the President direct that corrective action be undertaken by the Navy to assure equality of opportunity for Negroes to serve as officers and enlisted men and to broaden their occupational assignments and promotional opportunities.

2. That the President direct the Secretary of Defense to reappraise testing procedures used in procurement of enlisted and officer personnel.

3. That the President request the Secretary of Defense to undertake periodic reviews of recruitment, selection, assignment, and promotion policies and develop programs to utilize fully both Negro and white manpower resources.

4. That the President request the Secretary of Defense to discontinue ROTC programs at any college or university which does not accept all students without regard to race or color.

5. That the Department of Defense seek to remove all vestiges of racial discrimination from military installations and insure that in dealings with local communities the policy of the Armed Forces of equality of treatment prevails.

6. That the granting of funds for construction and operation of schools under the impacted area program be conditioned upon assurances that all children in the district be assigned without regard to race.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am most hopeful that the amendment I have submitted to H.R. 3369 will be adopted, because we need to continue the Commission. Furthermore, at present, a number of the competent staff members of the Commission are in doubt as to what will be their future activities.

Therefore, I urge that favorable action be taken on the extension of the life of the Commission.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment submitted by the able senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], but I shall do so with full recognition of the regrettable fact that a pistol was pointed at the head of the Senate. What both your party, Mr. President, and mine promised the American people; namely, to create a Civil Rights Commission on a permanent basis cannot, alas, be approved by the Senate, because of the inevitable "talkathon" which would ensue.

Mr. President, I remember very well when General Eisenhower, as Chief Executive of our country, sent to the Senate his recommendation for a Civil Rights Commission to be approved by legislative action. The people whom he chose to discharge a responsibility that was long overdue came from every section of our land, and represented then, as indeed they do now, able, honorable, decent Americans who simply are devoting their public service to the hallowed American principle of equal treatment under law.

I believe it is to the credit of the incumbent Chief Executive, President Kennedy, that he has continued in service a number of the Americans who originally were appointed to the Commission by President Eisenhower.

At any rate, now that a capitulation has regrettably, but of necessity, been made, I hope we may proceed on a temporary basis to continue a public agency whose functions are eminently important and whose duties require a continuing recognition by the Congress as well as by the American people.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). 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 (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had hoped that in the current extension of the Civil Rights Commission I would find it appropriate either to remain completely silent and vote against the extension or perhaps even to remain silent and vote for the extension, because some things done by the Civil Rights Commission in the several years of its existence have, I believe, been constructive.

Unfortunately, developments in recent years and particularly yesterday, when the 1963 Civil Rights Commission report was made public, have been such that I cannot sit silently in my seat since I feel that I should state in the RECORD my feeling that the Civil Rights Commission has outlived any usefulness that it may have had. It has shown itself to be unfair and now imbued with almost an obsession that it is a messianic agency, so that it is suggesting things to be done which are not only completely unconstitutional but are thoroughly against existing law, against the best interests of our country, and against the bringing about of any real degree of national unity and understanding.

First I wish to say a word with reference to the current organization of the Civil Rights Commission. When the Civil Rights Commission was first named there was some effort to make it representative of the best and most constructive thinking of all parts of the country. I well recall that I was approached and asked to make any suggestions which I considered appropriate with respect to highly representative and reputable citizens in the southern area of our country, so that there might be representation on the Civil Rights Commission from our part of the country which would command respect on the part of our citizens in general, whether white or colored. I was one of several Senators who made such recommendations. Two of the several fine citizens whom I recommended were appointed to the first Civil Rights Commission. They were former Gov. Doyle Carlton of my State of Florida and former Gov. John Battle of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. They both had intelligence enough to get off the Commission when they saw the turn it was taking, did they not?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is an interpretation which might be given to their actions. Perhaps they were completely exhausted by their difficult efforts up to that time. I do not know the reasons why they left the Commission, but they declined to be considered for reappointment.

Not only did I suggest the names of those two eminent citizens who were appointed, but also the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who made several suggestions as to appointees to be considered, included on his list both of those particularly eminent citizens of our area. They were appointed.

I am sorry to say that no such policy has been continued as to the appointment of the current membership of the Civil Rights Commission. I believe the Commission has suffered because of the fact that in recent years there have not been on the Commission truly representative members who were citizens of the area of those States most affected, and who could be fully respected from one end of our Nation to the other.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the able Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to my able friend.

Mr. TALMADGE. I concur in the statement made by the able senior Senator from Florida. It seems ridiculous to me to have a Commission allegedly acting as a factfinding body when only one point of view is represented on the Commission. I am sure the able Senator will recall some of the many extreme recommendations which the Civil Rights Commission has proposed, one of them being a recommendation, in the spring of this year, as I recall, to cut off all Federal funds going into the State of Mississippi—social security benefits, veterans' benefits, and all funds of any kind or character. Does the able Senator recall that recommendation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I recall it well, and with great sorrow.

Mr. TALMADGE. I should like to read a statement, and ask if my friend from Florida remembers the author of that statement.

> I don't have any power to cut off the aid in the way proposed by the Civil Rights Commission and I would think that it would probably be unwise to give the President of the United States that kind of power.

Does the Senator recognize that statement; and, if so, does he remember the author thereof?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. I well remember that when the recommendation reached the present President of the United States, President Kennedy, he reacted to the recommendation in the words just quoted by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. That particular statement was made by the President of the United States before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 19, 1963.

I should like to read another statement and ask if the able Senator recognizes it; and, if so, if he remembers the author thereof:

> Another difficulty is that in many instances the withholding of funds would serve to

further disadvantage those that I know the Commission would want to aid. For example, hundreds of thousands of Negroes in Mississippi receive social security, veterans, welfare, school lunch, and other benefits from Federal programs. Any elimination or reduction of such programs obviously would fall alike on all within the State and in some programs perhaps even more heavily upon Negroes.

Does the able Senator recall the author of that statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. Though my recollection is not so clear as in the other case, it is that the President of the United States made that statement also.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is entirely correct. That was the statement of the President in a letter dated April 19, 1963, to the Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission.

I ask the able Senator if, notwithstanding those two statements by the President of the United States, this partisan group renewed the same recommendation in its report submitted yesterday?

Mr. HOLLAND. They did, I am sorry to say. While I shall not mention that particular recommendation, because I am trying to confine myself to recommendations which are relatively new, I am sad that this group saw fit to overlook the fact that that kind of action, if carried out, would put our Government in the same position the whole world complained of when a certain power destroyed the village of Lidice merely because someone there had affronted it. That is a policy of punishment by association, in the sense of people living together in a great area being equally punished regardless of their guilt or innocence and regardless of their need. Aside from the un-American character of such action, it is blind for an agency established to give aid to an underprivileged group to suggest a course which is sure to bring greater disaster upon members of that underprivileged group than upon the public generally.

Mr. TALMADGE. In effect, it would expel an entire State from the Union, would it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. TALMADGE. That is, from the benefits, though not from the taxation.

Mr. HOLLAND. It would, indeed. We have not witnessed anything like that since Reconstruction days, when Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, duly elected by their respective States—on the theory that there had not been any breaking up of the Union but that instead there had been a victory for preservation of the Union—were refused their seats. When newly elected Senators and Representatives came to Washington, they were not permitted to take their seats but, instead, there were enacted punitive measures called the reconstruction acts, aimed against certain States, refusing to permit them to be heard in the councils of the Nation until they took several very distasteful courses, such as the reframing of their own constitutions, approval of the 14th amendment, and other steps which I shall not mention.

This is a following up or a renewal of the philosophy which prevailed in those days to such an extent that a Congress overrode, not once, but repeatedly, vetoes of the President, who at that time was trying to bring the Nation back together into unity.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the able Senator. I agree with him wholeheartedly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his intervention.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not heard the previous discussion. I just came into the Chamber. But I am sure the Senator will realize that despite all the trials and indignities that were heaped upon the South in the Reconstruction period, there was never any proposal for genocide such as is contained in the recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission—for starving the weak, the poor, and the indigent in a State, taking taxes from the people of a State but not permitting the return of one 5-cent piece of that money. Taxation without participation is worse than taxation without representation.

Dark as were the days of reconstruction even Thaddeus Stevens did not advocate total war on women and children. They did advocate shooting men who had served in the Confederate Army and Navy, but they did not propose a deliberate campaign designed to inflict hardship and suffering on all the women and children of both races in the South.

Compared to the vicious proposals of this Commission, Sumner and Stevens will appear in a more favorable light.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. Even Thaddeus Stevens never proposed anything that went so far as this recommendation. I am very sure the people who made this as one of almost innumerable recommendations have not given serious thought to it, because I know there are some good people on the Civil Rights Commission, and I could not understand how they could ever come to the point that they would make such a heartless and inhuman recommendation of this unconstitutional character. It does not smack of anything that has happened heretofore in America, even in Reconstruction days.

I am glad my distinguished friends have called attention to this point.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator would have to go back to the days of Attila and Tamerlane to find anything to equal this.

Mr. HOLLAND. To go back to the Commission, not only has the Senator from Florida not been approached about any recommendations for appointment of members of the Commission, but he finds, in discussing the same matter with his friends generally who come from the South, and who are Members of the Senate, that none of them has had any request for such recommendations.

Aside from the violation of the normal rule in the Senate that when appointments are to be made that singularly apply to sections that certain Senators are trying to represent, their viewpoint is usually sought by the appointive power, the very standing of the Commission has suffered greatly by reason of the departure from the earlier rule which I think was one that involved both courtesy and wisdom. Referring to the men named to succeed the former Governor of Florida, Doyle Carlton, and the former Governor of Virginia, John Battle, two good men, I shall have nothing derogatory to say about these new members. But the appointment of a teacher from North Carolina, regarded as highly liberal in his point of view, was made without either one of the two Senators from North Carolina having been asked for his opinion on his appointment. I do not think that was a wise course.

I find, representing the Commonwealth of Virginia, a former dean of Howard University Law School, Spottswood Robinson, was appointed. I am sure, from what I have heard, that he was a resident of Virginia. I noticed the President announced yesterday that he was going to appoint him to the District Federal bench, indicating rather clearly that here in Washington is where his present active connection is, rather than in Virginia. But I am asking Senators to decide for themselves what kind of substitutions for former Governor Carlton and former Governor Battle these two appointees were.

The Civil Rights Commission has suffered in the eyes of reasonable and moderate thinking people. I may not be a reasonable person, but I believe I am moderate in this field, and that everything I have done through the years shows it.

The Commission has suffered irreparable damage in that great part of the Nation where over 50 million people live and which is so directly affected by the departure from the earlier rule and by the type and character of the new appointees.

I shall mention briefly four matters which appear in the report published yesterday, which show how very far from its proper function, at least in my judgment, the present Commission has gone, and how far from the following of a reasonable course the present membership of the Commission has strayed.

In the first instance, I call attention to the field of defense. I am not going to mention many other matters which are of interest, but only one matter, because it is so new. I call attention to recommendation 4, on page 215 of the recommendations of the Commission. On that page, in the field of defense, the Commission includes this recommendation—and I leave it to the sense of the Senate and of the general public to judge how completely unsound a recommendation it is from the standpoint either of serving the security of our Nation or of protecting the rights of qualified members of the Negro race to serve as officers in the ROTC. Recommendation 4 reads:

> That the President request the Secretary of Defense to discontinue ROTC programs at any college or university which does not accept all students without regard to race or color.

The meaning of that—which I think is a hopelessly foolish recommendation—would be that in several of the States both members of the white race and members of the Negro race who have not only the desire to serve their country

in the uniform of the armed services as reservists, but who also have aptitude in that field, would, if that recommendation were carried out, be deprived of their chance to receive ROTC training or commissions or any standing in the Reserves. I think it is not only unwise, but unjust.

I could take 5 or 10 minutes to put into the RECORD, the names of some distinguished sons of the South, most of them white, some of them Negro, who have served this Nation with distinction in time of war. There are more of the same kind elsewhere. In my own State this recommendation would apply to cut off white men at the two State universities and the young Negro men at the Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, where some 3,000 Negroes are being educated, and where there is a fine Reserve unit, from any opportunity of fulfilling their desire to qualify themselves to serve their Nation in the Reserve forces.

How could it be made more clear that these members of the Civil Rights Commission have decided that the defense of our Nation does not count for much, after all; that the protection of the rights of young individuals, regardless of their color, to serve their Nation in uniform, to prepare themselves to serve it, does not count for much? Furthermore, this recommendation will so operate on large Negro schools in several States as to disqualify every member of the student body in those schools who wants to qualify for ROTC training, and destroy his opportunity to do so.

I cannot remember any more foolish recommendation that strays further from the protection of our Nation or the protection of the race that the Civil Rights Commission is supposed to protect.

The next point I wish to mention is in the field of voting. The Civil Rights Commission in its report of yesterday makes a statement which, insofar as my State is concerned, is not true. The Commission states:

> In seven States, the right to vote—the abridgement of which is clearly forbidden by the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States—is still denied to many citizens solely because of their race.

That does not happen to be the case. The statement is applied to my State because in counting the States, which are recited one by one, Florida is one of the seven Southern States named and because in listing the States one by one Florida is one of the Southern States listed. I find this small statement in the text, which is applicable to Florida:

> Florida contains 5 of the 100 counties. No litigation has occurred in the State. Registration has increased in two counties and remained virtually unchanged in the other three. Though the number of voters in these counties has increased from 76 in 1956 to 512 in 1962, fewer than 5 percent of the voting-age Negroes are registered.

There is no poll tax requirement in the State of Florida. There is no educational or literacy test requirement in the State of Florida. There is no unwillingness to register Negro citizens who are qualified by reason of age and residence to vote. Over 200,000 of them are registered.

The report selects five counties, four of them very small counties, where for some reason or other, sufficient to themselves, Negro citizens generally have not seen fit to claim that right or privilege, have not seen fit to register in large numbers, although the registration has increased in such counties from 76 in 1956 to 512 in 1962. The report makes the statement that Florida is one of the seven States mentioned where citizens are deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race.

It has been found in Florida that the Negro citizens in all areas do not respond equally or with equal speed to the invitation to vote, which was extended to our citizens in 1937, when we abolished the poll tax entirely in our State and when we offered the opportunity to vote to every citizen otherwise qualified in the States, without a literacy test, without a grandfather clause, and without any artificial measure to prohibit adult residents from voting. Several dozen counties became very active quickly—others have followed. The five counties listed merely happen to be at the end of the list of counties insofar as the effort to register and to vote on the part of the Negro population has been manifest.

There is no evidence cited in the report, or otherwise, as to anyone having been kept from registering. The report states that no suit has been brought in Florida. There is no showing of any citizen having been kept from registering. There is a showing of substantial improvement of the situation in one or two of the five counties.

It is not right to have a great State, which is moving with relative speed in this matter, held up by the report of the Commission as having, by the operation of its laws, or otherwise, deprived colored citizens of the right to vote because of their race. That does not happen to be true. I challenge anyone to refute my statement. To prove that it is not true, I cite the fact that more than 200,000 of our Negro citizens have registered; and most of them are voting regularly, as our other citizens do.

I come next to the question of education. In consideration of that question, the Civil Rights Commission makes the statement that the citizens of the South, including Florida, are not moving as the Supreme Court required them to move, and not moving so as to comply with the rulings of the Court in the matter of education.

It is true that in a great many areas in our State there is no integration in the schools. Lack of integration in certain schools is explained in one of two ways:

The first explanation is that no Negro citizen has been sufficiently desirous of placing his or her children in white schools to bring suit or make his or her wishes known; or, second, they do not wish to have their children in the white schools under any circumstances.

There is a strong showing in my State, from what has come to me as an individual citizen who has a large number of friends among the colored citizens of his State, of an expression to the effect that they feel their children do better if they are confined to contacts with their own kind, with their own people, during their years of education.

Not only is that true, but it is made clear by what they are doing voluntarily, because in many cases they have preferred to go to an institution where they are with their own people.

On page 65 of the Commission's report of yesterday are assembled the statistics with respect to Florida. The table on that page shows a total of 1,183,714 children enrolled in the schools. It shows that of that number, 956,423 are white, and 227,291 are Negro. It shows also that 1,551 Negroes are enrolled in desegregated schools, or a total percent of Negro pupils enrolled in desegregated schools of 0.682, or less than 1 percent.

I know not only from what Negro parents have told me, but also from the practice which is prevailing in my State, that many of our Negro people prefer to have their children remain in the segregated schools, where they think they can do better with children of their own kind.

A short time ago I delivered the commencement address at the Junior College of Dade County, at Miami, Fla. There are 6,000 youngsters enrolled as students in that junior college. Of that number, I was told, some 200 to 250 are colored, and the remainder are white.

At the commencement address I noted that a dozen or 15 of the graduates of close to nearly 300 were Negro youngsters.

The fact remains, however, that a larger number of the Negro youth of this same county, Dade County, who have the right to enroll and to attend that junior college without much expense, and to live at home at the same time, prefer to go, and do go, to our segregated university for Negro youngsters at Tallahassee. That is a fine school, with an attendance of approximately 3,000 youngsters. It has produced some very fine teachers, doctors, lawyers, preachers, and others who have engaged in some leading profession or calling through which they have been able to serve their people. That school has produced a great many notable athletes, among them Althea Gibson, who is still recognized as the finest woman tennis player in the past two or three decades.

Bob Hayes won all the speed races over in Europe during the recent tour there of the American track team. Willie Gallimore, of the Chicago Bears; and others are from that school. They learned football there and are now playing in the professional league.

It is just as true as can be—and no one can controvert it, because it is happening every day—that more Negro families in the Dade-Miami area, for reasons sufficient to themselves, prefer to send their youngsters at some expense to the Tallahassee school 500 miles away, and are doing so. Does that not show rather clearly that they have a preference themselves to continue the segregated form of education?

The Civil Rights Commission says in its report that the South is dragging its

feet and that we are keeping Negro children—and the report includes Florida in its summary—from going to schools of their choice. That does not happen to be true, because everywhere that a suit has been brought, and in some counties where suits have not been brought, Negro children who have shown any desire to go to integrated schools are now pupils in those schools. The Civil Rights Commission does not appear to have ever considered the idea that, first, the Supreme Court does not require the integration of all schools, but by its order provides simply that no student who is a Negro can be deprived of his or her right to go to a publicly supported school that is integrated.

Apparently they have not thought the problem through and do not realize that there are millions of Negro citizens in the South who apparently prefer the segregation of their own children, and show it by their continued practice year after year.

In the field of education, as in the field of voting and in the field of the security of our Nation, the Civil Rights Commission has gone completely off base. Apparently, with all of its study, it still does not understand that under the opinions of the Supreme Court there is no intention to require compulsory integration of all schools throughout the South or anywhere else; but that the sole meaning of the decisions that have been handed down is that no child may be deprived of the legal right to attend a public school solely because of his race.

The Commission seems not only to misunderstand that part of its mission which has to do with education, but it seems also to misunderstand the fact that a vast number of Negro families prefer a segregated type of education. I have talked with a good many teachers who are of the Negro race. They believe the worst thing that could happen to them, so far as their right to continue in professional education is concerned—and they have prepared themselves for their profession—would be to require integregation of all publicly supported schools.

A search was made not long ago to ascertain whether there was a single president of a non-Negro university or college outside the South who was a Negro. At that time, none could be found. In the South there are perhaps a hundred or more Negro presidents of Negro institutions and colleges. The fact that there are hundreds of deans and professors in colleges, and thousands of principals of high schools—does not seem to have been considered by the Civil Rights Commission; nor does it seem to have occurred to the Commission that many of those people feel—and I say this because I know it of my own knowledge; they have come to me with their complaints—that their right to continue in their livelihood, which they have chosen in an effort to be of service to their own people, will be greatly hurt and in many respects completely obliterated if universal integration in the schools of the South should be accomplished.

The fourth point that I wish to make has principally to do with the findings of the Civil Rights Commission in its report of yesterday with reference to the field of health. The Commission discusses at great length the Hill-Burton Act.

I digress to pay my tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for the outstanding effort and wonderful results which have occurred through his cosponsorship of that act.

The members of the Civil Rights Commission go so far as to recommend, by a fixed recommendation, that a clear provision of the Hill-Burton Act be ignored in the distribution of Federal funds appropriated under that act. I quote, first, this provision, which appears on page 130 of the Commission's report of yesterday:

> However, the act provides an exception to the nondiscrimination assurance "in cases where separate hospital facilities are provided for separate population groups, if the plan makes equitable provision on the basis of need for facilities and services of like quality for each such group."

There is no doubt that the Hill-Burton Act contains that provision. It does so because it was realized that one of the groups that most needed better health facilities was the Negro group, and that in many States separate facilities would be provided either under the same roof or under a separate roof. So that provision was placed in the law. The Civil Rights Commission indulges in this casuistry:

> If the Supreme Court of the United States had decided the school segregation cases of 1954, 8 years earlier, or if the Hill-Burton Act of 1946 had been enacted after 1954, it is unlikely that the act would authorize the use of Federal funds for racially separate medical facilities.

In other words, the Commission bases its recommendations upon this thinking: That, unfortunately, the Hill-Burton Act was enacted too soon to have come within the provisions of the 1954 school decision; otherwise, in the opinion of the Commission, the act would not have included this particular provision.

Let us consider the recommendations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, before the Senator leaves that point——

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not about to leave it; I was about to read the recommendations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry; I will not interrupt the Senator. I thought he was about to discuss another point.

Mr. HOLLAND. No. I want it to be clear that after recognizing the Hill-Burton Act and after expressing regret that it was enacted before the 1954 Supreme Court decision—because the Commission says that if that law had been enacted later, it would not have contained this provision, which the Civil Rights Commission thinks should not be enforced—it proceeds, on page 143, to make its recommendations. I read recommendation 1:

> Recommendation 1: That the President direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service, to refuse to approve applications for grants submitted under the separate-but-equal provision of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946.

In other words, it does not make any difference what the law provides. It does not make any difference that the Supreme Court had not passed on the law. The Civil Rights Commission, again following its feeling that it has a sort of messianic status, states that it wants the President to direct, by Executive order, transcending the legislation which has been on the book all these years, and has done so much good through all these years, this action:

> The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service, to refuse to approve applications for grants submitted under the separate-but-equal provision of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946.

That is the Hill-Burton Act.

Now I come to the second recommendation. They were afraid the first one would not go far enough and might not be held to apply when all the hospital was to be under one roof, and different wards or different rooms were to be assigned to people of different races. So recommendation No. 2 is included, as follows:

> Recommendation 2: That the President direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service, to refuse to approve applications for Federal funds under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946 when the plans for the proposed construction provide for duplicate facilities to be used on a racially segregated basis.

In other words, Madam President, if the plans for a hospital provide for two wings—one for one race and one for the other—or for two ward rooms—one for one race and one for the other—or for a different group of private rooms—some for one race and some for the other—even assuming that they are to be exactly equal—in fact, duplicates—and "duplicate" is the word used in the report, "duplicate facilities" for the different races—the Commission still asks the President to direct the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General never to approve such a program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad the Senator has brought up this point. I believe it is fairly typical of the recommendations which have been made by the Civil Rights Commission over the years it has been in existence. Does not it completely both ignore and run contrary to what Congress itself has directed should be done?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is entirely correct. Not only does the Commission ask the President to proceed exactly counter to what the law provides, but, in addition, its report shows that the Civil Rights Commission did not feel itself bound by the Constitution or by the laws, but felt bound only by objectives which it regards as so overriding and so compelling that, in its opinion, we need not worry about the Constitution and the laws. The Commission is saying, in effect, "We are going to straighten this out without giving any regard to either the Constitution or the laws."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not the feeling of the Senator from Florida that over the years the Civil Rights Commission has been functioning in exactly that way? I believe it was established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957; and its life has already been extended several different times. Does not the Senator from Florida feel that in many instances during its life the Civil Rights Commission has made recommendations that either were without reference to the law or openly sought to flout the law?

Mr. HOLLAND. It certainly has. I have already named several particulars, in the course of my brief remarks; and I could point out many more in the report, which was issued only yesterday.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I recall that only a little while ago the Senator referred to the fact that last year or in the interim report during the present year the Civil Rights Commission recommended the withholding of funds; and the Senator from Georgia, I believe, quoted to the Senator from Florida a very forthright and direct statement which the President of the United States made at that time—namely that he did not feel that under the Constitution anyone had a right to do that; furthermore, he said that, in his opinion, no President ought to be clothed with that authority. But now, in spite of that, this report of the Civil Rights Commission makes the same recommendation. Is not that true?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Alabama is correct. The Senator from Georgia also mentioned the fact that the President, in replying to the recommendation made earlier this year, stated that he felt he should call attention to the fact that if he acted upon that recommendation, he would hurt a great many members of the underprivileged race whom he was interested in helping, and whom the Civil Rights Commission was established to protect.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and of course the Senator knows that to be true. There are not as many members of the Negro race in the State of Florida as there are in my State, I presume—or nor as high a percentage in Florida as in the States of Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and a number of other States; but in the State of Florida there are enough for him to know that the percentage of the members of the Negro race there who are the beneficiaries of these various Government programs is greater than the percentage of the members of the white race there who benefit from them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly that is true in my State. In Florida, we have approximately 900,000 members of the Negro race, and most of them are fine citizens. They are enjoying the opportunities they have. They are advancing themselves daily. There have not been great troubles in our State. We are trying to deal with this problem moderately; and we are tired of being maligned by the Civil Rights Commission, and we are tired of having the Commission make recommendations which it admits, by its own earlier statements, fly directly in the face of the provisions of existing law.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the Senator from Florida is entirely correct. Of course I am sure he believes that now that the Civil Rights Commission has wound up its term and has finished it by making its report, the existence of the Commission should end, and this report should be its final one.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, the Senator from Alabama is entirely correct. I feel that the death of the Civil Rights Commission would not be deeply lamented by most of the good people of this country; and I feel that an organization that has gone as far afield as this one did in its recommendations of only yesterday, the very day when the question of extension of the life of the Commission was before the Senate, has clearly shown how completely irresponsible it has become and how completely it has become submerged in its own objectives, to the extent of being blind to the requirements of law and to the requirements of this grave problem, which exists mostly in the minds and hearts of men.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for one more question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield again to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that there are already in the Department of Justice two different divisions that are supposed to handle race relations and to deal with problems such as this, and that the Civil Rights Commission really constitutes a third?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. The Civil Rights Commission is a third thumb. I have never known of any useful employment for a third thumb; but that is what this Civil Rights Commission has been throughout its existence.

Mr. President, I shall hurry to state my conclusion. I note another recommendation by the Commission, in its report of yesterday, which I believe should be called to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the public. That one is to be found on page 125 of the report; it is recommendation No. 3, and reads as follows:

> Recommendation 3: That Congress amend section 1983 of title 42 of the United States Code to make any county government, city government, or other local government entity that employs officers who deprive persons of rights protected by that section, jointly liable with the officers to victims of such officers' misconduct.

Mr. President, under such a provision, we would include in the basic law affecting civil rights—section 1983 is an important part of the law which has to do with the protection of civil rights—a provision that any county government, city government, or other local government entity that employs any officer—meaning particularly peace officers—who trespasses upon the civil rights of any person, would become equally liable with the peace officer for the wrong done.

Mr. President, I wonder how carefully the members of the Civil Rights Commission have thought that through.

In my home county there are more than 200,000 people. Suppose that a constable, a deputy sheriff, a conservation officer, or any other officer in that county clothed with the power of arrest should do something that might be interpreted by a citizen of the Negro race as depriving that citizen of his civil rights. Under such a provision, as recommended by the Commission, all the citizens of our country through our organized government could be held jointly liable for the misconduct of the one officer who was alleged to have trespassed in that field.

I do not believe that many people in the United States wish to use that kind of approach to a problem which couples the innocent with the guilty, which couples the race that it is trying to protect with the majority race, which makes Negro citizens, through their tax contributions, as answerable to that kind of misconduct, if there be such misconduct, as are white citizens through their tax contributions. The thinking of the Commission is warped and unsound in a suggestion of that kind. Aside from its having the various qualities which I have already mentioned, it would follow that thinking which we despise so greatly and which we arraigned before the court of world opinion so severely when the Lidice instance occurred during World War II.

Mr. President, do the members of the Civil Rights Commission think that by following a course of the kind proposed, which would trespass so greatly upon our ideals of justice and fair play and our constitutional and other statutory approaches to problems of that kind, they can advance us towards better recognition of civil rights?

I have quoted only a few of the recommendations published yesterday by the Civil Rights Commission. To my mind they show clearly and conclusively the fact that the Commission has gone far astray. It has forfeited any right to be respected by decent citizens of any color. It has become so obsessed with the importance of its mission that it has forgotten that it, too, is a part of America; that it, too, is functioning under our Constitution and under our statutes; that it, too, is functioning under our ways of doing things and under our traditions. It has made quite a number of so-called factual reports which are not factual and recommendations which depart entirely from our American way of doing things.

Going back to the recommendation made in the field of security, affecting our Armed Forces, I call attention to the fact that the recommendation made at that point, that the President request the Secretary of Defense to discontinue ROTC programs at any college in which segregation exists, whether it be a white college or a colored college, also flies in the face of the provisions of law which apply to that subject. Since its passage the Morrill Act has specifically provided for separate racial facilities in the various programs under that act. I am so advised by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is chairman of the Armed Services

Committee, and who has much greater familiarity with the act than I. I have always had the belief that that is the case, but I am now making that statement because the Senator so advised me.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assure the Senator that the statement will stand up.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for having sent me that advice. That is but the second instance in an important field of the operation of our Federal law—this time under the Morrill Act, the other under the Hill-Burton Act, respecting hospitals and hospital facilities—in which the Civil Rights Commission, so-called, in its recommendations of yesterday, specifically recommends that the President shortcut all the judicial process, and bring about a situation which would be in accord with the Civil Rights Commission's objectives, and which it thinks should prevail, regardless of provisions in the Constitution and regardless of contrary provisions in existing law.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. I scanned the report of the Civil Rights Commission yesterday when it reached my office. The recommendation to which I shall refer appears, I believe, on page 125. I notice that the Commission has recommended the removal of all cases from any court to the Federal court under certain conditions. Is the Senator looking at that section of the report? I believe it appears at page 125.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. I have not had an opportunity to refer to all its statements that depart from American procedure.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it the view of the Senator from Florida that even a traffic case in the remotest village or community in America could be transferred, under that recommendation, to a Federal court through the whim of a bureaucrat?

Mr. HOLLAND. If Congress were foolish enough to enact such a law, that would be the result.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it the Senator's view that a divorce originating in the State of Florida, and subject only to the laws of the State of Florida, could be removed to the Federal court under that recommendation?

Mr. HOLLAND. It certainly is. The recommendation is not limited at all as to what classes of cases are concerned. It simply states—and I shall quote the whole statement in the RECORD—

> Recommendation 4: That Congress amend section 1443 of Title 28 of the United States Code to permit removal by the defendant of a State civil action or criminal prosecution to a district court of the United States in cases where the defendant cannot, in the State court, secure his civil rights because of the written or decisional laws of the State or because of the acts of individuals administering or affecting its judicial process.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it the view of the Senator from Florida that under that recommendation a lawsuit affecting title to real estate, and which is bound by the laws of 50 different States, could be removed to and tried by the Federal court at the whim and caprice of some Federal bureaucrat?

Mr. HOLLAND. Replying to the question of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, it certainly would be possible to remove to the Federal court such a cause or any other cause, whether it arose solely under State laws or solely in the field of rights protected by State law, if the conditions recited existed.

Mr. TALMADGE. Under that recommendation, a case in the courts of Kansas involving speeding could be removed to the Federal court; could it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the defendant alleged that the judge was prejudiced against persons of his color or of his race, such removal would be possible.

Mr. TALMADGE. If someone was indicted for crap shooting in the State of Oregon, California, or New York, under that recommendation the case could be removed to the Federal court; could it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. It could, if crap shooting were a crime in any of the good States mentioned by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is an outstanding lawyer. In all the years that he has been practicing law has the Senator ever seen a recommendation so extreme in its nature?

Mr. HOLLAND. I had not until I read the catalog of recommendations in yesterday's report. I have found several such recommendations, some of which I have cited, which I believe are as bad, indefensible, extreme and, I believe, as un-American.

Mr. TALMADGE. Would not the purport of that recommendation, if it were enacted into law by amending the Constitution, or whatever action might be required, have the effect at one fell swoop of abolishing the integrity of all courts in our land save the Federal courts, and including municipal courts, county courts, and State courts in the 50 States of our Union?

Mr. HOLLAND. It might well have exactly such a deleterious effect.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator. I agree with him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had not meant to take this long. I wanted the RECORD to show affirmatively some of the ridiculous things contained in the report made yesterday. In my judgment, the things included in this report of yesterday, if considered only by themselves, would suffice to support a unanimous finding by the Congress of the United States that the Civil Rights Commission, as now constituted, should not be extended but instead should be allowed to die and be forgotten.

I yield the floor.

CRISIS IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, things are changing so rapidly in Latin America, particularly with reference to the Dominican crisis, that I break into the debate on the Civil Rights Commission for a few brief moments to read to the Senate a cablegram I received from Governor Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico this morning. As the Senate knows, Muñoz-Marín is one of the great statesmen of the Western Hemisphere, a great leader of the Government of Puerto Rico. I am sure no one would challenge my observation that he is also one of the outstanding world statesmen. He is very much disturbed by the developments in the Dominican Republic.

As Senators listen to his cablegram they will become aware that he is also disturbed as to what the American position is to be.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] spoke on this subject yesterday afternoon in a brilliant address on which I commented yesterday, with which I agreed in part, taking exception only, as my speech of yesterday shows, to the procedure he would follow in seeking to restore a democratic regime in the Dominican Republic.

This morning I received the following cablegram from Muñoz-Marín, sent to me because of my position as the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations which deals with Latin American Affairs:

> HON. WAYNE MORSE,
> *U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:*
>
> I have just sent the following cable to President Kennedy regarding Santo Domingo situation: The United States faces a problem, a challenge, and an opportunity. As a citizen and as a neighbor of the Dominican people I feel it my duty to make my views known to you.
>
> I unreservedly favor taking a hard line toward the usurping government of Santo Domingo. No recognition, no economic aid. A soft line would result as I see it in the following:
>
> (1) A further demonstration of the powerlessness of the United States to support the democratic governments in the hemisphere;
>
> (2) A chain reaction of military coups in Latin America (Honduras is now said to be on the verge);
>
> (3) A shot in the arm for communism as the Batista dictatorship in Cuba turned out to be;
>
> (4) Deprive Alliance for Progress of a number of democratic partners compelling United States to deal with the oligarchies that oppose the reforms that are the basis of the Alliance;
>
> (5) Depend on military usurpation to combat communism instead of depending on democracy;
>
> (6) Allowing to lapse the opportunity of using the Santo Domingo situation for a stronger policy orientation under very favorable psychological circumstances.
>
> A strong line would refuse to recognize the stability of infamy as "stable government" and demand thorough respect for the freedom of the Dominican people to have their own democratically chosen government. I believe that such steadfast position on the part of the United States would strengthen democracy in Latin America immeasurably and that the puppet government and its military masters would crumble and open the way to action both viable and honorable in Santo Domingo.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN.

Mr. President, I share every view expressed by this great Puerto Rican leader.

Tad Szulc, one of the most reliable and accurate journalists who writes on Latin

American affairs—a journalist for whom I have such high regard that I recommended to my subcommittee, and the recommendation was unanimously adopted last year, that Mr. Szulc be called before the subcommittee for an executive briefing of his views concerning Latin America—has written an article, published in this morning's New York Times, the headline of which is "United States Believes Army May Move To Take Over Regime in Honduras."

I am satisfied, on the basis of information within my possession, that Mr. Szulc is completely correct in respect to the danger in Honduras that he points out in the article. He says in part:

U.S. officials and Latin American diplomats reported today that information from Honduras indicated that the army, led by Col. Elias Lopes, may be on the verge of revolt to prevent presidential elections October 13.

Officials said that the chance of a Honduras coup had become "90 to 10" since Dominican military leaders overthrew the regime of President Juan D. Bosch in the Dominican Republic last week.

He goes on to discuss the serious situation in Honduras; and I ask unanimous consent that his entire article may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as well as an article entitled "Junta Seeks World Ties," written by Henry Raymont and also published in the New York Times, October 1.

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

[From the New York Times, Oct. 1, 1963]

U.S. ARMY MAY MOVE TO TAKE OVER REGIME IN HONDURAS

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON.—U.S. officials and Latin-American diplomats reported today that information from Honduras indicated that the army, led by Col. Elias Lopes, may be on the verge of a revolt to prevent presidential elections October 13.

Officials said that the chance of a Honduras coup had become 90 to 10 since Dominican military leaders overthrew the regime of President Juan D. Bosch in the Dominican Republic last week.

The Honduran military leaders, who until last week still seemed to be undecided, may have been inspired by the Dominican coup d'etat to depose the democratic regime of President Ramon Villeda Morales.

It was understood that the U.S. Ambassador to Honduras, Charles R. Burrows, was actively seeking to dissuade Colonel Lopes and his military and civilian associates from overthrowing the Government.

A coup in Honduras would bring to four the number of military takeovers in Latin America this year. It would represent another painful blow to the Alliance for Progress, the U.S. aid program. The program aims at bringing economic and social development to Latin America within a democratic framework.

The Alliance had been intended as a practical response to the Communist character of the Cuban revolution. The overthrow of the Bosch regime and the earlier army takeovers in Guatemala and Ecuador has weakened the political posture of the Alliance.

The Government in Honduras has been attempting to improve political, social, and economic climate of the country after a long period of stern dictatorship. President Villeda Morales has been serving for nearly 6 years.

As in the Dominican Republic, the military in Honduras contends that the Villeda Morales regime has been partial to communism. They insist that any elected successor would also favor communism.

In next month's elections, Modesto Rodas Alvarado, backed by Dr. Villeda Morales' Liberal Party, is expected to defeat Ramiro Ernesto Cruz of the Nationalist Party, a conservative group.

Despite military charges of the Government's alleged "softness" on communism in Honduras, the record appears to show that Dr. Villeda Morales' policies have, instead, led to a loss of Communist influence.

Communists were reported several months ago to have been ousted from the leadership of the Banana Workers' Union of the Standard Fruit Co., the country's second largest.

Latin American diplomats said that the military pressures were based in part, on the military's fears that the ruling Liberal Party might favor the civil guard, the national militia, over the army.

But, the diplomats said, the main inspiration in favor of a coup seems to stem from the conviction of extreme rightist groups that a change of regime is necessary for patriotic and political reasons.

In the Dominican situation, administration officials insisted again that the United States had no immediate plans to recognize the military-backed civilian junta there or to restore suspended economic aid.

They said there was no truth in published reports that there was a split over hard and soft positions toward the junta and that the administration remained highly disturbed over last week's events in Santa Domingo.

JUNTA SEEKS WORLD TIES

(By Henry Raymont)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.—Confident that it has firm internal control of the country, the Dominican Republic's de facto regime concentrated today on obtaining international recognition.

In a series of communications with foreign diplomats here, the new civilian junta made every effort to stress that it will rule without military interference, respect civil liberties and follow a strongly pro-Western foreign policy.

The principal target of this effort is the United States, which has recalled its Ambassador, John Bartlow Martin, and expressed strong disapproval of the military coup that deposed President Juan D. Bosch last Wednesday.

Dr. Bosch, on whom Washington has put many of its hopes for the success of the Alliance for Progress, the Kennedy administration's Latin-aid program, as a countermeasure in the Caribbean to the violent revolution advocated by Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba, was on a Dominican frigate today, en route to Guadeloupe. The deposed president was accompanied by his wife and a military escort.

Unofficial contacts between members of the new government and the U.S. Embassy here were reported to have taken place over the weekend.

Washington's recognition is regarded as essential for the ambitious economic and industrial program the new Government hopes to begin with continued U.S. aid.

Donald J. Reid Cabral, the new Foreign Minister, formally appointed this afternoon Jose Antonio Bonilla Atiles to become the new Dominican delegate to the Organization of American States. He will also be designated Ambassador to the United States once the two countries resume diplomatic relations, Mr. Reid said.

Dr. Bonilla Atiles was Dominican Foreign Minister under the Council of Government that ruled the country for 2 years between the deposition of the Trujillo dynasty and Dr. Bosch's inauguration last February 27.

The new Ambassador is scheduled to fly to Washington tomorrow to assume his new post at the Organization of American States and to explain to U.S. officials the political and economic goals of the junta.

The Dominican situation has confronted the Kennedy administration with one of the most difficult decisions of its policy on the Western Hemisphere. The military coup here was the third in Latin America in 6 months, and easy recognition by Washington is seen by many as tantamount to encouraging similar moves in countries such as Honduras, El Salvador and Venezuela, where right-wing military leaders are opposed to the democratic reforms of the constitutional governments.

The predicament for the United States may have been eased a little by a division that emerged today on the issue of recognition among the Latin-American missions here. While Venezuela, Mexico, and Bolivia called home their diplomatic representatives, the envoys of Brazil and Argentina urged their governments to give immediate recognition to the civilian junta.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to the State Department that the situation is as serious in Honduras as it was known by the State Department to be serious in the Dominican Republic before the coup occurred, yet on the basis of such briefings as I have received to date from the State Department about all we did, when all is said and done, was merely to advise them not to conduct the coup.

We cannot stop coups that way.

Furthermore, there is much evidence being made available to us now, almost hour by hour, that the record of the United States in the Dominican Republic prior to the coup was a rather sorry one.

That is why this morning I asked to have the U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic called before our committee, and, in the absence of the Secretary of State, to have the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Martin, called before the committee. I have also asked for a thorough briefing of information which the CIA has available to it, and have suggested that it be made available to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The information we have been receiving—and we have received confidential information twice this morning—indicates that there are American business concerns in the Dominican Republic which helped finance the coup; including American business concerns that financed largely the campaign of the opponent of President Bosch. There are American business concerns which had been very close to Col. Wessin y Wessin, the Fascist-minded State-police-type of military leader who was the brains of the military coup in the Dominican Republic.

So long as I serve in my position I shall continue, no matter what embarrassment it may cause some, to insist that the American people be provided with the facts as to what happened in the Dominican Republic prior to this coup. I say most respectfully to the Secretary of State that it is his clear obligation to give orders that the facts be made available to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations without further delay.

I shall withhold from the public and from the Senate for the time being, until that briefing occurs, the information which has been given to me as to what American concerns were involved and what officials of those American concerns were involved. We cannot justify at any time any intermingling, intervention,

muddling, or meddling on the part of American businessmen abroad with American foreign policy.

The State Department in its briefing the other day said that foreign aid had been cut off.

From the floor of the Senate I ask the Secretary of State, at this moment, "Have you brought back from the Dominican Republic the entire personnel of our AID group in the Dominican Republic? You ought to bring them back immediately." That is the test, in the eyes of Latin America, as to whether or not we are going to cut off aid. I want to say what my suspicion is, because I express my suspicion after receiving a briefing from the State Department. My suspicion is that we plan to follow the old pattern of a slap-on-the-wrist performance. We are protesting the overthrow of a democratic regime, and we will protest it, if we follow the pattern, for another 10 days or 2 weeks, and then the State Department will throw up its hands and say, "What other course have we? We have to have some dealings with the Government. After all, they say they are anti-Communist and pro-Western, and in another 2 years they will have elections and restore a democratic regime. Therefore we have decided to recognize them."

I do not "buy" that argument. Not only do I not "buy" it, but I say that it is gross hypocrisy. The sad thing about American foreign policy is that it is characterized by hypocrisy.

I commend Mr. Marin for the cablegram he sent to the President and for the position he has taken.

I am disturbed about another item in the New York Times this morning with regard to the Dominican situation. It is the old pattern all over again. This is what the New York Times said, speaking about the Dominican Republic situation:

> The predicament for the United States may have been eased a little by a division that emerged today on the issue of recognition among the Latin American missions here. While Venezuela, Mexico, and Bolivia called home their diplomatic representatives, the envoys of Brazil and Argentina urged their governments to give immediate recognition to the civilian junta.

Are we surprised at that from Brazil and the Argentine? Argentina has followed the same pattern. In the Argentine the military took over, and the United States shortly thereafter recognized that military junta.

We know that in Brazil there are Fascist forces at work seeking to destroy the image of democratic government in Brazil.

I am not surprised at the position taken by the Argentine and Brazil, but we are reaching one of the most serious crises in United States-Latin American relations in a quarter of a century, for the chips are down, as a result of what has occurred in the Dominican Republic. We are either going to support constitutional democratic government in Latin America when it is established, and refuse to give support to military juntas that overthrow it, or we are going to lose any following in Latin America we can hope to obtain by throwing billions of dollars into Latin America.

There is nothing more critical facing the administration; and I urge that the State Department and the CIA make available to the President of the United States and to the Foreign Relations Committees of both Houses of Congress immediately all the facts, including the ugly facts, in respect to what transpired prior to the military takeover in the Dominican Republic. We need the information now as to what the plans of this administration are in regard to the handling of this military junta.

I close by making the point on the floor of the Senate that I made last night, but which needs to be made over and over again: Let the American people not be fooled by a three-man civilian commission or council in the Dominican Republic that the military leaders have purportedly set up to run governmental affairs. They are civilian stooges, and they have no freedom of movement except the freedom of movement that the military dictators grant them. It is another example of the type of hypocritical pattern that is established in Latin America. In the past the United States has given support to that kind of subterfuge.

The time has come to make clear to the Dominican Republic that we are suspending relations with them, stopping trade with them, stopping any Alliance for Progress support for them, until a democratic regime is first restored in the Dominican Republic and the people themselves get rid of their military dictatorship, which acts behind a facade of civilian stooges.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. First of all, I thank the Senator from Oregon for the kind and most generous words which he uttered on the floor yesterday about my remarks concerning the developments in the Dominican Republic. I find myself in agreement with the position he has taken today. I share his views about Governor Munoz-Marin, of Puerto Rico, who is one of the world's great statesmen not only in the field of Caribbean affairs, but throughout Latin America. It is in a sense regrettable that he is operating in so small an area as Puerto Rico, although his influence can be, is, and should be, felt throughout this hemisphere and beyond.

This problem we now face in the Dominican Republic is a difficult one because we are, unfortunately, facing an accomplished fact. We are considering locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen. We are concerned about the lost liberties of the Dominican people after they have been taken away. I think our criticsm should be directed toward the reason why these things were not prevented before they happened and to see what we may do to prevent their happening elsewhere. It is easy to ask, "What should we do now?" and to find disagreement at the answers. The proposal I made yesterday on the Senate floor with which the distinguished Senator from Oregon, chairman of the Inter-American Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, disagreed, was made because we had not acted beforehand to prevent the disaster. Why could we not have prevented this situation? I find it difficult to understand why this great Nation, with all its wealth, power, influence, and prestige, could not prevail upon and prevent a handful of tin-horn gangsters not to overthrow a constitutional government established after a free election, which had been recreated under our sympathetic auspices and our approval, and the approval of the whole free world.

It seems to me that is the direction in which we should launch our investigation.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon proposes calling on the nations of the hemisphere to join us, in withholding recognition of the Dominican junta, but, as he himself has pointed out, the very fact that Argentina and Brazil would not join—and they will not be the only ones—demonstrates that a majority of the governments are sympathetic toward the same kind of junta military government which operates in those countries and now in Santo Domingo and which we regrettably have aided by recognizing them, and giving them all kinds of aid—financial, economic, military. That is true of Peru, Ecuador, Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and others. Only a minority of free, democratically functioning nations in that area will join us. The United States will not get a majority of OAS members to join us in withholding recognition and imposing sanctions.

What then is the answer? We want to work jointly with the other nations of this hemisphere, but if only a minority are governed by free regimes, if a junta is either in charge or is preparing to take over in others, and will not join us, what is to be our course of action? The Senator from Oregon rejects the idea of unilateral action. I reject the idea of the kind of intervention the United States engaged in in the early days of this century, the so-called gunboat diplomacy, when we sent Armed Forces into Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Mexico, without the assent and against the opposition of those people. But that is not the type of intervention which I have proposed.

Instead we have in Santo Domingo the situation of a duly constituted freely elected democratic regime being overthrown, with arms which the United States furnished. The tanks and other equipment used in the military coup, and for these usurpers to retain control have come from the arsenal of the United States. They were supplied to the previous dictator, Trujillo under our military aid program. Let me say, parenthetically, that I, with a number of distinguished senatorial cosponsors, have proposed an amendment to the foreign aid bill to abolish all military aid to Latin American countries. As I pointed out in a previous speech, and as I shall point out again, this aid has not added and is not adding to the security of the Western Hemisphere or to the protection of the countries of Latin America from invasion or infiltration by communism, but is merely serving as an instrument for

the overthrow of established democratic regimes by the military, as is the case in the Dominican Republic.

I hope the Senator from Oregon will also wish to see the aid to the new junta in Santo Domingo withheld permanently, and will not rely on its promises, because such promises will not be adhered to and are not pertinent in any event. If the administration follows the policy it has hitherto followed, as the Senator points out, within 2 or 3 weeks it will find a face-saving formula under which we shall be told that the beneficiaries have promised to do better; that they have promised to make reforms. We have found, by past and very recent experience, that such promises are utterly worthless and we have no excuse for not knowing it. We should say that there will be no recognition and no aid, not for 2 weeks or 3 weeks or 6 months, or any specified time, but until there is an entirely new deal, and a return to democratic practices. These gangsters do not have to comply, but they should not have our recognition or aid till they do.

How can a return to democratic practices be secured? That is difficult to achieve. How are the Dominican people going to revolt when a gang of sordid power-grabbing gangsters are in control of the tanks, planes, guns, and other military equipment that we have sent to those countries? That is a problem which I believe the United States ought to have the ingenuity and intelligence to solve. We have not yet solved it.

If we look at the situation in the Caribbean, we find that it is worse than it has been. We have lost Cuba to Castro and Khrushchev. We served notice on the dictator in Haiti, Dr. Duvalier, that we would not recognize the validity of his last election. We withdrew our economic aid from him. We did not withdraw our Ambassador. Duvalier kicked out our Ambassador and relations are severed. Yet this Haitian dictator appears to be more securely entrenched than ever before. I believe the same thing will happen in the Dominican Republic unless we show more foresight, imagination, guts, determination, and more action than we have hitherto.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the Senator's reading from the New York Times, there is brewing in Honduras a plot to overthrow the present government. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would the Senator proceed to prevent it from succeeding?

Mr. MORSE. I would make representations, through the American Ambassador down there, to the potential military junta in Honduras, that if they follow a coup course of action all connections between the U.S. Government and Honduras will be broken off.

Mr. ELLENDER. They should already know that.

Mr. MORSE. They do not know that. Quite to the contrary, they know that they can go ahead with their coup and that after a few days they will obtain recognition and probably will also get a response by way of a good many millions of dollars, so that they can stabilize their government as a result of the revolutionary coup. They know that they can blackmail the United States. They have blackmailed us in coup after coup, and the American taxpayers have been fleeced out of millions of dollars through this kind of shoddy performance.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will remember that we were at odds with respect to what was happening in the Dominican Republic prior to the Bosch regime. At the time of my visit in the Dominican Republic I said it was a mistake for us to do anything to throw Trujillo out. We did it. Today there is turmoil, and it can be expected to continue. That has been true since Trujillo's overthrow. Since the death of Trujillo we spent more than $65 million in economic aid alone, and that is only a beginning.

As I pointed out, there is no question that Trujillo was a dictator. There is no doubt that he might have had to kill a few persons to get where he was. He did it with force. However, that is the condition we find all through the South American countries.

If the distinguished Senator from Oregon or the distinguished Senator from Alaska believes that they can establish democracy, as we know it in this country, he is mistaken. It will require time to do so. If Trujillo had not been killed, I venture to say that much of the property that he owned would have been distributed among the people. He had started to do that. Unfortunately, he was shot before that operation could be carried out. After that happened, I predicted that there would be chaos in that country. It will take millions of dollars to restore order, and we may never be able to restore the prosperous economy that existed prior to the death of Trujillo.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana knows that he and I have for years been in complete disagreement with regard to our policy toward the Trujillo regime. In my judgment we should have stopped giving him any support a quarter of a century ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. We gave him very little support.

Mr. MORSE. We gave him a good deal of support. We gave him a good deal of support in connection with the sugar monopoly. We gave him a great deal of support by way of aid and abetment constantly. We made a sorry, bloody job of it by our support of the tyrant Trujillo in the Dominican Republic. I was sorry to see him assassinated, as I am sorry to see any human life taken. However, having him removed from power in the Dominican Republic was one of the greatest things that could have happened in that country to the cause of freedom and human rights.

I have another great difference with my friend from Louisiana, and that is with regard to the potentiality of the establishment of democratic regimes in Latin America. They can be established if the U.S. Government follows its own democratic principles in handling all of its relationships with those countries. Our professings are usually quite different from our practices in Latin America.

Over the years we have continued to support the military leaders in Latin America. They have no friendship for democratic processes. The military aid support that we have given Latin American countries over the years is one reason why Latin America today is on the verge of communism. If we continue to follow our present course in Latin America, in my judgment we shall be chiefly responsible for driving one Latin American country after another into the arms of communism.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to take a moment to commend the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska, even though I must say that I disagreed with the suggested remedy offered yesterday by the Senator from Alaska. However, the purpose of his speech is one with which I am in full agreement. Later, after the vote on the extension of the Civil Rights Commission, it is my intention to address the Senate on the subject of our relationship with the Dominican Republic and the relationship with the military coups and juntas that plague this hemisphere.

The senior Senator from Oregon is correct. We should make it crystal clear that we will have "none of it," that we will not contribute a penny, that we will sever relations, and that we will do everything we can to bring these juntas to destruction.

It seems to me that the sooner we make that clear, the better will be the policy of the United States not only in this hemisphere, but throughout the world.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for his comment.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I, too, join the Senator from Minnesota. We spoke on this subject yesterday. I hope that all Senators who feel that way will join in supporting the plea that the President should not, as was done in the case of Peru, jump into recognition of the military junta without calculating the overall cost to us in Latin America, especially in the Caribbean area.

I and others have advocated some form of Central American-Caribbean defense program, which would bring into closer alliance the nations that are particularly interested in those two areas, as contrasted with the OAS. The OAS, with all due respect to it, has proved to be leaden-footed in connection with this situation.

I hope that if the President does not jump into it—and he should not, and I thoroughly agree with my colleagues—perhaps through the method which we always used in this country, namely, by debate, we can find a better way than the one we have been pursuing, because the OAS does not seem to have the steam to start to deal with the problem, and therefore we must find another way, a way that does not make the mistake of jumping into recognition.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite correct. He has been in the forefront of the proposal for a hemispheric defense system. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who has just left the Chamber, is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. He has been one of the leaders in the committee of that concept. I have always supported it. I think we must try to come to it, for I believe it will bring about much greater stability in the Western Hemisphere, so far as hemispheric defense is concerned, than any proposal that has been made to date.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely wish to place this problem in proper perspective. As I recall, the Senator from Oregon was present when testimony was given that four situations contributed heavily to what happened:

First, the readmission of the exiled Communists was tolerated by Bosch. The Communists who had been driven out of the Dominican Republic came back.

Second, the Government rented a school to a Communist group for the teaching of Communist doctrine. Protests about that act were made to Bosch. They remained pending for months, but he did nothing about them.

Third, the government-operated radio was used by Communists to spread Communist doctrine.

Fourth, a Cuban base was used without challenge. Dominicans went to Cuba, and Cubans came into the Dominican Republic, spreading communism.

Those four facts were clearly established by the testimony of State Department representatives.

In addition, there was a mass closing of business, about which not only businessmen, but also working people, complained. There was a complete strike of the economy, mainly protesting the soft hands that were applied to the Communists.

Those statements of fact cannot be challenged. I respectfully say that this is not a one-sided question.

Are we to give aid to operate a country that lets its schools teach Communist doctrine; that allows its radios to be used to spread Communist doctrine; that allows a Cuban base, which teaches communism, to be used unchallenged; that invites exiled Communists to return from everywhere?

This issue is not so clear and simple as has been suggested. It has been said that that government should have remained in office. The people of the Dominican Republic have some judgment.

We were quick to recognize Castro; and all the proof was that Castro was a Communist. No one complained about that.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Ohio is quite mistaken.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There was very little complaint about Castro.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is mistaken about that. Let him read the RECORD. The Senator from Ohio does not know what he is talking about when he makes that statement, because apparently he has never read the RECORD, so how would he know?

The senior Senator from Oregon spoke day after day against the Castro regime. Yet the Senator from Ohio seeks to leave in the RECORD the impression that no one objected to the Castro regime. I do not intend to let the Senator from Ohio get by with that statement. I do not intend to let him get by with the red herring he has just drawn across the floor of the Senate.

I do not yield to the Senator from Ohio to draw a red herring across the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not a red herring.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call the Senator from Ohio to order. I do not yield further to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The Senator from Oregon declines to yield further.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the four points made by the Senator from Ohio. The Senator from Ohio has said that the Bosch regime agreed to the admission of Communists to the Dominican Republic. He did because that is their national policy. I stand before the Senate today, with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] sitting next to me, as one of the three authors who added to the Smith anti-Communist bill authored by the Senator from Maine the amendment that outlawed the Communist Party in the United States. The third author was the then Senator from Massachusetts, John Kennedy. It was a mistake for the Dominican Republic not to outlaw the Communist Party; but that was its sovereign right.

In the campaign that resulted in the election of Mr. Bosch as President of the Dominican Republic, every candidate favored the readmission of the Communists and other exiles to the Dominican Republic. That is the record. Bosch's opponent took the same position. It was represented to us by the State Department, in the briefing to which the Senator from Ohio referred, that apparently the reason was that they had suffered so long under the dictatorship of Trujillo, and so many people had had to flee the Dominican Republic, that it was thought, as a matter of national policy, that all exiles should be readmitted.

I think the Dominican Government made the same mistake on this matter that Betancourt made in Venezuela. The Government of the Dominican Republic ought to have profited by the mistake made by Betancourt; although I suppose it is rather difficult for those of us who have not been exiles, who have not suffered all the cruelty that goes along with an exile policy, to appreciate fully the desire of the candidates of the Dominican Republic, as it was also the desire of Betancourt in Venezuela, to say, "It is better to let them in and watch them than it is to keep them out or to drive them into the underground." I do not share that point of view; but that was the policy that was followed. Therefore, I do not think it is proper or fair to give the impression that Bosch favored letting the Communists come back to the Dominican Republic, without pointing out at the same time that that was the position of all the candidates in the campaign.

Now we come to the school incident. The briefing by the State Department representatives was that an old school building in the Dominican Republic had been taken over by a Communist group. Here, again, the sad fact is that the Communist Party of the Dominican Republic has never been outlawed. That was a great mistake. I hold no briefs for the mistakes of Bosch or the mistakes of any other President in any other Latin American country. But those mistakes have nothing to do with the underlying principle of whether the United States should support military juntas that overthrow constitutional governments. It is true that the old school building has been used by some Communist group which has held meetings in it. Apparently, as was said by a representative of the State Department, Communist doctrine was taught. The American Embassy had taken it up with President Bosch. He kept promising that he would do something about it. Apparently some steps were underway to do something about it when the coup occurred. But is the school incident an argument that justifies our supporting a military junta that destroyed a constitutional government which was elected by the then free people of the Dominican Republic?

It was pointed out also by the State Department that there was a general strike by businessmen in the Dominican Republic, although actually it reached effective proportions only in the capital city. There was little effect in other parts of the country. There were a good many reasons for that strike. Bosch had sought to put into effect a rather stringent taxing program. A considerable amount of restriction and limitation had been placed upon the economy of the Dominican Republic in an attempt to benefit all the people. It was that program that resulted in the demonstration by businessmen but it was a strike that lasted, relatively, for a few hours. It ran its course in 1 day, and the following day the stores were open again so we were told by the State Department. It was a demonstration. Is that justification to support a military junta that throws out a constitutionally elected regime because some business interests in the country have demonstrated against it? What nonsense is that?

Some of the details of the coup and the events which led up to it are described by Prof. Ronald Hilton of Stanford University in today's New York Times.

I ask unanimous consent to have this account printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Oct. 1, 1963]

REPORT ON SANTO DOMINGO—LATIN AMERICAN SPECIALIST OUTLINES EVENTS LEADING TO COUP

(The writer of the following is editor of the Hispanic-American Report, Stanford University.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

With what may be an all-too-common lack of prescience, the American press did not have a single representative in Santo Domingo at the time of the coup which overthrew President Juan Bosch.

There were well-founded rumors that a coup was being prepared to defend the old order, the pretext being an alleged Communist threat; the only doubt was when the coup would be launched and whether the President would be able to devise some means of meeting brute military force. The observations of one who witnessed the coup may be of some interest.

The visitor to the Dominican Republic was immediately struck by the fact that the military-cum-police was still intact, and virtually unchanged. It should be remembered that the military who assassinated Trujillo did so not out of love of freedom and democracy but because the tyrant had become an embarrassment and threatened the privileged position the military had built up. Under the Bosch regime, the military police state continued to live side by side with the relatively powerless civilian regime. The cat was simply waiting to pounce on the spirited mouse.

SHAMELESS CONTRIVANCE

The coup was contrived with a shamelessness which was scarcely credible. The merchants' association called a strike, which was a miserable failure even though the small shopkeepers were bribed to participate. Three radio stations and one TV station incited the people to revolt in a clearly subversive fashion.

President Bosch used his constitutional powers to close them down; the anti-Bosch elements who were inciting the crowd to overthrow the Government denounced this as an infringement on popular rights. The army staged a coup and immediately forced all the radio stations in the republic simply to rebroadcast all day long the junta propaganda. It would be hard to conceive of a grosser non sequitur.

The merchant's strike was sparked largely by local Spanish interests. Conversations with business leaders, both Dominican and foreign (including German), revealed that by and large they were delighted with the coup. It was assumed that the new military regime (with civilians as a figleaf) should make life easier for business.

They denounced Bosch as a "Communist," and when asked for details provided "facts" which were carefully checked with well-informed diplomatic observers. Almost without exception, the "facts" were clearly unfounded; sometimes the charges were clearly inspired by resentment that the Government had refused to give the company a contract or had awarded it to a competitor.

The elections which brought Bosch to power were witnessed by Organization of American States observers, and Bosch's enemies were therefore unable to claim they had been fraudulent. The rightist minority revealed that inability, all too frequent in Latin America, to understand the nature of democratic elections. If you can't win in the elections, some other way must be sought to grab power. The successful candidate must be denounced as personally incompetent or corrupt.

ACCUSED OF CORRUPTION

Bosch was described as both. It was strange to hear Bosch, who dismissed the one adviser suspected of corruption, being accused of corruption by people who clearly have no general objection to it. It may well be that Bosch, an author who had for years lived outside of the Dominican Republic, lacked both the technical skills and the personal knowledge of present-day Dominican affairs to be an ideal President, but his opponents are in general scarcely more attractive.

Bosch was regarded by sober American observers as sufficiently attractive to be worth widespread support. The United States and the Alliance for Progress had a much wider commitment to support the Bosch regime than is generally realized. The planning of the country was largely in the hands of CIDES (Centro de Investigaciones de Desarrollo Economico y Social), supported by the Ford and Parvin foundations and by the Agency for International Development; its director, Sacha Volman, a U.S. citizen, is one of the bêtes noires of the new regime. He took refuge in the U.S. Embassy while the army searched his home.

Former Vice President Wallace was in the Dominican Republic at the time of the coup; he had a project to develop appropriate strains of hybrid maize to increase the corn production. This is just one of many projects with which the United States was attempting to get the economy off the ground. Incidentally, Ambassador Martin and his staff deserve high commendation.

It may be that no regime can save the Dominican Republic. A ride across the country bears graphic evidence of what we know from vital statistics. There may be no country in the world where one sees such a high proportion of children, most illegitimate, for whom there is no prospect of education, training, and jobs. Perhaps the example of Puerto Rico offers some hope. Otherwise within 50 years the Dominican Republic will be another Haiti.

RONALD HILTON.

Mr. MORSE. As to the use of the radio by the Communists the fact is that the Communist Party was not outlawed in the Dominican Republic. However, the broadcasts were not extensive although I think they should have been outlawed. We were told by the State Department that President Bosch was about to submit this and other Communist control problems to the Congress but was prevented from doing so by the coup.

Mr. President, the alleged mistakes and weaknesses of the Bosch regime do not justify U.S. support of a military junta overthrowing the Bosch regime. However, the Senator from Ohio forgot to point out what the State Department briefed us on, in regard to the governmental objectives of the Bosch regime and the good things he has sought to inaugurate for the peoples of the Dominican Republic. He was in the process of carrying out his campaign pledges including the land reform program, tax program, employment program, strict economy by eliminating waste and graft. His insistence on trying to help with the employment problem and his attempt to bring about the necessary reforms in the sugar industry and the rest of industry of the Dominican Republic won for him the enmity of the military leaders and their business allies.

Let us face it. President Bosch followed what is generally recognized to be a liberal program in the Dominican Republic, based upon the good old American concept that the government has a responsibility to come to the assistance of its people when the people cannot assist themselves, and when something needs to be done for the common good and for the general welfare, and it is not being done by the private segment or sector of the economy. Democratic government owes a responsibility to protect the general welfare of all the people. This is a pretty good American democratic doctrine.

All the red herrings, all the non sequiturs, all the side issues raised by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] do not change the controlling fact, that a constitutional, democratic form of government was overthrown in the Dominican Republic by a military junta. It raises a major foreign policy question for the United States: Are we going to recognize it? Are we going to aid it? Are we going to follow the past practice, after a few days, of coming in and maintaining the military junta in power?

In my judgment, if we do it, the predictions of Muñoz Marín will come true, and the predictions of other authorities on Latin America as to what will happen to American prestige in Latin America will come true.

We will lose Latin America because democratic forces in Latin America will have a clear demonstration that they cannot trust the United States.

Bosch took the position that his administration had to get the Dominican Republic on the move. He was attempting to come to the economic assistance of the general mass of the people; and, of course, that was bound to bring him into conflict with the vested interests, including, I am afraid, some foreign business interests. His progressive program was bound to raise objections from the oligarchy. It was bound to raise objections from the remnants of the old Trujillo regime. But it does not make a case for the United States aiding and abetting or now giving support to a military junta that has overthrown a constitutional government. The fact remains that the people of the Dominican Republic did not remove Bosch. He was removed by a military clique, and they in effect destroyed the constitution. They in effect removed the civilian commander in chief of the army. As I said yesterday—and this was brought out also in the briefing by the State Department, about which the Senator from Ohio forgot to tell us—Bosch was seeking to remove Col. Wessin y Wessin who, after all, was seeking to usurp civilian power. Bosch saw it coming. He was about to call a session of the legislature under the constitution to lay his case before the Congress, and the military did not want to face any public disclosure of its traitorous intrigue, so they overthrew him.

The last time the plain people of the Dominican Republic were given a voice in their government, they chose Mr.

Bosch to be their president. The question remains—is the Government of the United States going to support a military overthrow of the constitutional Government of the Dominican Republic elected by the people of the country? If we do we belie all our professings about supporting freedom and democratic government in Latin America.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for just one moment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield, provided that in doing so I do not lose my right to the floor.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Oregon is correct in his statement with a few of the other matters that he mentioned, but I want it observed that there has been no denial of the statement made by me that there were four factors dealing with intensive Communist activities that caused general dissatisfaction. Those four factors were, as I have enumerated them: The return of the exiled Communists; the actual conduct of a school teaching communism in a government building; the use of the government radio in spreading the Communist doctrine; and the use of a Cuban base for the exchange of Communist technique and philosophy.

Now there are two sides to every coin. The only point I wish to make is that this is not a one-sided argument.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, judging from the colloquy between my friends the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], it would seem that in the regime established by us, the "Commies," who were thrown out by Trujillo before his death, were permitted to come back. That seems to be the great difficulty that caused this overthrow.

In regard to the statement made by my good friend the Senator from Ohio, that nobody objected to the recognition of Castro, I wish he would read my report—I still have a few copies.

In 1958, when I came back from South and Central America, I prescribed a course of action that we should follow toward Cuba. But my advice, and that of the Ambassadors who were there—Smith, and others—was not followed by the State Department. I begged Mr. Rubottom, who was the head of the Latin American desk at that time, that we should under no circumstances recognize Castro.

But we did. In less than 6 months we regretted it, and we withdrew our Ambassador.

Mr. President, I do not wish to go into details on what has happened in the Dominican Republic. But as I stated several years ago, at that time I knew of no government in South or Central America that was not dependent for its existence on an army, on force. I believe the only one I mentioned that was not in such a position was Uruguay.

Mr. President, it will take time, and much effort, in order to teach the people south of us about democracy as we know it. I am very hopeful, and I agree with my good friend the Senator from Oregon, that we should under no circumstances assist these juntas by giving them aid of any kind. I know what the pattern has been, and it was no surprise to me to see it fall.

I again state that I regret that Trujillo was assassinated. As I said in my report, I was in South and Central America in 1952 and in 1958. I said in 1958 that there was no country in South or Central America that made greater progress during that period of time, in all of South and Central America, than the Dominican Republic. I was challenged when I made that statement, but I am glad to say that every American who visited there after my visit stated they found conditions as I described them. The island had made great progress; the people had a much better way of life than they had ever enjoyed before.

All of that came about through what I would term a benevolent dictatorship. It is a sad thing that at the time Trujillo was in the process of dividing up much of the land that he owned and was attempting to distribute it among the people, he was assassinated.

We now find ourselves in a position in which we must now spend millions of dollars in order to maintain the status quo. When Trujillo was in power, we contributed only $2.9 million in economic aid to the Dominican Republic. He was a good administrator, and the economy of his nation flourished. Since his death, we have given the Republic, to date, $65.5 million in economic aid alone.

It is true that we gave Trujillo the same advantage that we gave to Cuba and to many other countries in which sugar is produced. But all in all, a grave mistake was made when we encouraged, not the assassination, but the change of government in the Dominican Republic.

MRS. ELIZABETH G. MASON—EXTENSION OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3369) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at a time when we are faced with deficit budgets and the possibility of a tax cut that will further deepen the deficit, and at a time when we are hearing promises galore that Federal expenditures will be maintained at the current levels or even reduced in areas where reduction will not harm the national security, I once again rise to oppose extension of the Commission on Civil Rights. I am certain of two things: First, that allowing this ill-conceived and malformed child of the executive branch to die a natural death will in no way affect our national security. Second, that its demise will end a useless, multimillion-dollar drain on the National Treasury.

Since 1957, the Commission has expended $4,483,000 of the taxpayers' money. It has grown from a budget of $200,000 in 1958, to an estimated budget of $985,000 in 1964. The number of its personnel has grown from 16 to 76, if I recall the figures. When the 1964 estimate is added to the previous expenditures, the total is $5,468,000. And this money has gone to support a group that advocates that all Federal money should be withdrawn from the Southern States unless integration is made the order of the day.

Personally, I would like to find some way to insure that the taxpayers of the South could withhold their funds from the support of the Commission. Indeed, there is no reason to say the South alone, for I am confident that the actions and policies of the Commission are an affront to the vast majority of American taxpayers all over this Nation. On this account alone, the Commission should be allowed to die.

And what has been gained by the expenditure of this $4½ million, aside from providing a high and supposedly influential haven for some members of the Howard University Law School? Let us look at the record and note just what that expenditure has accomplished.

That record is composed of a series of reports, recommendations, and hearings with which the Commission has seen fit to busy itself over the last 6 years. These reports are generally notable for their bias, and the essence of their bigotry is perhaps best summed up in its recent interim report to the President concerning Mississippi. That interim report recommended that the President and Congress explore the possibility of cutting off all Federal expenditures being made to the State of Mississippi. Reading it over, I felt as if the Constitution did not exist, and that the dangers of concentrated power which our forefathers so rightly and correctly feared had already progressed past the point of no return.

Indeed, if there is an underlying theme of all the reports and activities of the Commission, it is that no good whatsoever can flow from local government and the powers of the individual States.

Their efforts are aimed at breaking down that power, and trampling over the rights of the local people to deal with local problems. This is true in their reports on the schools, on the voting processes, and spills into such areas as our housing problems. As such, the Commission undermines our American way of life.

Mr. President, I have taken the position that the activities of this Commission, as indicated by the recommendations made in its various reports, will cause far more harm than good to the very individuals it is supposedly trying to help. The American people will not stand still for the implementation of these proposals, and alienation and ill-feeling toward the Negro will undoubtedly grow more and more pronounced. We have seen indications of this already, in all parts of the country.

To outline the type of total integration the Commission has in mind, I would

like to quote a few short excerpts dealing with its many recommendations as contained in its reports.

First, from its interim report of this year, dealing with Mississippi:

The people of Mississippi and of the other States should know that according to information available to the Commission in fiscal year 1962, the Federal Government received from all sources in Mississippi $270 million. During the same period, payments from the Federal Government to the State, counties, municipalities, and individuals exceeded $650 million for grant-in-aid programs, U.S. Corps of Engineers construction contracts, military prime contracts, and direct civilian and military payrolls. Examples of additional Federal programs benefiting Mississippi include area redevelopment loans and grants, small business loans, accelerated public works projects, and Federal Aviation Agency grants.

I might add here that apparently the Commission was unaware of the amounts of the Federal welfare payments that go to benefit a great number of Mississippi Negroes. Here is a prime example of the harm that would accrue in the name of doing "good."

The same principle is evident in its publication "With Liberty and Justice for All," of 1959, where we find this recommendation:

We recommend that Federal agencies act in accordance with the fundamental constitutional principle of equal protection and equal treatment, and that these agencies be authorized and directed to withhold funds in any form to institutions of higher learning, both publicly supported and privately supported, which refuse, on racial grounds to admit students otherwise qualified for admission.

In "Equal Protection of the Laws in Public Higher Education, 1960," we find that the Commission suggests that the Federal Government take such measures as may be necessary to assure that funds under the various programs of Federal assistance to higher education are disbursed only to those public institutions of higher education that do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin. Such measures should stipulate that no Federal agency or official shall be given the power to direct, supervise, or control the administration, curriculums or personnel of an institution operated and maintained by the State or a political subdivision thereof.

Turning to the field of employment, we find that the Commission recommended that Federal statutory authority be granted to the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity or that an entirely new agency with such authority be established empowering it to first, encourage and enforce a policy of equal employment opportunity in all Federal and federally supported employment; second, promote and enforce a policy of equality of opportunity in the availability and administration of all federally assisted training programs and recruiting services; and third, encourage and enforce a policy of equal opportunity applying to labor unions which operate directly or indirectly under the Federal funds, contracts, or grants-in-aid.

Nothing will do more to alienate our white citizens than the above recommendations, should efforts be made to enforce them overnight.

In the volatile field of housing, we find the Commission believes as follows:

Recommendation 2(c): Direct FHA and VA, in selling or leasing reacquired housing, to take appropriate steps to assure that such Government-owned housing will be available on a nondiscriminatory basis.

And in the same publication:

Recommendation 5: That the President direct the Urban Renewal Administration to require that each contract entered into between local public authorities and redevelopers contain a provision assuring access to reuse housing to all applicants regardless of race, creed, or color.

If these recommendations are ever implemented by the strong hand of the Federal Government, we will enter into an era of domestic strife that we have not seen since Reconstruction. The Senate may take my word for it.

My opposition to the Commission is doubtless well known. As a final word, let me point out once again that shortly after the Commission was given life, a Civil Rights Division was established in the Department of Justice. Although the budget of this Division is roughly comparable to that of the Civil Rights Commission, its activities and responsibilities are almost entirely overlapping. Nothing of benefit has yet come from this double expenditure of the taxpayer's dollar and, in my opinion, nothing ever will.

Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study carefully the report published yesterday by the Civil Rights Commission. I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a few excerpts, with comments, from this most recent civil rights report.

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

EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS, 1963

Recommendation 1: That Congress, acting under section 2 of the 15th amendment and sections 2 and 5 of the 14th amendment (a) declare that voter qualifications other than age, residence, confinement, and conviction of a crime are susceptible of use, and have been used, to deny the right to vote on grounds of race and color; and (b) enact legislation providing that all citizens of the United States shall have a right to vote in Federal or State elections which shall not be denied or in any way abridged or interfered with by the United States or by any State for any cause except for inability to meet reasonable age or length-of-residence requirements uniformly applied to all persons within a State, failure to cmplete six grades of formal education or its equivalent, legal confinement at the time of registration or election, judicially determined mental disability, or conviction of a felony; such right to vote to include the right to register or otherwise qualify to vote, and to have one's vote counted.

Comment: This recommendation completely disregards sections of our Constitution which give the States the absolute right to prescribe the conditions which must be met by their electors.

Recommendation 3: That, if the steps previously recommended prove ineffective, Congress further act to assure the attainment of uniform suffrage qualifications as contemplated by section 2 of the 14th amendment, through enactment of legislation proportionately reducing the representation in the House of Representatives in those cases in which voter qualifications continue to be used as a device for denying the franchise to citizens on the grounds of race, color, or national origin.

Comment: Concerning this so-called recommendation, it is sufficient to say that it would carry us back to the Reconstruction era for which the Civil Rights Commission apparently has so high a regard. We of the South had quite a little experience with the era of Reconstruction, and its unhappy lessons provide ample reason for us to oppose the President's civil rights proposals.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Recommendation 1: That the Congress enact legislation requiring every local school board which maintains any public school to which pupils are assigned, reassigned, or transferred on the basis of race, to adopt and publish within 90 days after the enactment of such legislation a plan for prompt compliance with the constitutional duty to provide nonsegregated public education for all school-age children within its jurisdiction. The Congress should authorize the Attorney General, in the event the board fails to adopt or to implement a plan, to institute legal action to require the adoption or implementation of such a plan or any other plan the court finds more appropriate and consistent with the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

Comment: It is easy to see what is sought after here. This recommendation, if given substance by legislation, would entirely preempt and eliminate the power and control of the local school boards. Can anyone imagine one of the small, rural school districts of Louisiana being controlled and regulated by the Attorney General from here in Washington? I cannot, but apparently the Civil Rights Commission can.

EMPLOYMENT

Recommendation 1: That Congress enact legislation establishing a right to equal opportunity in employment when that employment is assisted by the Federal Government or affects interstate commerce, with authority to institute action and to issue appropriate orders vested in a single administrator located in the Department of Labor, and provision for appeal to an independent authority.

Comment: Here again we see the Commission turning to Washington for the solution to every problem. Here again we see them calling for the ever-increasing concentration of power in the hands of the Federal Government. And here again we see them calling for those hands to be extended into the affairs of virtually every business in America, forcing employers to hire persons they do not wish to employ, and to displace persons who may be doing a good job but whose face is the wrong color.

JUSTICE

Recommendation 1: That Congress empower the Attorney General to intervene in or to initiate civil proceedings to prevent denials to persons of any rights, privileges or immunities secured to them by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

* * * * *

Recommendation 3: That Congress amend section 1983 of title 42 of the United States Code to make any county government, city government, or other local governmental entity that employs officers who deprive persons of rights protected by that section, jointly liable with the officers to victims of such officers' misconduct.

Recommendation 4: That Congress amend section 1443 of title 28 of the United States Code to permit removal by the defendant of a State civil action or criminal prosecution to a district court of the United States in

cases where the defendant cannot, in the State court, secure his civil rights because of the written or decisional laws of the State or because of the acts of individuals administering or affecting its judicial process.

Comment: The first of these recommendations would give more power to the Attorney General than has ever been visited upon any man charged with the administration of justice in the history of our Nation. As such, it would pave the way for a despot, for power can be used for both good ends and bad. No matter what we may think of the actions of the present Attorney General, there is no way to ascertain who will follow him. Given the power envisioned in recommendation 1, the actions of the next Attorney General may make the actions of Mr. Robert Kennedy pale into insignificance.

Recommendation 3 is unjust on its face, while No. 4 would do away with and usurp the power of our State courts which form the cornerstone of American jurisprudence.

MILITARY

Recommendation 2: That the President request the Secretary of Defense to reappraise testing procedures currently used by all services in the procurement of enlisted and officer personnel so that they will be validated for performance both in general and for persons differing in educational, economic, regional, and other background factors.

Comment: When this recommendation is translated into plain English it clearly means that Negroes should be given preferential treatment in the testing procedure now in effect in all of the military services. On the basis of tests given him when a man enters military service, he is assigned a training school in one of the needed specialties, such as electronics, mechanics, or metalworking. Our military preparedness and effectiveness is directly dependent on the enlisted man's performance of his duty upon completion of his training. When allowances are made for "persons differing in educational, economic, regional, and other background factors"—in other words when some men receive preferential treatment over others who may be better able to do the job, our total preparedness is bound to suffer. Also antagonisms among the men cannot help being created.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I agree with my senior colleague from Louisiana, and with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who discussed the Civil Rights Commission problem. I shall vote with them in this matter. If I were convinced that I could persuade Senators to vote in the same manner, I would speak for whatever length I thought might be effective in aiding the cause. However, I believe my colleagues who have spoken before me have made the case very well.

HEARINGS BEFORE FINANCE COMMITTEE ON TAX REDUCTION BILL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this morning the Senate Committee on Finance voted on a motion to close hearings on the tax reduction bill recommended by the President, on November 1.

As one who voted against the motion, I would like to make clear for the record my reasons for voting against this proposal. It is my feeling that the proposal had merit and that the committee could well schedule its hearings to conclude the testimony of administration witnesses, as well as public witnesses, by the first of next month. On the other hand, the committee did not have before it a proposed schedule of the date on which hearings would commence, the list of witnesses to be heard, or the date on which the chairman would propose that the hearings should be concluded.

It was my feeling that the chairman of this committee, as well as the chairman of any other legislative committee, should propose a schedule for the dates on which witnesses would be heard on important measures of this sort. Until the proposed schedule of witnesses is before the committee, members have no basis upon which to decide whether the procedure suggested by the chairman is appropriate.

As one member of the committee, I would not wish to dispute the procedure recommended by the chairman over the difference of a matter of several days.

It is also my feeling that the committee should seek to proceed expeditiously with the tax bill and offer the Senate the opportunity to vote on this measure before it adjourns for this session. In that respect, my views are parallel to the views of the President.

After all, each year the Appropriations Committee of the Senate acts upon a number of important measures which by custom, if not by constitutional requirement, are required to originate in the House. It is agreed procedure that these bills must be enacted before the Congress adjourns for the session. I would hope that the Senate Committee on Finance would take the same attitude with regard to the tax cut proposal, although I fully recognize that neither I nor anyone else has the power to require this.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak on the subject of the meeting of the Finance Committee this morning, but since the Senator from Louisiana has made his statement I believe perhaps it should be supplemented.

It so happens that I was the Senator who made the motion—first, that the committee hear the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for the remainder of this week; that we ask the Secretary of the Treasury to testify next Monday, October 7; that we should complete the public hearings on or before November 1; and that statements could be filed in certain cases in lieu of open testimony. I regret that the motion received only 4 votes and was defeated with either 11 or 12 negative votes.

I appreciate the conciliatory statement made by the Senator from Louisiana, which is characteristic of him, but in my judgment the action of the Committee will mean the death of the President's tax program.

This is a crushing defeat for the administration, and it is disheartening to those of us who have tried to get the case of the administration before the American people. I have a deep feeling of disappointment within my breast, but I believe perhaps it would be better if I did not express it or go into it in too great detail.

The trouble started last January when the Democratic caucus refused to enlarge the membership of the Finance Committee. Had it been so enlarged, some of the "faint hearted" might have had courage to go ahead. But that was not done.

Measures can be killed not merely by open opposition but also by delay.

The Times Dispatch of Richmond as of last Thursday quoted the chairman of the committee as saying that he planned to have the staff brief the committee for a week or more and that public hearings would not begin until the week of the 14th of October and that the public hearings might run for approximately 6 weeks, which would cause the public hearings to be concluded approximately the 1st of December. If this schedule is followed, of course it will mean that there will be no tax bill this session, and a vital part of the administration's program will go down the drain. For after the hearings are concluded there will have to be a further period of making policy decisions in committee and also drafting changes. Then the bill will have to go to the floor of the Senate and to conference.

I think we may as well recognize what has happened. I regard it as a calamity of the first order—not that I regard the tax bill as perfect. It is in fact a very imperfect bill. I would strive to improve it, to give a larger share of the benefits to those with incomes of under $10,000 a year, and to reduce the benefits to those with incomes of over $50,000 a year. Nevertheless, on balance, as of the present moment, I regard the bill as having more good in it than bad.

It is always somewhat ungracious to fight these committee battles out on the floor of the Senate, and I had not intended to speak until my good friend from Louisiana—and I assure him he is my good friend—raised the issue; but I do not think we can purposely gloss it over and say we will have another chance. I know there is an old saying that "He who fights and runs away lives to fight another day," but if we continue to yield time after time, the effectiveness of resistance continually diminishes. I think this should be recognized, very frankly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission. It that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Minnesota wish to take me off my feet?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I apologize. I thought the Senator from Illinois had concluded his statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall complete it very shortly.

We may as well recognize the fact that what happened this morning was a defeat for the Kennedy administration—a defeat administered by both Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I say, in response to the Senator from Illinois, that I am not at all prepared to concede that the vote this morning meant the tax bill would not be voted on this year. Had I felt that was the effect of the vote, I believe I would have voted the other way. I do believe,

however, as I said in my statement, it would be best to proceed and see how the chairman of the committee proposes to handle the bill. The Senator from Illinois knows, as I do, that the chairman of the committee would probably vote against the bill. I think, as a matter of fairness, he would proceed on the basis that would offer us an opportunity to hear the administration witnesses and the public witnesses, and I hope we would have an opportunity to vote on the bill prior to the time Congress adjourns this session.

If that does not happen, the Senator has the same recourse every other Member of the Senate has, to offer all phases or portions of the tax bill as amendments to other bills that are on the calendar. Of course, the Senator is familiar with that fact.

MRS. ELIZABETH G. MASON—EXTENSION OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3369) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for himself and other Senators.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] would each vote "yea."

The pair of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 15, as follows:

[No. 179 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Anderson	Hart	Morton
Bartlett	Hartke	Moss
Bayh	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Beall	Hruska	Muskie
Bennett	Humphrey	Nelson
Bible	Inouye	Neuberger
Boggs	Jackson	Pastore
Brewster	Javits	Pearson
Burdick	Jordan, Idaho	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Keating	Proxmire
Cannon	Kennedy	Randolph
Carlson	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Church	Lausche	Saltonstall
Clark	Long, Mo.	Scott
Cooper	Magnuson	Smith
Cotton	McCarthy	Symington
Curtis	McGee	Tower
Dirksen	McGovern	Walters
Dodd	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Edmondson	Mechem	Yarborough
Goldwater	Miller	Young, Ohio
Gore	Monroney	
Gruening	Morse	

NAYS—15

Byrd, Va.	Hill	Robertson
Eastland	Holland	Russell
Ellender	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Ervin	Long, La	Talmadge
Fulbright	McClellan	Thurmond

NOT VOTING—15

Aiken	Fong	Prouty
Allott	Hayden	Simpson
Case	Johnston	Smathers
Dominick	Mansfield	Stennis
Engle	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.

So the amendment offered by Mr. HUMPHREY, on behalf of himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. DIRKSEN, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy that Senators have an opportunity today to save the Civil Rights Commission from dying of neglect. The work of the Commission is too important to let it fade out of existence. The 1-year extension proposed by this amendment will prevent the Commission shutting up shop before the Senate has a chance to consider and debate the 4-year extension with expanded functions proposed for it in the administration's civil rights bill.

Already the uncertainty regarding the extension of the Commission's life may have done serious damage to its effectiveness. According to press reports, Berl I. Bernhard, the very competent staff director, and other top administrators have submitted their resignations. It would be most unfortunate if the Commission were to lose its trained staff at a time when their knowledge and experience have an important role to play in the fight for justice and equal rights for all.

I hope that in view of today's action, these men will reconsider their resignations. But it is obvious that piecemeal extension of the Civil Rights Commission will make it very difficult to hire and retain competent personnel. A 4-year extension would enable the Commission to work effectively without the constant threat of dissolution affecting the morale of its staff. This amendment is a stopgap measure, but I know that we will be able later in the year to give the Commission the 4-year duration which the administration has recommended.

The Civil Rights Commission has long since proved its worth. Its careful investigations have produced a series of valuable reports on the brutal effect discrimination has had on the lives of our Negro citizens. The spotlight the Commission has thrown on the evil practices of bigotry have made us all aware that this is not a sectional problem but one which must be squarely faced by all Americans. The work of the Commission has provided a solid base of evidence for the administration's civil rights bill, which incorporates many of the suggestions of the Commission. As legislators and as citizens, we cannot act wisely and effectively to end the evils of discrimination without accurate and impartial evidence. As a factfinding body the Commission has splendidly performed the task assigned to it by the Congress.

It is a good omen that this proposal for the extension of the Civil Rights Commission has been introduced by the leadership of both parties. This bipartisan approach is not only a tribute to the fine work which has been done by the Commission, but a sign that the Negro's struggle for equality goes beyond partisan questions and touches our conscience as men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not hear the Chair state the question which is now before this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill H.R. 3369. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to

vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 15, as follows:

[No. 180 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Anderson	Hart	Morton
Bartlett	Hartke	Moss
Bayh	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Beall	Hruska	Muskie
Bennett	Humphrey	Nelson
Bible	Inouye	Neuberger
Boggs	Jackson	Pastore
Brewster	Javits	Pearson
Burdick	Jordan, Idaho	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Keating	Proxmire
Cannon	Kennedy	Randolph
Carlson	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Church	Lausche	Saltonstall
Clark	Long, Mo.	Scott
Cooper	Magnuson	Smith
Cotton	McCarthy	Symington
Curtis	McGee	Tower
Dirksen	McGovern	Walters
Dodd	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Edmondson	Mechem	Yarborough
Goldwater	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Morse	

NAYS—15

Byrd, Va.	Hill	Robertson
Eastland	Holland	Russell
Ellender	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Ervin	Long, La.	Talmadge
Fulbright	McClellan	Thurmond

NOT VOTING—14

Aiken	Fong	Prouty
Allott	Hayden	Simpson
Case	Johnston	Smathers
Dominick	Mansfield	Stennis
Engle	Metcalf	

So the bill (H.R. 3369) was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

STANLEY FRANK MUSIAL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last Sunday afternoon, September 29, one of the outstanding athletes of this century, Stanley Frank Musial, drove in a run, with a sharp single into right field, and then retired from baseball.

Stan Musial is more than a great athlete. He is a great man—an inspiration to every American who respects the priceless combination of character with ability.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article, written by Bob Burnes, and published in the St. Louis Globe Democrat of Sunday, September 29. The article is entitled "A Salute to a Great Man."

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

A SALUTE TO A GREAT MAN

(By Bob Burnes)

The name by which Stan Musial is best known grew, like Betty Smith's tree, in Brooklyn.

Unlike most ballplayers, there was no colorful name which attached itself immediately to Musial—a name like the Babe for Ruth or the Splendid Splinter for Williams.

Since it is commonplace to attach descriptives to athletes, everybody tried. Stan early was called the Greyhound or the Donora Dynamiter. Those who knew him best called him Stash, the Polish diminutive for Stanley. None exactly fit.

In fact, he had been in the major leagues for 7 years, had won two batting titles, twice had been named the league's most valuable player before a nickname was born.

When it was found, it was a pip.

It happened in Brooklyn on May 18, 19, and 20, 1948. Musial, coming back from an appendicitis operation, was en route to his greatest batting season. In the process, he was about the delightful business of destroying the Dodgers, a ball club against which he dearly loved to hit, especially in the chummy surroundings of Ebbets Field in Flatbush.

He warmed up to his task on May 18 by obtaining two hits in four times at bat. On the following day he went five-for-five, three singles, a double and a triple. On the third day, he went four-for-six, a single, two doubles and a home run. In 3 days he had 9 hits in 15 times at bat as the Cardinals won, 4–3, 14–7, and 13–4.

It was not a series to enchant the diehard Dodger fans. Every time they looked up, Musial was headed plateward, carrying lumber and gazing longingly at the right field screen.

And every time he did the fans moaned "Here comes that man again."

And that's where the name "The Man" by which Stan Musial is known everywhere was born.

The Dodger fans were paying him the supreme tribute as a ballplayer.

Millions of Americans, baseball fans and those who have never seen a major league game, now pay him the same tribute. They all call him "The Man" and they mean it in every sense of the word.

More than a great name, a familiar number and a ball player who belongs even now in the hall of fame will go to bat for the last time as a Cardinal, Sunday, when Stan Musial plays his last game.

A living legend will die.

This writer, who saw Stan play his first game and will see him play his last, says honestly that something will go out of his life as a reporter when No. 6 no longer is on the Red Bird roster.

He never expects to see anyone like Musial again.

This is the unbelievable hold that Stan Musial has on an American public—The Man who has captured a tough public merely by being a simple, wonderful human being.

Waiters and cabbies in New York, dowagers in San Francisco, the movie colony in Los Angeles, and every American from coast to coast who has ever heard of baseball knows of St. Louis No. 1 citizen and talk of him as an old friend. They have stood in every city and given him tremendous ovations, even hard-bitten fans who wouldn't rise up if Abner Doubleday came back to visit.

They all say the same thing, "Stan can't retire. Baseball won't be the same without him."

Indeed it won't.

Oh, this is not merely a case of a man with a yard of statistics and a roomful of plaques to prove his prowess. Stan has them all. "He got so many on our last trip," one Cardinal player said, "that we were thinking of using them for poker chips in the card game."

You name the town and Stan has a statistic there or a memorable event.

In Chicago, he drove out his 3,000th hit in dramatic fashion in a pinch role. Or in Boston where he went five-for-five for the fourth time in a season, in this instance against five different pitchers. Or in San Francisco where, late in 1962, he almost destroyed pennant hopes with still another five-for-five day. ("In my younger days," he said apologetically on that occasion, "they would have been five doubles—but I don't run quite as fast.")

Or in Los Angeles, where he broke the National League record for total hits in a career with a single off Ron Perranoski.

Or in Cincinnati, where he ignored a doctor's orders, got up out of a sick bed, straggled to home plate almost too weak to swing the bat and lashed a pinch homer that won a game the Cards needed.

Or in Pittsburgh, his home town, where he almost wrecked the Pirates' pennant hopes in 1960 with decisive late inning hits.

Or in Milwaukee, where he and his counterpart, ageless Warren Spahn, have had so many personal duels. Where even this year, he singled home the winning run off Spahn who said, "I oughta know better than to try to pitch to him."

You name it. He's been there and left his mark.

Ask the fans in Brooklyn. They know. They named him. Little wonder that Buzzy Bavasi, the general manager of the transplanted Dodgers, in sending in a ticket order for the Musial testimonial dinner on October 20 wrote feelingly: "I'll be there. I want to make sure he retires."

But this is the story only of Stan the baseball Man.

The story of Stan the Man reveals even more completely his stature.

You name the year. He's been there and left his mark. You name the situation and he's had the answer for it.

Some of them have been big stories. They've made the headlines. Others have been little stories, of importance only to the people involved.

There is a big story and perhaps the most important of all in 1946. Here was Stan Musial, still a young man in baseball. He was just back from service. He was not yet in the big money class in baseball. Now he was seated at the kitchen table in his

modest home on Mardel Avenue and a man was filling that table with money.

Nobody counted the money. The guest said there was $100,000 in cash on the table. There was more to be had if Stan agreed to jump his contract with the Cardinals and go to Mexico. Technically, it was not illegal. Others had done it and more would. Stan looked at the money and shook his head.

He didn't or couldn't know then that in less than 10 years he'd be making that much with the Cardinals. He didn't know that because he would stay with the Cardinals, other good fortune would come his way and before he ended his career he would be independently wealthy.

All he knew was that there was $100,000 in front of him for the taking. And he turned it down.

There was no histrionics. He explained "I knew I could never look my son in the eye if I took that money."

A big story, yes. But then there were little, humane stories, too, like the one former teammate, Del Rice, tells.

As good fortune touched Musial, Rice's luck went the other way. He was nearing the end of his career. His wife was dying of leukemia. His home was badly damaged by fire. As Rice wearily and despondently returned home from the hospital late one night, there was Musial sitting on the front steps.

No story, no cameras, no nothing but a friend in need.

"I just thought maybe you'd like somebody to talk to," Stan said simply.

This again is why they call him "The Man."

Yes, this man-boy out of the Pennsylvania coalfields who never lost youthful enthusiasm for the game he loved.

This was the son of an immigrant coal miner whose boyhood idols were pitcher Carl Hubbell of the Giants and hitter Paul Waner of the hometown Pirates. He would have relished signing with either one but the Giants were late with their offer and the Pirates wanted him to stay close to home. The Cardinals offered him a chance to travel—all the way to Williamson in West Virginia.

This is the boy who came home from his second year in the minors and married Lillian Labash, his sweetheart from schooldays. Lillian knew then, as she still knows today, that she has to share her man with baseball.

"He was occasionally late for a date," she said, "especially if he passed a ball field on the way to my house. And he's late for dinner once in a while now if there's a ball game going on in Francis Park. He always has to stop and watch."

This is the Man who survived the only near disaster of his career—with the help of a friend he never forgot.

In 1940, at Daytona Beach, Fla., where he played the outfield when he wasn't pitching, Stan landed on his left shoulder—and the shoulder went dead. With a child on the way for the family, Stan despaired of a future in baseball. But the team manager—Dickie Kerr—persuaded the Musials to stick it out. The Kerrs took the Musials into their own home.

That encouragement started Musial on his way to the majors as a tremendous hitter. He never forgot the kindness of Dickie Kerr and he proved it in two lasting ways.

That son for whom the Musials were waiting was named Richard—for Dickie Kerr.

A few years ago, Stan quietly bought a home for the retired Dickie Kerr in Houston, then was terribly embarrassed when the story came out months later.

The stories of Musial's quiet kindness are endless—of the time when a Santa Claus headed for an orphan home became sidetracked in a bar and Stan dropped his own decorating on Christmas Eve and, answering an urgent plea, took over in his place. There was never any publicity on the story. Stan wanted it that way.

Or there is the Stan Musial who is the despair of his family on Halloween. There is always open house at the Musial residence that night. Youngsters from all over town form a steady stream to trick and treat—and Stan is always there to greet them.

"I thought one year we might slow it down," Lil Musial said, "because I thought it might be wearing on Stan. He said he enjoyed it and insisted on doing it."

Lest you get the impression that Stan Musial is some sort of maudlin do-gooder, you look to another facet.

On planes, in the clubhouse, anywhere the ball club descends, he is the life of the party. There is always some sort of music in the clubhouse—guitar, harmonica and raucous singing, plus Stan supplying the rhythm by beating a coathanger on the side of a trunk. "Stan's happiest at times like that," says long-time roommate Red Schoendienst.

For years he has been an amateur magician. When an illusion works, Stan has a pleased smile. When it doesn't, he laughs uproariously at his own blunder.

Some years ago, the Cardinals had trouble getting from New York to Cincinnati during a railroad strike. Somehow they got as far as Columbus and commandeered a fleet of taxicabs.

En route something went wrong with the hood of the cab in which Stan and others were riding. Musial hopped out, leaped up on the hood, flapped it in place and told the driver "start moving." The cavalcade rolled into Crosley Field with Stan still riding front gunner on the lead cab. The Cardinal management was quite a time recovering from that one but, as Stan explained simply, "we had to get there and that's the only way I could figure to do it."

Much has been made over the years of the fact that Musial gets on well with umpires. He has drawn high praise from them openly, a rare feat. Al Barlick, a close friend, once stopped a game to shake hands with Stan when another record was set.

Jocko Conlan told an assembly of players "if all you guys were like Stan, our job would be a hundred times easier." Recently Ken Burkhart, a one-time teammate, stopped in the Cardinal clubhouse to tell Stan how much he regretted Musial's retirement.

It leads to the impression that Stan does not concern himself with the umpires. He has never been ejected from a major league game. He was thumbed out once by a class D umpire who was as much a rookie as he was.

"I argue with the umpires," Stan has said. "I fight for our rights as much as anybody but I try to do it quietly. I think I've been close to being thrown out three times in my career.

"Once when I started out to the mound after a pitcher knocked me down, Al Barlick got out there fast and stopped me. Another time I yelled bitterly and loudly at George Barr, another good friend, about a bad call. It shocked him and he leaped back and said 'I thought it was a good pitch, Stanley.' It struck me funny and I started to laugh and we forgot it.

"There was another time when I was called out on what I thought was a bad pitch. I started to say something but the look in the umpire's eye stopped me and I just started walking. The other players said he watched me all the way to the dugout. They said if I had turned around, he would have run me.

"Funny thing," Stan went on, "he was a good friend. The fellows thought he just wanted the honor of being the first to run me."

It has been a great and wonderful life for Stan Musial, whose records will live on long after his career ends.

From the days of an immigrant's son, he has risen to be St. Louis' best known citizen. It is something indeed when an immigrant's son is called to the President's box during an All-Star game for a personal visit—and for Stan to note "they said you were too young and I was too old and we both fooled 'em."

He lives comfortably in a pleasant home in southwest St. Louis. He is a splendid father to his four children, Richard, Geraldine, Janet, and Jean. "Stan is strict with the children," Lillian says, "and if their schoolwork is not up to what he wants, there are serious sessions."

When Dick was enrolled at CBC, the brother-director voiced the hope that Stan would be an active member of the Fathers Club. "Only," Stan said, "if I am known as Dick Musial's father." He kept his word, was chairman of numerous events, and so did the school. Lillian performed in a similar role in the Mothers Club.

Throughout his career, he has been active in civic enterprises. He served as chairman of the Globe-Democrat's Old Newsboy Day and took great pleasure in the job. Two years ago, he was called upon to speak at McKendree College in a series of lectures delivered by prominent people in a variety of fields. Though called upon often to talk, Stan does not relish the chore. But he worked hard on the lecture and made a splendid presentation.

As a restaurateur, banker, prominent citizen and churchman, the demands on his time are exorbitant. But after working a full day on all these, he turns nights and weekends to his first love—baseball.

There he asks no favors. He is just 1 of 25 on the ball club. His durability, his refusal to buckle under minor injuries contributed to many of his records. When he did have an injury, he demanded flesh-colored tape to avoid any touch of showboating.

Only once in his career has he asked for a favor. When his son graduated from Notre Dame, he wanted to attend and the Cardinals approved it. After all, how many ballplayers stay around long enough to see their only son graduate from college?

Otherwise, No. 6 is no different from No. 11 or No. 38.

He has always had the same answer when asked his biggest thrill in baseball, "Just putting on the uniform every day."

This is "the man" most people know and love.

This is "the man" who has left an indelible mark on baseball, not because he alone was a great player but because he was a greater man.

This is "the Man."

They named him well in Brooklyn.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "A Hit for 22 Years, Stan the Man," written by Bob Broeg, sports editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

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

A HIT FOR 22 YEARS, STAN THE MAN

(By Bob Broeg)

Stanley Frank Musial, baseball's Horatio Alger, goes to bat today for the last time. The poor Polish immigrant's son who struck it rich by playing a boy's game better than most men, will end his great baseball career in the Cardinals' regular-season windup with Cincinnati at Busch Stadium.

A living legend, a homer-hitting grandfather at nearly 43, Musial has set more than 50 major and National League records for batting and durability in the course of 22 years. He has played more games for one team than any other player in the 87-year history of major league baseball. And

he is first in career total bases and extra-base hits and second only to Ty Cobb in base hits.

With the Cardinals, throughout his big league career, Musial, at his peak, was a swift baserunner, talented outfielder and good first baseman. As baseball's highest paid handyman—at $100,000 a year—ever to smooth a troubled manager's furrowed brow, he's the only player to put in 1,000 games in both the infield and outfield.

Although he'll be remembered as long as baseball recordbooks are kept, Millionaire Musial will be remembered most for the personal qualities that have made him rate with Babe Ruth as baseball's most popular celebrity. While the Babe achieved his appeal through a booming bat, booming voice and blithe spirit, "the Man"—respectful Brooklyn fans gave Stan his nickname years ago—remained to the end a trim athlete and good family man. He made news on the field, seldom off it. But he reached the public everywhere with his talent, team consciousness and even temperament. Polite, patient, and proud, he was a ballplayer's player—as well as a fan's player.

Success most decidedly did not spoil Stanley Frank Musial, the Horatio Alger of baseball. Will there ever be another like him?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Musial's Records Hard To Beat," written by Bob Broeg. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a chart showing the alltime high position of Musial in our national pastime.

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

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 29, 1963]

MUSIAL'S RECORDS HARD TO BEAT

(By Bob Broeg)

The giant following table tells graphically the stature of Stan Musial, the batter as the comes up to the final game of one of the most amazing careers in baseball history.

Musial's virtues as a person are praised today in the Sunday pictures section of the Post-Dispatch, and paeans will be sung to our man Stan on the field this afternoon as a public-spirited citizen, modest hero, team player, family man, and model for American youth.

But, as that table so clearly proves, Musial would have been a man to be remembered even if he had been a grade A heel. Only "Babe" Ruth and "Ty" Cobb or, more accurately, Cobb and Ruth, made a comparable statistical impact in offensive baseball.

The question is, "Will anyone ever replace Musial as, for instance, he replaced Ruth in career extra base hits and Cobb in total bases?"

Maybe, but not necessarily so. Musial himself thinks that hitters like Henry Aaron, Vada Pinson, and Al Kaline, all of whom started even younger than he did and briskly, if not quite so fast, have a crack at 3,000 hits. And it's the exclusive 3,000-hit club that is the springboard to king-sized totals, the open sesame to the record book.

HILL GETS STEEP

Pinson, just past 24, has played little more than 5 years in the big leagues and averaged 200 hits, Musial's own hot pace to the 1,000-hit milestone. Aaron, a 10-year man and not yet 30, is just short of 1,900 hits. And Kaline, who also has played 10 seasons in the big leagues and won't be 29 until December, is near the 1,700-hit mark.

However, already injury prone, the talented Kaline recently went to Mayo Brothers' clinic, completely exhausted. And if the Detroit star is beginning to feel the strain, his chances will be lessened.

Even Cincinnati's Pinson and Milwaukee's Aaron, though headed in the right direction, could be detoured by illness, injury, or earlier athletic aging.

"A ballplayer is at his peak between 28 and 32," Musial often has said. The Man had his own best year, .376, with 230 hits, 104 of them for extra base hits, and 429 total bases, when he was 28.

"I didn't really begin to feel my age until I was nearly 38," baseball's famous No. 6 told the Chicago Cubs' Ernie Banks the other day.

"Then I began to need to work out in the winters and watch my diet even more closely."

Musial hit an incredible .330 when he was nearly 42 years old, but the fact is that, reaching the 3,000-hit goal in early 1958 when he was just past 37, he needed five-plus seasons for the final 628 hits before this weekend windup.

So Pinson, Aaron, and all others, even if able to assault successfully the steep 3,000-hit plateau, will find it extremely difficult removing Musial from his National League pinnacle.

SIX THOUSAND FOR NO. 6

The man who has played the most games, batted the most times, scored the most runs, knocked in the most runs, and had more doubles than any player in National League history is the proudest of having collected the most hits. He broke early last year the 45-year-old record held previously by western Pennsylvania's other legendary baseball celebrity, Honus Wagner.

Of the more than 50 National League or major league records Musial owns, it's his opinion that the most enduring well could be his major league marks for extra-base hits and total bases.

Earlier this year Stan snapped Ruth's 27-year-old standard (1,356) of extra-base blows. A year ago he surpassed Cobb's 34-year-old record for total bases, 5,863.

As the only player ever to reach 6,000 in total bases, just as Ruth was the only performer to pass 700 in homers and Cobb the sole athlete to get 4,000 base hits, Stan (The Amazing Man) Musial might have set a standard to have and to hold—and to keep.

Yes, just as we who've followed him through 21 playing seasons have memories of his many big moments to have and to hold—and to keep. It'll be most interesting to watch the pack try to follow our man Stan up baseball's highest mountain.

The man stands tall in top batting categories

	Runs	Hits	2-base hits	3-base hits [1]	Home runs	Runs batted in	Average [2]	Extra-base hits	Total bases
1	Cobb	Cobb	Speaker	Crawford	Ruth	Ruth	Cobb	Musial	Musial.
2	Ruth	Musial	Musial	Cobb	Foxx	Gehrig	Hornsby	Ruth	Cobb.
3	Musial	Speaker	Cobb	Wagner	Williams	Musial	Jackson	Gehrig	Ruth.
4	Gehrig	Wagner	Wagner	Beckley	Ott	Foxx	Browning	Cobb	Speaker.
5	Speaker	E. Collins	Lajoie	Connor	Gehrig	Cobb	Brouthers	Speaker	Gehrig.
6	Ott	Lajoie	P. Waner	Speaker	Musial	Ott	O'Doul	Foxx	Ott.
7	E. Collins	P. Waner	Gehringer	Clarke	Mathews	Williams	Delahanty	Williams	Foxx.
8	Williams	Anson	Heilmann	Brouthers	Mantle	Simmons	Keeler	Ott	Wagner.
9	Gehringer	S. Rice	Hornsby	P. Waner	Mays	Goslin	Williams	Hornsby	Williams.
10	Foxx	Crawford	Medwick	E. Collins	Snider	Hornsby	Hamilton	Wagner	Hornsby.

[1] 3-base hits: Musial, 17th.
[2] Average: Musial, 28th.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Missouri. Stan Musial has been a personal friend of mine and a personal friend of my colleague for many years. He is both a great athlete and a great citizen, and we are very happy and proud to have had him in our stadium. He has made a great contribution to the American way of life.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that we shall now take up a number of so-called private bills to which there is no objection. Later, we shall take up the two fishery bills, Calendar No. 479, Senate bill 1988; and Calendar No. 457, Senate bill 1006. The latter is controversial, so there may be a record vote on the question of its passage. That will be the final measure to be called up today.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar bills No. 490 through No. 501.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now consider these bills, in order.

JOHN JOSEPH

The bill (S. 1287) for the relief of John Joseph (also known as Hanna Georges Youssef) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Act of October 24, 1962 (76 Stat. 1247), to provide for the entry of certain relatives of United States citizens and lawfully resident aliens, John Joseph (also known as Hanna Georges Youssef), shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 1 of that Act.

HANNAH ROBBINS

The bill (S. 1838) for the relief of Hannah Robbins was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was

read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hannah Robbins may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act. This section shall apply only to grounds for exclusions under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

LYDIA ANNE FOOTE

The bill (S. 1881) for the relief of Lydia Anne Foote was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any period of time in which Lydia Anne Foote may reside in France within five years after the date of enactment of this Act shall not be deemed to be residence in a foreign state within the meaning of section 352(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

JAN KOSS

The bill (H.R. 1280) for the relief of Jan Koss was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

FIORE LUIGI BIASIOTTA

The bill (H.R. 3648) for the relief of Fiore Luigi Biasiotta was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH KOLLOIAN IZMIRIAN

The bill (H.R. 2303) for the relief of Elizabeth Kolloian Izmirian was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ANNA C. CHMIELEWSKI

The bill (H.R. 3762) for the relief of Anna C. Chmielewski was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NORIYUKI MIYATA

The bill (H.R. 4075) for the relief of Noriyuki Miyata was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MARGUERITE LEFEBVRE BROUGHTON

The bill (H.R. 7022) for the relief of Marguerite Lefebvre Broughton was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SUSANNA GRÜN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1096) for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grün (Susanna Roth), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Susanna Grün (Susanne Roth) shall be held and considered to be a returning resident alien within the purview of section 101(b)(27)(B) of that Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

GABRIEL KERENYI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1341) for the relief of Gabriel Kerenyi, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 10, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and *"And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gabriel Kerenyi may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ALESSANDRO A. R. CACACE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1488) for the relief of Alessandro A. R. Cacace, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alessandro A. R. Cacace shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Mr. Hilton D. Hall, a United States citizen.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ADMITTING FORMER PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES TO SEAT IN THE SENATE AS SENATORS AT LARGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar 484, Senate Resolution 78.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 78) admitting former Presidents of the United States to a seat in the Senate as Senators at Large with certain privileges, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate be amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"8. Former Presidents of the United States shall be entitled to address the Senate upon appropriate notice to the Presiding Officer who shall thereupon make the necessary arrangements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was amended and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas, pursuant to rule XXXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, former Presidents of the United States are accorded the privilege of the floor while the Senate is in session; and

Whereas, it would seem particularly beneficial for the Senate to know the views of former Chief Executives who by experience are uniquely qualified to comment on grave national problems: Now, therefore, be it

PROHIBITION OF FOREIGN FISHING VESSELS WITHIN THE TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 479, S. 1988.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 1988) to prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by persons other than nationals or inhabitants of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the word "United", to strike out "States" and insert "States,"; in line 6, after the word "United", to strike out "States and" and insert "States,"; in line 7, after the word "possessions", to insert "and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico"; in line 9, after the word "Shelf", to strike out "claimed by" and insert "which appertains to"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "party.", to insert "However, the Secretary of the Treasury may issue a license authorizing a vessel other than a vessel of the United States to engage in fishing within the territorial waters of the United States or for resources of the Continental Shelf which appertain to the United States and to land its catch in a United States port, upon certification by the Secretary of the Interior that such permission would be in the national interest and upon concurrence of any State, Commonwealth or territory directly affected."; after line 14, to strike out:

(b) The vessels and all fish taken or retained in violation of this Act, or the monetary value thereof, may be forfeited.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(b) Every vessel employed in any manner in connection with a violation of this Act including its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, cargo, and stores shall be subject to forfeiture and all fish taken or retained in violation of this Act or the monetary value thereof shall be forfeited.

On page 3, line 21, after the word "process", to insert "including warrants or other process issued in admiralty proceedings in Federal District Courts,"; on page 4, after line 14, to insert:

(e) Such person so authorized may seize any vessel, together with its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, cargo and stores, used or employed contrary to the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued hereunder or which it reasonably appears has been used or employed contrary to the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued hereunder.

At the beginning of line 21, to strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)"; in the same line, after the word "so", to strike out "authorized," and insert "authorized"; in line 22, after the word "lawfully", to strike out "found" and insert "found,"; on page 5, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(f)" and insert "(g)"; in line 6, after the word "shall", to strike out "stay the execution of such process, or"; and in line 9, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "property" and insert "fish"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is unlawful for any vessel, except a vessel of the United States, or for any master or other person in charge of such a vessel, to engage in the fisheries within the territorial waters of the United States, its territories and possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or to engage in the taking of any fishery resource of the Continental Shelf which appertains to the United States except as provided by an international agreement to which the United States is a party. However, the Secretary of the Treasury may issue a license authorizing a vessel other than a vessel of the United States to engage in fishing within the territorial waters of the United States or for resources of the Continental Shelf which appertain to the United States and to land its catch in a United States port, upon certification by the Secretary of the Interior that such permission would be in the national interest and upon concurrence of any State, Commonwealth, or territory directly affected.

SEC. 2. (a) Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(b) Every vessel employed in any manner in connection with a violation of this Act including its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, cargo, and stores shall be subject to forfeiture and all fish taken or retained in violation of this Act or the monetary value thereof shall be forfeited.

(c) All provisions of law relating to the seizure, judicial forfeiture, and condemnation of a cargo for violation of the customs laws, the disposition of such cargo or the proceeds from the sale thereof, and the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this Act, insofar as such provisions of law are applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Enforcement of the provisions of this Act is the joint responsibility of the United States Coast Guard, the United States Department of the Interior, and the United States Bureau of Customs. In addition, the Secretary of the Interior may designate officers and employees of the States of the United States, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and of any territory or possession of the United States to carry out enforcement activities hereunder. When so designated, such officers and employees are authorized to function as Federal law enforcement agents for these purposes.

(b) The judges of the United States district courts, the judges of the highest courts of the territories and possessions of the United States, and United States commissioners may, within their respective jurisdictions, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue such warrants or other process, including warrants or other process issued in admiralty proceedings in Federal District Courts, as may be required for enforcement of this Act and any regulations issued thereunder.

(c) Any person authorized to carry out enforcement activities hereunder shall have the power to execute any warrant or process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction for the enforcement of this Act.

(d) Such person so authorized shall have the power—

(1) with or without a warrant or other process, to arrest any person committing in his presence or view a violation of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder;

(2) with or without a warrant or other process, to search any vessel and, if as a result of such search he has reasonable cause to believe that such vessel or any person on board is in violation of any provision of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, then to arrest such person.

(e) Such person so authorized may seize any vessel, together with its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, cargo and stores, used or employed contrary to the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued hereunder or which it reasonably appears has been used or employed contrary to the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued hereunder.

(f) Such person so authorized may seize, whenever and wherever lawfully found, all fish taken or retained in violation of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder. Any fish so seized may be disposed of pursuant to the order of a court of competent jurisdiction, or if perishable, in a manner prescribed by regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

(g) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2464 of title 28 when a warrant of arrest or other process in rem is issued in any cause under this section, the United States marshal or other officer shall discharge any fish seized if the process has been levied, on receiving from the claimant of the fish a bond or stipulation for the value of the fish with sufficient surety to be approved by a judge of the district court having jurisdiction of the offense, conditioned to deliver the fish seized, if condemned, without impairment in value or, in the discretion of the court, to pay its equivalent value in money or otherwise to answer the decree of the court in such cause. Such bond or stipulation shall be returned to the court and judgment thereon against both the principal and sureties may be recovered in event of any breach of the conditions thereof as determined by the court. In the discretion of the accused, and subject to the direction of the court, the fish may be sold for not less than its reasonable market value and the proceeds of such sale placed in the registry of the court pending judgment in the case.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] whether there is any particular controversy over this bill. I understood there is not.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct. Insofar as we understand the situation, there is no controversy whatsoever; but I do wish to submit an amendment to the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] was most cooperative in agreeing to postpone his remarks on another subject until we had concluded our action on the measure for extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission. I promised that soon thereafter, I would yield to him. So after the committee amendments are considered en bloc, I shall yield to him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendments were considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this bill provides for enforcement procedures and penalties to protect the U.S. territorial waters and Continental Shelf resources from foreign intervention. The bill is cosponsored by Senators ERVIN, JACKSON, KENNEDY, MAGNUSON, MORSE, NEUBERGER, SCOTT, SMATHERS, and THURMOND. It was supported in committee hearings by the State Department, Department of the Interior, Department of the Navy, Department of the Treasury, and it received the very strong endorsement of the entire fishing industry. The bill was passed out of committee without opposition. This is legislation that is needed. Its need has become urgent during this past summer with the numerous incidents in which foreign vessels have engaged in fishing activities within our territorial waters.

The basic purpose of the bill is to provide for the enforcement of our territorial waters and of our claim to resources on the Continental Shelf which as yet has not been determined.

This bill makes no claims of new jurisdiction. For example, the bill provides for penalties on foreigners taking fishery resources within our territorial waters. The bill does not define territorial waters. This has been accomplished by custom and executive pronouncements over a period of many years.

By the same token reference is made to Continental Shelf resources which appertain, or in other words belong, to the United States. The bill does not itself establish any claim over the resources but provides for penalties for the taking of such resources that are claimed by the United States.

This point was made quite clear in the hearings and in the committee's action in accepting the amendment proposed by the State Department to change the word "claim" to "appertain." Webster's dictionary and Black's Law Dictionary define "appertain" as meaning to belong or pertain.

The basic question in regard to the Continental Shelf provisions of the bill is what resources appertain or belong to the United States.

At the present time there are two possible bases of claim. The first is pursuant to the 1953 Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Act. This is made clear in the title to the Submerged Lands Act which provides that the purpose of the act is "to confirm the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the seabeds of the Continental Shelf seaward of state boundaries." Section 9 of the act reads as follows:

> Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to affect in any wise the rights of the United States to the natural resources of that portion of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside of the area of lands beneath navigable waters, as defined in section 2 hereof, all of which natural resources appertain to the United States, and the jurisdiction and control of which by the United States is hereby confirmed.

The natural resources of the subsoil and seabeds of the shelf include not only mineral but living resources of the shelf. The same act defines the term "natural resources" as follows:

> The term "natural resources" includes, without limiting the generality thereof, oil, gas, and all other minerals, and fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life but does not include water power, or the use of water for the production of power;

Therefore, we established a claim over not only oil, a resource of the subsoil, but also marine animal resources of the seabed.

I believe that we established a claim quite clearly to all resources of the seabed of the Continental Shelf. This would I believe include certain coral, oysters, and clams resources. It appears also that shrimp and finny fish are not included.

The Outer Continental Shelf Act makes it clear that the provisions of that act are not intended to interfere with fishing in waters above the Continental Shelf. But there can be no question but this was a clear unilateral claim, one that has been repeated by numerous other nations, and has been recognized in international law.

It is true that the U.S. Government has never specifically and formally named the resources of the Continental Shelf which are included. Under the Outer Continental Shelf Act, the United States has claimed certain living coral reefs off Florida outside the 3-mile limit and on the Continental Shelf. This bill does not attempt to identify these exact claims either. However, it does provide for the immediate enforcement of these claims when clarified and when a question is properly raised. I think that this is significant and can be seen quite clearly in the fact that the catch of oysters, clams, and dungeness and king crab totals over $50 million a year.

The second basis is a claim by the United States over resources of the Continental Shelf found in the International Convention on the Continental Shelf. The Convention will take effect on the ratification of one more nation and it is anticipated that a ratification will be added shortly. The bill would provide for the enforcement procedures to assure the protection of resources claimed by the United States pursuant to this Convention. The nations which have ratified to date are: Australia, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Cambodia, Columbia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark Guatemala, Haiti, Israel, Malagasy Republic, Malaya, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Senegal, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Union of South Africa, United States, and Venezuela.

I, therefore, believe that this legislation is essential for the protection of our territorial waters and our resources of the Continental Shelf.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the bill before us proposes: first, to protect our territorial waters from encroachment by foreign fishing vessels; and, second, to preserve our marine resources on, or attached to, the Continental Shelf.

Foreign vessels violating the provisions would, for the first time, be subjected to penalties which would include forfeiture of catch, tackle and cargo, imprisonment up to 1 year, and a fine not to exceed $10,000.

Introduced by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the bill is cosponsored by 12 other Senators, including myself. The East, South, and West are all represented among the sponsors.

The bill does not define territorial waters, either in terms of width or depth—and for good reason.

Congress has never fixed the width of our territorial waters by statue, nor is there international agreement on this question.

Other countries have established or are claiming territorial waters of varying width from their shores, the trend in recent years being to extend their boundaries outward.

An accord conceivably may be reached eventually on this problem through the medium of an international conference, but in the meantime it behooves us to protect those resources of the oceans which by their nature or location near our shores it is in our national interest to do so.

This is not being done today; it has not been done in the past by our Government, and our Government presently lacks the statutory authority to protect these resources. This bill would provide that authority.

Early in our history we, and many other nations, informally accepted 3 miles as a suitable limit to our territorial waters. At that time 3 miles was about the maximum distance a shore-based cannon could fire a cannonball. In other words it was approximately the distance the adjacent seas could be defended from a nation's shores.

Times and technology have changed but here in the United States we continue to consider 3 miles seaward the limit of our territorial waters, not on the basis of any law but by custom or tradition.

Many other countries have departed, or are departing, from this custom, which had its beginnings in another age.

Soviet Russia and Iceland claim 12 miles; Mexico 9 miles.

Norway has a 4 mile limit, but also asserts jurisdiction over waters out to 12 miles for fishing purposes.

Canada has a 3 mile limit but is extending its territorial waters to 12 miles in May, 1964.

Denmark observes a 3-mile limit for its home waters, but has established a 12 mile protected fishing zone for Greenland and has announced a similar zone around the Faroe Islands will be maintained next year.

Ecuador, Chile, and Peru have entered into a tripartite agreement to claim jurisdiction over fisheries in waters outward to 200 miles from their shores, an unrealistic and extreme claim that I am sure other Nations do not support.

The United States, United Kingdom, and Japan still accept a limit of 3 miles.

National interests, Mr. President, may require our Government in the near future to reconsider the extent of our own territorial waters.

Military as well as economic considerations may compel a broadening of our jurisdiction. In any event, S. 1988 leaves the question of the extent of our territorial waters completely flexible and open to any adjustment Congress or the administration may wish to make.

The able senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] has described on the Senate floor specific violations of our territorial waters by foreign fishing vessels.

Unfortunately, about all we can do now when such violations occur is to politely ask the masters of the vessels to please move back beyond our 3 mile limit.

Violations by both Russian and Japanese vessels have occurred. The Russians are especially indifferent as to where their right to fish the high seas ends and where the U.S. jurisdiction over our territorial water begins.

They have not been indifferent, however, to violations or presumed violations of waters within the 12-mile limit they have imposed by the fishing vessels of other nations.

During the past 10 years, for example, the Soviet Government has seized 854 Japanese vessels and 7,024 Japanese fishermen.

I do not know what disposition Soviet Russia has made of the catch aboard these ships or of the vessels themselves, but I do know, from Japanese reports, that some of the fishermen seized have been detained in Russia for more than 2 years.

The August issue of Japan Report, published by the Japanese Information

Service, announced happily that the Soviet Government had promised to release "about 120" Japanese fishermen "now in Soviet custody who have been found guilty or indicted on charges of violating Soviet territorial waters or operating in Soviet waters."

The decision to release the fishermen, according to the Soviet Ambassador—

The report continues—

was made by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet on August 22 in the interests of promoting friendly relations between Japan and the Soviet Union. Most of the fishermen to be released are from Nemuro and Wakkanai in Hokkaido (Japan's most northern large island), and some have been detained in Russia for more than 2 years.

Mr. President, according to this account of the Soviet motive for releasing Japanese fishermen held as prisoners, perhaps one way of "promoting friendly relations" between ourselves and Russia would be to seize some of the Russian vessels violating our territorial waters and detain their crews until more friendly relations could be established by releasing them. Not even this, however, could be done at present.

Nor is such action the purpose of this bill. The object of this bill is not to promote more friendly relations with the Russians or the fishermen of any other nation who invade our waters. The object of this bill is to protect our marine resources and our national interests.

Soviet Russia has gone further to protect her resources than to establish a 12-mile limit. In addition she has sealed off the vast Okhotsk Sea between the Kurile Islands and the Siberian mainland to Japanese trawlers and to salmon fishing, and has established a quota on king crab which limited Japanese production in 1962 to 126,000 cases.

The Okhotsk Sea is larger than Hudson Bay and has almost the same area as the Gulf of Mexico.

Soviet strictures on Japanese fishing increase the pressures on Japanese fishermen to encroach upon our salmon fisheries, our halibut fisheries, and our king crab fisheries, in other words to increase Japan's pressures on us. Possibly this is one purpose of the Russian restrictions, I do not know.

But I do know that we must withstand these pressures, whatever their origin, and that if it is our intention to withstand them, the passage of this bill is essential.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask how the term "territorial waters" is defined.

Mr. BARTLETT. The bill makes no effort to define "territorial waters." It leaves that subject untouched. The bill does two things, one of which should have been done long before now; and the other had best be done now, instead of later.

Under existing law, a foreign fishing vessel can come within the territorial waters of the United States, and the Federal Government has no authority to do other than to suggest that the invading ship leave the territorial waters.

There are no penalties whatsoever against such intrusions. The bill very properly would apply them. It is done by many other nations and, in my judgment, should have been done here long ago.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the penalty that would be invoked?

Mr. BARTLETT. The penalty provided in the bill is a fine of $10,000, 1 year's imprisonment, or both, for the master of the ship or the person in charge of the ship.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am quite sure that other countries have similar laws. Some of the shrimp fishermen in my State are constantly being harassed by Mexican gunboats, and arrested when they claim that they are 10 or 12 miles offshore.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is true. It is also true that American tuna fishermen are similarly treated off the coast of South America. There are no penalties whatsoever for U.S. territorial water violations.

Mr. RUSSELL. In our country there are two sets of territorial waters. The States whose laws derive from the common law of England have a provision for territorial waters which extend out 3 miles from the shore, whereas States that follow the Napoleonic code or the Spanish law claim up to 12 miles, and, in some cases, out to the end of any shelf that might project itself under the waters.

Mr. BARTLETT. Realizing the situations which the Senator from Georgia has explained, the committee thought it proper not to touch upon that phase at all, and made no effort in the bill to define the extent of territorial waters. So the law would be unchanged by the language of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator think that a conviction would stand if a Russian fisherman were fishing 3 miles off the Massachusetts coast and were arrested?

Mr. BARTLETT. Within the 3-mile limit?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, within the 3-mile limit.

Mr. BARTLETT. Clearly there could be no doubt about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. How about the waters off Cape Canaveral, Fla.? Florida claims jurisdiction over 12 miles of territorial waters. If such a fisherman were within 6 miles of the shore, what would be the legal situation?

Mr. BARTLETT. The determination would have to be made by the court. We did not think it proper to seek to define the extent and limits of territorial waters if a fisherman were arrested off the coast of Florida at a point claimed by the State of Florida, which claim might or might not be recognized by the Federal Government. It is far, far better for that judgment to be made by the Federal court than by language in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no sympathy whatever with international poachers, whether they are fishing in our waters or are there for the purposes of gathering intelligence. But I am becoming a wee bit leery of vesting a great deal more jurisdiction in the Federal courts.

Mr. BARTLETT. We see no other way out. Each State is entitled to make its own laws on the subject. Many States do. Perhaps most—or, for all I know, all of them—do. But the individual States do not have the necessary naval craft; they do not have access to the Coast Guard. They cannot enforce those laws. In recent months there has been a rash of incidents of that kind, many in Alaskan waters, which have been certified by the Coast Guard. But that is not all. In other coastal areas foreign ships have come within the 3-mile limit.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has Alaska established any jurisdiction over territorial waters?

Mr. BARTLETT. Alaska has, and Alaska has laws against fishing by foreigners within such waters, with penalties attached. But the Alaskan navy is not adequately equipped, and seldom can catch the fast Russian or Japanese vessels. To our discouragement, we find that not in every case can the Coast Guard cutters catch fishing trawlers. Sometimes they give heel to the Coast Guard cutters.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the Senator thought about equipping a small plane with a 20-millimeter cannon and letting it go out and fire across the bow of such a vessel, halting it in the manner that has been known since time immemorial, when one party demands that the other should heave to and halt the ship?

I wish to help the Senator. I have never had an answer to the question as to how far out the jurisdiction of Alaska extends into territorial waters.

Mr. BARTLETT. Three miles.

Mr. RUSSELL. Three miles. I would have thought that the Senator's State would have adopted the Spanish territorial jurisdiction, inasmuch as it has such valuable fishing waters, because that jurisdiction is 12 miles.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator from Alaska is a bit disturbed at the moment, as is his colleage from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], who is present in the Chamber, because within the last week Russian trawlers operating—it is true, in international waters, but close to Kodiak Island—have repeatedly, obviously, and deliberately destroyed king crab gear owned and operated by Alaskan fishermen. We are apprehensive on many scores. One of them is for the reason to which the Senator alluded, in a manner of speaking, a few moments ago. Fishermen, whether they are in Alaska, Masachusetts, Rhode Island, Louisiana, Washington, or elsewhere, are independent and free-minded men.

When they see their means of livelihood being destroyed and they are driven from their historic fishing banks, they are likely to react. In the present case Governor Egan of Alaska, my colleague [Mr. GRUENING], and all others concerned have a lively apprehension that an international incident may occur unless the Russians withdraw from those waters, which have been fished by us for so long and not by them, and they should do so with great promptitude.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would be glad to support the Senator in connection with the bill. It seems to me that the bill would have little effect in sustaining a criminal indictment. But I am perfect-

ly willing to support it and try it. If it does not work, the Senator's fishermen constitutents can always file a complaint with the Civil Rights Commission and it will arrive at some solution.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the Federal court would have jurisdiction over cases arising within boundaries established by the States?

Mr. BARTLETT. The bill applies only to the 3-mile territorial waters as recognized by the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. Suppose one who is not within the jurisdiction is arrested. Who would then be responsible?

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask what the Senator means by the term "not within the jurisdiction"?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not heard that the bill defines jurisdiction, which I believe is necessary.

Mr. BARTLETT. This definition has been in effect——

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to finish my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for clarification of the point. So far as the Federal Government is concerned, the territorial waters of the United States were set out in 1793 as 1 sea league, or 3 geographic miles.

This was done under the administration of President Washington, and was done specifically by the then Secretary of State Jefferson after several episodes involving the seizure of British ships by French ships off our coast, those two nations then being at war.

The territorial limit of 1 sea league has never been described in law. This has been left for Executive action, and Jefferson was very careful at that time, in enunciating the policy, to add that he did not assert that this represented a definitive conclusion which ought to be established for all time. It was a pliable instrument which could be changed at the will of the President.

Mr. ELLENDER. In any event, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, as the Senator says, the limit is fixed at 3 miles.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. What the Senator means in the bill, when there is reference to jurisdiction, is jurisdiction over the rights we have within the 3-mile limit?

Mr. BARTLETT. And we may depend upon it. The enforcing authorities—who in this instance would be chiefly, and perhaps altogether, the Coast Guard—would so construe it, because they would have to deal with territorial limits as defined by the U.S. Government, not as defined by the States.

Mr. ELLENDER. So it would be the Federal jurisdiction which would be involved?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is my interpretation.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator from Alaska has already given the definition I would give. The definition relates to territorial waters of the United States. That does not mean any particular State, but the United States. In section 3(b) of the bill it is stated:

> The judges of the United States district courts, the judges of the highest courts of the territories and possessions of the United States, and United States commissioners may, within their respective jurisdictions, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause,

Mr. ELLENDER. What prompted my question was the statement by the Senator from Washington.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it correct that at the present time it is unlawful and prohibited for any foreign fishermen to fish within the 3-mile limit off the U.S. coast; and is it correct that the only remedy available now is to escort them, if they do so, beyond the limit, and tell them never to come back again?

What is sought by the bill is to provide a penalty, a fine, or a jail sentence, for such persons if they violate the law; is that not correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. As always, the Senator from Rhode Island has compressed the issue concisely and effectively.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the whole purpose of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. That is the whole purpose of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is to put teeth into the law.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. I gladly yield.

Mr. GRUENING. If it should eventuate that proposed legislation to extend the territorial waters limit to 12 miles should be enacted, would the passage of this bill have any effect? Would the bill have to be amended, or would that limit be covered?

Mr. BARTLETT. The bill would not have to be amended.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has stated the situation correctly. I agree with his statement. Of course, there are added penalties, which are entirely consistent with the principle involved.

Mr. PASTORE. Entirely consistent.

Mr. BARTLETT. The purpose is to keep them out of our waters.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

I should like to ask about the language of unique character with respect to the Continental Shelf. Does the Senator understand, and should the legislative history show, that language will mean whatever international law and agreement may make it mean?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is the case, with one postscript which I should add.

When one reads the bill for the first time, one might gain the inference that it goes much further than it actually goes. I said at the outset that the bill would do one thing which should have been done long ago. The bill also proposes to do a thing which would be better done now than later.

As the Senator from New York knows, the Geneva Conference of 1958 was directed to the subject of what resources of the Continental Shelf are owned by the coastal States. That convention will be ratified when one more nation, the 22d nation, signs it.

The pending bill seeks only to extend to the Continental Shelf, wherever it may be, the same enforcement provisions provided for the territorial waters. It asserts no claims on our part. It does not seek to disturb the situation otherwise.

The Senator from Rhode Island offered the language to me which I have proposed in the amendment sent to the desk, which clarifies the situation and makes it clear that we are not claiming in this bill the Continental Shelf itself. We are merely claiming the fishery resources thereof.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, if I may restate the situation, we are not seeking to establish new or unilateral positions with respect to the Continental Shelf by passing the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are leaving it open deliberately.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Second, this is a small step of putting teeth into our law, as stated, for the territorial waters.

The entire question of territorial waters was before the conference in Geneva in 1958, and it got into a stalemate over navigation and military purposes, but all of the countries there agreed that fishing is a different thing. It may not even follow a coast line.

This is a first step. We are leaving the question open deliberately, because, as surely as I am standing on this floor, within the next 5 or 10 years there must be international agreements on fisheries on the whole high seas or there will not be fish left for anybody.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will yield for one brief further point, we, the outstanding advocates in the world of freedom of the seas, would not wish to give the impression that we are laying down, as it were, a ukase, an ultimatum to the world, saying, "This is it. Take it or leave it."

We are, as the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Washington have so ably stated, making our legislation conform to the international agreements which we may enter into or which are on the desk, as it were, for signature, or any new ones which may come along. We are not endeavoring unilaterally to establish new international rights.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I invite the attention of the Senator from New York to the fact that the language on "the Continental Shelf" merely applies to crabs and shellfish that crawl on the ground, and does not apply to fish that swim.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator understands that I have no desire to restrict our country in any way in its freedom of action. Sometimes when we believe we are leaving ourselves free we cause mischief in other directions when we are to get a benefit.

I believe Senators have done exactly the right thing. I am glad to see it done. I am for the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. I believe the Senator described his bill and its purpose quite clearly, and I have no questions about it.

The people in my State share the apprehensions which the Senator from Alaska described to the Senator from Georgia. I compliment the Senator upon this piece of proposed legislation, which perhaps is too narrow in scope in terms of the total problem, but which will serve effectively to fill the gap in the statute which applies to the policy and in the law which applies to the protection of our rights in our own territorial waters.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator from Maine has been one of the chief supporters of fisheries legislation which has been offered in this Congress. We appreciate his help.

I wish to comment also on the appropriate statement that he made; namely, that the proposal does not go as far as we need to go if we are to preserve fisheries. As the Senator from Washington said so correctly a moment or two ago, if we do not do something about the problem, and do it soon, there will not be any fish left for anybody.

Mr. MUSKIE. It serves the additional purpose of putting other nations on notice that we are alert to encroachments of our fishing rights and intend to protect them.

Mr. BARTLETT. I point out that in 1956 we were the second fisheries nation in the world. Now we are fifth.

Mr. President, I send amendments to the desk, which I ask to have stated. The amendment is submitted as only a nonsubstantive charge designed to make absolutely clear that resources of the Continental Shelf are to be protected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 1, line 8, after the word "any", to insert "Continental Shelf", and in the same line, after the word "resource", to strike out "of the Continental Shelf".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Alaska.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the bill S. 1988 and to urge its enactment.

Frankly I do not believe there can be any serious question about the need for new legislation on this subject. The interests of our national security and the interests of our fishing industry require the additional protections which would be provided by the enactment of the bill.

Existing Federal law already prohibits foreign vessels from fishing in the territorial waters of the United States, but the prohibition is little more than an empty gesture because no penalties are provided and no effective means of applying the prohibition exist under present law. All that the Coast Guard can do now is simply to tell the offending vessel to leave U.S. waters.

This bill would finally put some teeth into the law. It provides for penalties involving fines of up to $10,000 and imprisonment for not more than a year, or both, for persons violating the prohibition against fishing in U.S. waters.

The bill is critically necessary because of the enormous increase, within the past 2 years, of exploitation of the fishing grounds adjacent to the United States by the fishing fleets of foreign nations, and by the increasing numbers of these foreign fishing vessels which encroach on the territorial waters of the United States. There is no need for me to detail the tremendous numbers of Russian fishing vessels, for instance, which have been operating on Georges Bank, almost within sight of Cape Cod, and off the shores of Alaska. A committee of the House of Representatives recently determined that Russia maintains a fleet of from 200 to 400 fishing vessels in the North Atlantic. More than a dozen large seagoing Russian trawlers now make regular round trips between the North Atlantic fishing grounds and Cuba, and on their trips south, these vessels hug the south Florida coastline, at times well within the 3-mile limit. A number of these trawlers equipped for special electronic capabilities which can serve military purposes have been observed close to our shores within the last 2 years.

Under these circumstances, I think it is high time we took effective steps to protect our own interests, as other nations have long ago done, by enactment of effective penalties against poaching.

In this regard, I think we are indebted to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] for his foresight and vision in bringing this problem to the attention of our committee and to the attention of the Senate. And I say this pointedly because the administration has done nothing on its own initiative with respect to this problem, despite its critical implications for our security and the welfare of the fishing industry. The administration has not called this problem to the attention of Congress. It has not acted on its own to meet the situation. Despite its vast resources, the most the administration has done is to support the foresighted efforts of the sponsors of this bill to get action, as have many of the rest of us.

The failure of the administration to realize the need for effective action in this area might have had serious consequences but for the alertness of Senator BARTLETT and others like him who have called our attention to this problem and suggested this effective remedy. Other steps may have to be taken. Careful consideration, for instance, should be given to the possibility of extending the territorial waters of the United States, for fishing purposes only, from the present 3 miles to 6 or 12 miles, as other nations have already done.

In addition, the provisions of this bill, when it is enacted, must be enforced vigorously and effectively by the administration if we are to safeguard both our security and the vast food resources of the fisheries adjacent to our shores.

In conclusion, I point out that the maritime traffic off our shores has increased 10 times in the past 2 years, and I think it is high time we made sure our laws in this respect are adequate to safeguard our interests. This bill is a long step in the right direction, and I hope it will be approved.

THE TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES SHOULD BE PROTECTED FROM EXPLOITATION BY FOREIGN FISHING THEREIN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am pleased to support this fine measure (S. 1988) for the protection of American territorial waters from invasion by foreign fishing vessels. In the past, we have been protected from such violations only by our distance from other fishing nations. Now the major fishing nations of the world are sponsoring large modern fishing fleets that can operate within our waters. There is much evidence of an increasing number of violations by foreign fishing vessels, which will increase unless we show a greater determination to stop the practice. Our fisheries are being depleted and our domestic fishing industry damaged by these invasions by foreign fishing ships.

This bill would accomplish that result through establishing enforcement machinery and providing penalties for violations. It is important to note that these provisions are similar to those in effect in most other maritime countries of the world. Our fishing fleets have been harassed for years by other countries attempting to enforce far more onerous restrictions against our vessels in what they claim are their waters. Boats of the Texas shrimp fleet have frequently been victims of harsh action by other countries because of their innocent activities. We may hope that this legislation may inspire a greater willingness by foreign vessels to insure reciprocal treatment for our fleets than has previously been the case. There are no teeth in our present laws to protect our territorial waters; this bill will put enforcement teeth into our domestic law.

I congratulate the Senator from Alaska for his leadership in this matter, and urge passage of this bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill is a long overdue piece of legislation and it should receive widespread support because its approach is completely justifiable. It merely says that where the United States claims rights—to its territorial waters or to its resources on the Continental Shelf—effective measures will be available to protect these claims.

This bill does not create or expand any offshore claims of the United States. That is a matter which must be handled apart from this bill—by legislation, by executive action, by international nego-

tiation, or by international law, as the case may be. Therefore, this bill does not advocate unilateral assertion of claims in the international sphere.

Moreover, it does not authorize unilateral sanctions in the international sphere. The sanctions enacted under this bill would operate only within the range of our domestic claims; only within our sovereign domain, where other nations have no justifiable claims of international rights, and have no basis for expecting multilateral action.

Under existing Federal law, fishing in U.S. territorial waters by foreign vessels is prohibited. But this prohibition is of little more effect than mere words. The existing Federal law does not provide effective sanctions to enforce the prohibition. The Coast Guard may only order a foreign vessel, trespassing in a territorial fishery, to leave the territorial sea. No more effective remedy is provided to enforce U.S. law. Similarly, we have no way to enforce our claims to the resources of the Continental Shelf off our shores.

In my judgment, the existence of such hollow prohibitions and paper claims is unwise. It is not effective. It is an invitation to violators. It does not instill an attitude of responsibility to law. It does not allow the United States to back up its edict, and it certainly does not generate respect from others. It artificially limits the alternatives available to our enforcement officers.

These considerations make the need for more effective sanctions abundantly clear in my judgment. This is reenforced by the wide support given to the bill at the committee hearings, and it is confirmed by the unanimous judgment of the Commerce Committee. And if we need further evidence, the United States is not alone in its desire to protect its fishery resources. Australia, Canada, France, Japan, and Russia all have provided by law strong sanctions to deter territorial violations.

I do not believe that, when this Nation claims rights off our shores, the U.S. Senate should tell our fishermen we will do nothing to protect those rights and make them meaningful. I urge the Senate approval of this bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, even though there have not yet been any reports of invasions of the territorial waters of the State of Washington by fishing vessels of foreign nations in recent weeks as there have been in other areas of the North Pacific, the need for S. 1988 is no less apparent to protect the rich fishery resources of these waters where Pacific Northwest fishermen operate. The increased fishing effort off our coasts by foreign fishing fleets equipped to search out, capture, and process large concentrations of fish cause us to reexamine the inadequate laws we now have to protect our coastal fisheries.

This search for large concentrations of fish by these efficient fleets, coupled with the fact that our important migratory species do congregate in our territorial waters as they prepare to enter the several rivers and estuaries of Washington and the Fraser River in Canada, makes it absolutely imperative that we establish mechanics for the enforcement of a law to prohibit fishing by foreign-flag vessels in our territorial waters and to provide penalties for violations. Salmon is the best known and most valuable U.S. resource involved, but many other important resources are also covered by this measure.

The absolute prohibition against fishing in our territorial waters by foreign-flag vessels contained in this bill with the accompanying enforcement authority and penalty provisions constitutes the kind of positive action that is essential to prevent trespass on water areas that have formerly been inviolate since the establishment of the Republic.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of S. 1988, I would like to present the following statement in strong support of the bill.

The State of Hawaii well knows the implications of frequent incursions and excursions into the territorial seas of the United States by foreign fishing and whaling vessels. A significant portion of the island State's economy is bound up with the fishing industry. In terms of per capita consumption of seafood, I would say that we in the State of Hawaii are probably the highest in the United States. And yet, the fishing industry in Hawaii has been hard hit by a declining number of men and boats. The postwar deep-sea fleet numbered 31 ships and a crew count of 373 men. Today, for various reasons, the fleet numbers 19 and lists 170 crew members. I dare say the same proportionate decreases in ships and men would hold for Alaska, the Pacific, and Atlantic Coast States.

S. 1988 seeks to clarify the situation with regard to foreign fishing operations within the sovereign jurisdiction of the United States, a point which has been attested to by a representative of the U.S. Navy. It is, in this regard, comparable to fishery laws which prevail in other sovereign nations, seeking to protect their own fishing grounds. The least that we can do is give our domestic fishermen the same protection their counterparts receive from their own governments. Those of us who may doubt the wisdom of S. 1988 should read and reread the testimony of Mr. James Ackert, president of the Atlantic Fishermen's Union. He repeatedly points to the wanton and reckless operations of the Russian fishing fleets off the Atlantic coast wherein no concern is paid to established conservation practices in the United States—350- to 400-foot-long Russian nets with their insides laced by smaller mesh liners, which have been picked up by U.S. fishermen, proves the complete lack of any conservation interest by the Russians.

The representative of the Department of State, on September 5, 1963, stated that the Department fully approves of the purposes of the bill and that there are no objections from the standpoint of U.S. foreign relations. The Department further indicated that frequent illegal incursions into U.S. territorial seas have indeed occurred.

The Department of State, through its Special Assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife, has further indicated before the Senate Commerce Committee that existing legislation is ineffective in dealing with instances of foreign vessels fishing in U.S. territorial seas. U.S. authority, for all practical purposes, is limited to expulsion of the vessel and thus provides no real deterrent to them.

The Department of the Interior, through its Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, has indicated much the same. It is in favor of enactment of legislation, such as S. 1988, which will prohibit foreign vessels from engaging in fishing within the territorial seas of the United States and which will also provide criminal sanctions for fishing by such vessels in violation of these conditions. It further feels that existing legislation is unclear and is ineffective due to lack of adequate provisions for sanctions to serve as a deterrent to foreign fishing in territorial seas of the United States.

Together with my distinguished colleagues from the Pacific and Atlantic coast States, I strongly urge serious consideration of S. 1988, which provide for specific sanctions in order to deter these incursions and also clarifies existing legislation in this most crucial area of our domestic fishing industry.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the American fishing industry has been in decline for some years, and for this reason I am pleased that two bills to help this important industry are scheduled for Senate consideration today.

My State, one of the oldest in the Union, has always had a deep interest and stake in fishing, but during the past 20 years Connecticut's fish catch has dropped by over 50 percent.

In 1940, the catch was 14 million pounds. By 1960 this figure had dropped substantially, to only a 6-million-pound catch for Connecticut fishermen. And there has been no change in this downward trend since 1960.

To a very large extent, the decline of the American fishing industry can be attributed to the impact of foreign competition. Fishermen of foreign nations, many of whose governments susidize their ultramodern fishing fleets or extend help to the fishing industry in various other ways, are able to operate in waters traditionally fished only by the American fleet.

And the basic reason why we have lost out in waters that the United States has traditionally fished, is that our fishing vessels do not compare favorably with those of some of our competitors.

Just a brief survey of the facts that have been developed by the Commerce Committee and several of the executive agencies clearly brings home the staggering disadvantage under which our fishing industry operates.

A great part of our fishing vessels are obsolete and inefficient; 32 percent of the vessels operating in 1961 were between 21 and 50 years old; 50 percent of the large trawlers fishing out of New England were more than 20 years old.

Opposed to this are the up-to-date foreign fleets, with refrigerated mother ships up to 350 feet in length. These vessels are able to sail farther from their home ports and stay out for longer

periods of time than is possible for American ships.

There are other technological advances which the American fishing industry is unable to fully utilize. For instance, adaptations of radar and sonar enable foreign fleets to find and follow schools of fish efficiently, so they need not merely wait until they happen upon a school.

How can we help the American fishing industry reverse its decline and at least hold its own, or even improve its competitive position?

We can go right to the source of the problem, which is the inability of American fishermen to meet the prohibitive costs of constructing new and large fishing vessels incorporating the latest developments in refrigeration and other advanced fishing techniques.

Ever since 1792, American fishermen have been forbidden to land fish in the United States from a foreign-built vessel. This means that they cannot purchase ships from foreign countries, where construction costs are much lower than here.

In 1960, Congress took a first step to help meet this problem, by providing a subsidy not to exceed 33⅓ percent of the costs of constructing a fishing vessel in a domestic shipyard.

This program expired in June of this year, but the bill before us, S. 1006, would extend the subsidy program for another 5 years, until 1968, and increase the maximum Federal contribution from 33⅓ to 55 percent.

I will support this bill, and I will do so for two reasons:

First. It seems to me that it is a matter of equity and simple justice for the Federal Government to help defray the high cost of constructing fishing vessels in domestic yards. It is a matter of firm and traditional national policy to require their construction in American yards, to make sure that our shipbuilding industry is maintained and kept in readiness for any national emergency. But in so doing, I think we have an obligation to help the domestic fishing industry make up for the disadvantages this policy causes, in the form of higher construction costs than its competitors must pay.

Second. The larger subsidy provided in this bill is the result of our experience with the previous 3-year program. The two-thirds of the costs that has had to be financed by vessel owners has been beyond the means of most vessel owners, and credit from conventional sources has been difficult to obtain. The 55 percent subsidy will leave only 45 percent of the construction costs to the owners, and I am hopeful that this will lead to greater activity in the construction of large and modern fishing vessels.

I am afraid that if we do not extend and expand this program of subsidies for fishing vessel construction, our fishing industry will suffer an even greater decline in the future, perhaps to the point of no return, where we can no longer reverse the trend of recent years. At least we have a chance to do so now, and I hope the Congress will do so this year.

The second bill would not have as large and beneficial an impact on the fishing industry, but I think it is a worthwhile measure which in the long run is necessary and important to the American fleet.

S. 1988 would make clear the fact that foreign vessels are prohibited from fishing in our territorial waters and from taking Continental Shelf fishery resources. It also would set up enforcement procedures and establish penalties for violators.

During the last few months, we have seen foreign fishing operations on an unprecedented scale close to our shores, and violations of our territorial waters are becoming more and more frequent.

To the indignity of losing our traditional fishing areas, has been added the injury of foreign fishing fleets working in sight of the mainland. In fact, these foreign vessels have even come into our own territorial waters.

Clearly, we should not permit this. We have to make other nations understand that they cannot encroach this far into our fishing grounds. And once this policy is announced, as a matter of law, we can use the stronger enforcement procedures and penalties to effectively discourage further violations in our waters. As matters now stand, Federal officials can only expel violators of our territorial waters from the territorial area. This does not provide a real deterrent to violators but I believe the authority contained in S. 1988 will do so.

The bill would permit fines, imprisonment, and forfeiture, and it would also authorize procedures for the seizure of foreign vessels operating illegally.

This is by no means a final answer to the problems of the fishing industry. But S. 1988 will be helpful, and in conjunction with the construction subsidy program, Congress will be taking two important steps toward assisting in the revitalization of the American fishing industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, shall it pass?

The bill (S. 1988) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is unlawful for any vessel, except a vessel of the United States, or for any master or other person in charge of such a vessel, to engage in the fisheries within the territorial waters of the United States, its territories and possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or to engage in the taking of any Continental Shelf fishery resource which appertains to the United States except as provided by an international agreement to which the United States is a party. However, the Secretary of the Treasury may issue a license authorizing a vessel other than a vessel of the United States to engage in fishing within the territorial waters of the United States or for resources of the Continental Shelf which appertain to the United States and to land its catch in a United States port, upon certification by the Secretary of the Interior that such permission would be in the national interest and upon concurrence of any State, Commonwealth or territory directly affected.

SEC. 2. (a) Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(b) Every vessel employed in any manner in connection with a violation of this Act including its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, cargo, and stores shall be subject to forfeiture and all fish taken or retained in violation of this Act or the monetary value thereof shall be forfeited.

(c) All provisions of law relating to the seizure, judicial forfeiture, and condemnation of a cargo for violation of the customs laws, the disposition of such cargo or the proceeds from the sale thereof, and the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this Act, insofar as such provisions of law are applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Enforcement of the provisions of this Act is the joint responsibility of the United States Coast Guard, the United States Department of the Interior, and the United States Bureau of Customs. In addition, the Secretary of the Interior may designate officers and employees of the States of the United States, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and of any territory or possession of the United States to carry out enforcement activities hereunder. When so designated, such officers and employees are authorized to function as Federal law enforcement agents for these purposes.

(b) The judges of the United States district courts, the judges of the highest courts of the territories and possessions of the United States, and United States commissioners may, within their respective jurisdictions, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue such warrants or other process, including warrants or other process issued in admiralty proceedings in Federal district courts, as may be required for enforcement of this Act and any regulations issued thereunder.

(c) Any person authorized to carry out enforcement activities hereunder shall have the power to execute any warrant or process issued by any officer or court of competent jurisdiction for the enforcement of this Act.

(d) Such person so authorized shall have the power—

(1) with or without a warrant or other process, to arrest any person committing in his presence or view a violation of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder;

(2) with or without a warrant or other process, to search any vessel and, if as a result of such search he has reasonable cause to believe that such vessel or any person on board is in violation of any provision of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, then to arrest such person.

(e) Such person so authorized may seize any vessel, together with its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, cargo and stores, used or employed contrary to the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued hereunder or which it reasonably appears has been used or employed contrary to the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued hereunder.

(f) Such person so authorized may seize, whenever and wherever lawfully found, all fish taken or retained in violation of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder. Any fish so seized may be disposed of pursuant to the order of a court of competent jurisdiction, or if perishable, in a manner prescribed by regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

(g) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2464 of title 28 when a warrant of arrest or other process in rem is issued in any cause under this section, the United States marshal or other officer shall discharge any fish seized if the process has been levied, on receiving from the claimant of the fish a bond or stipulation for the value of the fish with sufficient surety to be approved by a judge of the district court having jurisdiction of the offense, conditioned to deliver the fish seized, if condemned, without impairment in value or, in the discretion of the court, to pay its equivalent value in money or otherwise to answer the decree of the court in such cause. Such bond or stipulation shall be returned to the court and judgment thereon against both the principal and sureties may be recovered in event of any breach of the conditions thereof as determined by the court. In the discretion of the accused, and subject to the direction of the court, the fish may be sold for not less than its reasonable market value and the proceeds of such sale placed in the registry of the court pending judgment in the case.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in connection with the bill which we have just passed, S. 1988, prohibiting fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by persons other than nationals or inhabitants of the United States, there are certain thoughts which I would like to advance.

The United States is now the leading naval and maritime nation in the world. We have the capability of controlling the seas more effectively than any nation in the history of the world. Our powers for control are truly three dimensional in nature: we not only dominate the surface of the seas because of our swift moving and massive Navy, but we control the skies above our ships, and we are presently going a long way—thanks to our submarine programs—to being able to control the seas beneath the surface. All told, our worldwide seapower is far greater and more absolute than was the control of the British Navy in its heyday. And, the British and we are the only two modern nations who can ever be said to have dominated all the oceans' seas.

With these implicit powers go great responsibilities for a just and proper future. The one great undiscovered, unexplored new frontier in our world today is the ocean floor. We have as yet no clear estimate of the abundance of riches to be found there. I am not just thinking of fishery resources, but of the important mineral resources and other resources that may be found there. Perhaps some day in the more distant future there may be actual undersea colonies of human beings living and exploiting the resources of the deep.

Because of our paramount naval position and because there are so many possible gains for the United States at the bottom of the oceans, I believe that our national interest is best served by keeping the control of the ocean floors as well as surfaces as international as possible, so that we can exploit all the ocean bottoms of the world. We may well discover that the mineral or other resources on the ocean floors are not too far from the shores of other nations and on their Continental Shelves. At this very time the Coast Guard cutter *Northwind*, is making various surveys along the northern shore of the Soviet Union, often within sight of land.

It would seem to me that ours should be the last nation to advance, as a matter of U.S. national interest, any proposal which would remove from the world's oceanic areas and oceanic floors their international nature. I can see why a nation with a large army, like the Soviet Union or a nation with no fleet, like Ecuador, might hazard bold proposals to the effect that fishery resources hundreds of miles out to sea should be considered their own and not in the public domain. But if we should ever follow this policy, it seems to me that we may be setting a very dangerous precedent, in opposition to our total national interest.

My own thought is that we should approach this problem from a multilateral viewpoint—so that we do not limit ourselves in the future by setting an example now which other nations might apply later against us.

I would suggest a twofold approach to this problem; first by beefing up the existing Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention, and second, by securing the necessary final ratification of the Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf. Our objectives with respect to the former could be achieved by the adoption of a multilateral enforcement policy within the Northwest Convention, setting forth the provision that the enforcement arm of any signatory nation can board and inspect any fishing vessel within the prescribed waters. This could then serve as a guideline policy for other fishing conventions to which we are signatory. I would even suggest that our own Coast Guard, which has great experience in this area, be made the investigating and inspecting agent for the convention. Presently the U.S. Coast Guard undertakes international responsibility in such areas as the International Ice Patrol, the North Atlantic and Pacific weather stations which also carry beacon and radar services for all aircraft, and the long range electronic navigation stations which service all countries which wish to avail themselves of these navigational aids.

The next scheduled meeting of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention will be at Halifax this coming spring. I believe we should press for a much earlier meeting, and that we should send a strong delegation to it with specific responsibility for putting enforcement teeth into this convention, to increase its effectiveness. I would also recommend enlarging and strengthening the convention secretariat which presently has only an executive secretary—Canadian—a biologist-technican—Canadian—and three clerk-typists—American—so that it can administer the convention policies with greater effectiveness.

My second approach toward resolving this problem is to urge the Department of State to make every effort to secure one more country's ratification of the Geneva Convention of 1958 on the Continental Shelf. This convention would give the coastal State sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring and exploiting the natural resources of the Continental Shelf. Then, too, the shelf is defined in such a manner that little doubt would exist as to the rights granted therein to any coastal State. One more ratifying country would put this convention into effect, and thus could resolve our problems with respect to ocean resources in that area.

These procedures would also give an opportunity to the Soviet Union, which is a party to both conventions, to demonstrate her willingness to engage in further peaceful, international activities—an attitude which she avows, but which she has yet to demonstrate, but which we hope may stem from our agreement on the partial nuclear test ban treaty.

These multilateral approaches, in my judgment, would constitute a most sound and wise way to act in our world today. It is the way of responsible nations, who are willing to cooperate to the mutual benefit of all. It is an old and accepted way in which matters of international concern are settled. I consider it a wise method and one which can set the guidelines for other and future agreements to protect and conserve the resources of our oceans.

I realize that my distinguished friend and colleague from Alaska, Senator BARTLETT, and the cosponsors of S. 1988, are acting with a just and proper concern for the preservation of our fishery resources, and the protection of our domestic fishing industry. I, too, share that concern, not only for the fishermen from my own State of Rhode Island, but for all our fishermen.

I am in complete accord with the objective of the legislation which has just passed as it applies to our territorial waters and voted for this legislation.

But I do believe we should be careful in exercising the power we have now given ourselves by legislating in advance with respect to fishery resources which the United States at some future date may determine belongs to us. We have in effect set the stage for unilaterally extending our jurisdiction beyond the 3-mile limit once the Executive makes a determination that any single fishery resource belongs to this country. While I have complete confidence in the judgment of the Executive, I would still prefer to advance our objectives in the long accepted and traditional method of international agreements.

With these thoughts in mind, I am submitting a Senate resolution requesting the President to secure acceptance by all concerned Governments of the two proposals recommended by the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries which are designed to facilitate the establishment of international control and inspection in this area. As I suggested previously, this could then serve as a guideline policy with respect to other international agreements to which we are a party.

I also urge the Department of State to bend all its efforts to securing that one

final ratification to the Convention on the Continental Shelf, so that it, too, may be put into effect.

I believe this twofold approach to this problem can accomplish our national objectives regarding the conservation and protection of our fishery resources in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and would do so in an internationally accepted manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 207) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, signed at Washington, District of Columbia, under date of February 8, 1949, has been ratified or adhered to by the Governments of 13 countries, including the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas such contracting Governments have agreed to promote the conservation and protection of the fisheries resources of the Northwest Atlantic Ocean in order to make possible the maintenance of a maximum sustained catch from those fisheries; and

Whereas the establishment of the right for any contracting Government to carry out the inspection of all fishing vessels of any other contracting Government in the convention area would promote the objectives and insure the observance of the convention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to make such efforts as may be necessary to secure the acceptance of all the Governments parties thereto of the two recommendations adopted by the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries and transmitted by the Commission to the United States as depositary Government on July 10, 1963, as proposals of the Commission to amend the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries in order to facilitate the establishment of measures of international control and inspection of all fishing vessels of any Contracting Government in the Convention area.

SEC. 2. The President is further requested to make all such efforts, through the U.S. delegation to the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, as may be necessary to place before such Commission for its consideration at the earliest possible time, either at a special meeting or at the next regular annual meeting, proposals for measures establishing further necessary regulations to protect and conserve the fisheries resources in the area to which the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries applies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CORRECTION OF INEQUITIES IN CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 457, Senate bill 1006.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (1006) to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 2, line 24, after the word "substitute", to strike out "$12,500,000" and insert "$10,000,000", and on page 3, line 3, after "June 30,", to strike out "1972" and insert "1968"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 12, 1960, as amended, may be cited as the "United States Fishing Fleet Improvement Act".

SEC. 2. The Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212), is amended as follows:

(1) in section 2 delete the word "and" at the end of subsection (6); add a new subsection (7) as follows:

"(7) the vessel will be of advance design, which will enable it to operate in expanded areas, or be equipped with newly developed gear, and will not operate in a fishery, if such operation would cause economic hardship to efficient vessel operators already operating in that fishery, and;", and renumber the present subsection (7) as subsection (8);

(2) delete section 4;

(3) in section 5, delete the phrase "33⅓ per centum" and substitute "55 per cent";

(4) amend section 9 to read:

"SEC. 9. If any fishing vessel constructed with the aid of a construction subsidy in accordance with the provisions of this Act, as amended, is operated during its useful life, as determined by the Secretary, contrary to the provisions of this Act or any regulations issued thereunder, the owner of such vessel shall repay to the Secretary, in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe an amount not to exceed the total depreciated construction subsidy paid by the Secretary pursuant to this Act and this shall constitute a maritime lien against such vessel. The obligations under this section shall run with the title to the vessel."

(5) in section 12, delete "$2,500,000" and substitute "$10,000,000"; and

(6) amend section 13 to read:

"SEC. 13. No application for a subsidy for the construction of a fishing vessel may be accepted by the Secretary after June 30, 1968."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wanted to make an inquiry—I think several Senators who are interested in this bill would like to know also—whether it is intended to continue consideration of this bill after the Senator from Wisconsin makes his statement, which I understand will take him about 20 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed. I understand the Senator from Wisconsin will take 20 or 25 minutes, and the Senate will proceed with the consideration of the bill thereafter.

DO WE SELL THE ROPE TO HANG US?—WHEAT FOR THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk about the probability that the United States might sell as much as $400 million worth of wheat, at the world price, to the Soviet Union. That world price is 55 cents below the American domestic price.

I have listened for 5 hours to detailed explanations and justification of this act by the Secretaries of Commerce and Agriculture and the Under Secretary of State and their spokesmen, and I am emphatically opposed to this proposal.

VIOLATES CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

This transaction would violate the policy of Congress as set forth in the Agricultural Act of 1961.

In August 1961, Congress passed the Agricultural Act, which stated as follows in the Statement of Policy of the act:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to expand foreign trade in agricultural commodities with friendly nations as defined in section 107 of Public Law 480 and in no manner either subsidize the export, sale, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nation other than such friendly nation.

"Friendly nation" is defined in section 107 of Public Law 480 as follows:

A friendly nation means any country other than the U.S.S.R.—

That is the first point.

The language continues:

or any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement.

Mr. President, there is no way we can avoid the fact that this is a direct contradiction of the declaration of policy in the Agricultural Act of 1961, which would forbid the sale of wheat under the only terms under which there is any possibility of selling it to the Soviet Union.

The New York Times reports this morning that few Members of Congress oppose the sale of this wheat. This is said to be based on interviews with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Agricultural Committee and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee after a meeting held yesterday.

It may well be that few Members of Congress will oppose this kind of arrangement for the President to act in contradiction of the specific language of Public Law 87–128, the Agricultural Act. However, if this be true, if only a few Members of Congress would oppose it, what is wrong with having Congress act?

The fact is if there is virtually unanimity of opinion in Congress, Congress can act promptly. No showing has been made that there is any real urgency in this matter. There is no urgency in any of the presentations I have heard from the State, Commerce, and Agriculture Departments on the part of Russia, and certainly there is no urgency on our part.

It would seem to me a resolution from the appropriate committees of Congress would give us an opportunity to understand the issue, debate it, and dispose of it in a matter of a relatively few days, because this does constitute a major change of policy.

ECONOMIC BENEFIT TO U.S.S.R.

The present agricultural sales to the U.S.S.R., which are not subsidized agri-

cultural products, but are of agricultural products which move where the world price and domestic price are about the same, constituted last year $4½ million. The sale of the wheat would be 100 times as much as that, in one sale—about $400 million.

The economic effect on the Soviet Union would be very substantial.

This one arrangement, this one deal, would apparently consume almost 10 percent of the Soviet Union's gold and foreign exchange, which is said to be between $4⅛ and $8 billion.

If the U.S.S.R. wants to make this arrangement, which would consume this much of her gold and foreign exchange, and more than 1 year's gold production in the Soviet Union, it would obviously be considered or proposed by the U.S.S.R. only if it would result in great economic benefit to the Soviet Union. It would. In the first place it would be very helpful to the Soviet's food reserves. The way in which the Soviet economy operates, to produce that amount of wheat would require an enormous amount of manpower, because of the inefficiency of Soviet agricultural production. And, of course, manpower is the essence of any economy's strength.

There is no question that the production of that amount of wheat would take many tractors and other farm machinery and would consume a great deal of steel, electrical production, and require much chemical fertilizer, all of which would have not merely an effect on the Soviet economy, but a profound and serious and substantial effect.

HELPS U.S.S.R. MILITARY

In the second place, there is no question that it would have a significant effect on the Soviet military effort. The sacrifices for defense which we make in this country are substantial. The Soviet Union makes three times as substantial a contribution to their military in terms of the gross national product. The Soviet Union's military effort takes 30 percent of her gross national product, as compared with 10 percent in this country. So obviously any big and substantial support of the Soviet Union's economy will directly benefit her military effort.

The sale of this wheat would have a significant military effect in terms of military food reserves, manpower, and military strength.

HELP U.S.S.R. TO DOMINATE SATELLITES

A main argument against this deal is that this wheat will be primarily used by the Soviet Union, according to all the testimony available, for export.

NOT FOR FAMINE RELIEF

It is true that we have two precedents in which the United States of America has given assistance in the past to Russia. The first time was in 1892, when there was no Communist regime, but when there was a tyrannical regime. Even that assistance encountered a great deal of public criticism in this country. The second time was in 1921, when there was a Communist regime, but where the situation was entirely different, where crop failure had led to widespread famine in Russia. Some 9 million people were fed by the American relief organizations, under the direction of Herbert Hoover.

If we had that kind of situation today, I am sure every Member of Congress would support such aid. To supply relief for hunger under the American flag is appropriate, proper, and desirable, from any standpoint. Any country, including a Communist country, which would request this kind of assistance would undoubtedly receive substantial consideration by all branches of the Government.

But this is something different. This is a sale to the Soviet Union at the subsidized price, which is below the domestic price. It is a sale to the Soviet Government, not for use by the Russians primarily, but for use in keeping its commitments to its satellites.

Elliott Janeway, in last night's Washington Star, wrote, and I quote as follows:

> Theorizing apart no one knows how severe the failure may have been within Russia herself; how much of a reserve she may have; or how much of her present purchases are really scheduled not for her own internal use, but instead for resale throughout free Europe and for rationing and political bribery among the satellites.
>
> We don't need Russia to get in between us and our allies and friends in free Europe, and to resell our premium commodities to them for their good money when they are our creditors. It is to the mutual interest of all in the Atlantic Community for us to earn more by direct sales to Europe. No doubt about it, free Europe needs wheat and it has the money to pay for it. True, Russia will offer to pay us in gold which we badly need, but so will Europe.
>
> The satellites need our wheat even more, and this is a time for us to trade out a tangible political return on all that we have been giving to Poland and to Yugoslavia as well as for us to look for our own back in Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

This is a mighty persuasive argument against the sale. If we have the wheat, and other countries are willing to buy the wheat, why should we sell it to the Soviet Union, the world's largest producer of wheat, so that it can continue its export of wheat to satellite countries and to Western Europe, in following its own interests? Why should we ourselves not sell it, particularly to free Europe?

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I heard the Senator from Wisconsin describe the law as it now exists. I should like to point out what the law provides. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Wisconsin that under the Agricultural Act of 1961 the policy of Congress was declared to be—and I am now referring to section 2(c):

> To expand foreign trade in agricultural commodities with friendly nations, as defined in section 107 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, and in no manner either subsidize the export, sell, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nations other than such friendly nations and thus make full use of our agricultural abundance.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator has stated the law precisely as it is, and he has referred to the proper section. I concur completely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That declaration of policy is that we shall sell at subsidized prices to friendly nations, and that we shall in no manner sell or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nations other than such friendly nations.

Is it the understanding of the Senator from Wisconsin that it is our declared policy that our Government will sell at subsidized prices to friendly nations only, but not to unfriendly nations?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct. The particular reference to Public Law 480 explains, in a very simple and very direct way, what a friendly nation is. I read from section 107 of Public Law 480:

> As used in this act, "friendly nation" means any country other than (1) the U.S.S.R.

It then goes on to speak of any country dominated or controlled by international communism. The U.S.S.R. is explicitly and clearly defined as not a friendly nation for purposes of the act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, under the Agricultural Act of 1961, reference is made to Public Law 480 in ascertaining the definition of a friendly nation. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator again state how Public Law 480 defines a friendly nation?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Section 107 of Public Law 480 states:

> As used in this act, "friendly nation" means any country other than (1) the U.S.S.R.

Then it refers also to any nation dominated or controlled by international communism.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it proper, in interpreting that language, to come to the conclusion that, as a prerequisite to the right to sell at a subsidized price, the buyer must be a country friendly to the United States?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the country is unfriendly, the declaration of policy, as specified in Public Law 480, prohibits the sale.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To sell to Red Russia, the conclusion must be drawn, from the provisions of Public Law 480, that Red Russia is friendly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is a rather strained and tenuous conclusion, is it not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe so. However, I have seen some very strained and tenuous conclusions reached to make the argument that we are talking about a country like Red China or Cuba. However, the law is clear, explicit, and precise. The law says:

> (1) The U.S.S.R. is not a friendly country.

That is the only country cited. There is no mention of any other country. There is no mention of Red China or Cuba. It mentions only the U.S.S.R.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Section 107 is applied completely to Red Russia. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It provides that Red Russia shall not be considered a friendly nation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is what it says.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Nor shall any other nation be considered a friendly nation which is under the control of Red Russia.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Section 107 also provides:

> Or any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the interpretation of the Senate from Wisconsin that if we sell to Red Russia at the subsidized price, we must declare it to be friendly to our cause? Would it not require us to say that the Soviet Union is a friendly nation?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would seem that way, unless the President is willing—it is hard to find the exact phrase—unless he is willing not to abide by the policy declaration of Congress. If he does not wish to abide by it, he can make the sale. If he wishes to abide by the declaration of Congress, he cannot make the sale under any circumstances, because the law is that clear. It is not a matter of interpretation—10,000 times 10,000 lawyers could not make any other interpretation from that language. The interpretation is absolutely clear. It is as clear as it can be.

However, the President, if he wishes, can ignore or overlook or not abide by—I believe that is the best phrase—the declaration of policy that Congress has made in the preamble to the Agricultural Act of 1961.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would it or would it not follow that if the administration is allowed to sell wheat at a subsidized price to Red Russia, it could also sell wheat at a subsidized price to Red China and Cuba?

Mr. PROXMIRE. My interpretation is that it would be easier under this law to sell to either Cuba or China, because China and Cuba are not mentioned in it. If the President or his advisers want to say at any time that Castro and Mao are friendly, or at least not unfriendly, they are free to do so. But the U.S. Government cannot sell to the U.S.S.R. unless it is willing to ignore or to overlook the explicit prohibition or explicit statement of policy by Congress.

The question that arises is whether there has been a significant, substantial change in the last 2 years that would make it clear that Russia has taken a different tack; that Russia can no longer be categorized as not a friendly nation. I feel that it would take the greatest imagination to find such a change.

It is true that Russia concurred in the test ban treaty. I am glad Russia did so. But, after all, since the act of August of 1961 it has been revealed that the Russians put their missiles in Cuba, 90 miles from our shore. That has taken place since that act of Congress. Certainly that is an unfriendly action and would completely counterbalance any subsequent friendly action which has taken place since then that I know about. Is that not correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur in the Senator's statement. But is it not also true that if we now make a declaration that Russia is friendly, that declaration would be in complete conflict with the definition of friendly countries as contained in section 107 of Public Law 480?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So even if we wanted to say that Russia is friendly and therefore shall have the beneficence and the act of our charity, such a declaration would be in conflict with the specific language of the statute.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we are to decide that Russia has changed its ways and that it is helpful and friendly to us, should the proposed action be taken through a modification of the law, or should it be done by having the administration make a declaration on the subject?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I recognize that the President has the prime responsibility. There are times when the President should take steps which might directly contradict earlier policy statements by Congress. But it seems to me that when those steps are taken, there should be a clear justification for them and an overwhelming consensus that the steps are necessary and wise. But to take such a step in these circumstances, without any action by Congress, would seem to me to make statements of policy by Congress in the future meaningless.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for the information he has given.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, a prime purpose of the wheat sale would be to permit the Soviet Union to continue to hold the grip it now has over its satellites. There is no question that one of the reasons why the Soviet Union is able to dominate and operate in Cuba is that the Soviet Union is the prime source of wheat and all other food and material for Cuba. This is true in the other satellite countries, as well.

PROPOSAL COULD HELP RED CHINA

The newspapers this morning reported that the food shortage situation in Red China is worse than it has been at any time in recent years—worse, even, than in 1961. In 1961, many experts said that there was a possibility—certainly not a probability, but a possibility—that conceivably there could be a revolution in Red China, a revolution that might overthrow the Communist regime. I admit this is unlikely. Of course, it is always unlikely, but it may have been possible.

Now the reports are that the food shortage in Red China is worse than it was then. Although the State Department may assure us that it will try to make certain that this enormous amount of wheat will not be transshipped from Russia to China, the fact is that that is always a real possibility. While it is true that there is a conspicuous and vehement ideological dispute between Red China and the Soviet Union, the fact is that if the Communist regime in Red China is faced with a situation in which an anti-Communist revolution might succeed, it is perfectly obvious that Russia would ship wheat, at whatever sacrifice is necessary, into Red China, in order to prevent that kind of revolution. This is another reason why it would be a mistake for our Government to contradict the clear and explicit statement of Congress in the Agricultural Act of 1961.

PROPOSAL CONTRADICTS J. F. K. UTAH SPEECH

As a Democrat, I was proud of the magnificent speech delivered by President Kennedy at the Mormon Tabernacle in Salt Lake City last week. It was a great speech. It was a speech which made me proud to be an American, as well as to be a Democrat. But what does that speech really mean in terms of this kind of proposal? The President said:

> As we go, so goes freedom. No other nation has the power to maintain world freedom. Our U.S. interest is best served by preserving and protecting a world of diversity, in which no monolithic power can acquire that ability to dominate.

The fact is that the monolithic powers of Red China and the Soviet Union are based on economic strength. There is no question at all that if we were to provide the enormous amount of wheat that has been proposed—more than 200 million bushels, valued at $400 million—if we concluded that kind of deal, the economy of the Soviet Union would be strengthened in its capacity to dominate not only its own people but the people in the satellite countries, as well.

RUSSIA CANNOT GET WHEAT ELSEWHERE

There has been one prime argument in favor of making such an agreement. It is the one argument in which those who support it seem to persist. The argument is that if we do not make this arrangement, Russia will get the wheat anyway; that all we would be doing by refusing to deal with Russia would be to make it possible for other countries to make more money. It is said that we would be preventing American farmers from increasing their income and preventing our wheat traders from making a profit. This argument does not stand up at all, because if Russia is to get wheat without getting it from us, from whom will she get it? Canada has already committed every bushel she can possibly deliver; and there is a real question whether Canada can deliver what she has committed.

Where will our European allies get wheat? This was as bad a wheat growing season in Western Europe as it was in Eastern Europe. This was a poor wheat growing season in the entire Eastern Hemisphere. Wheat is short in West Germany, in France, and in Italy. No surplus of wheat is available to be sold to the Soviet Union.

It has been argued that if the United States does not sell wheat to the Russians, our allied countries will buy the

wheat from us and resell it to the Soviet Union. What does that mean? It certainly does not mean that our farmers will be out in this kind of arrangement.

Our farmers would still produce the wheat and profit from it. Our traders would still sell the wheat and gain from it.

The argument that our wheat would be sold to the West Germans, the French, the English, or the Italians, and would then be resold to the Russians, is what this contention comes down to. It is said that if we do not sell wheat to the Russians, they will get it anyway, because there just is no other place from which to get it.

The fact that Russia cannot get enough wheat in Western Europe, Canada, or any other part of the world is the reason why Russia is coming to us.

RIDICULOUS THAT 200 MILLION BUSHELS BE RESOLD TO U.S.S.R.

Suppose it is true that some of the wheat which we sell to West Germany or any of the other Western European countries might find its way to Russia or the Russian satellite countries. It is almost inconceivable that we would sell 200 million additional bushels of wheat to our Western European allies or to any other purchaser without having any idea where it would go, so that we might establish some kind of exchange control, some kind of surveillance of shipping, some kind of information sources, so that so vast an amount of wheat, which would take many ships over many months to deliver, could not be shipped without our knowing whether it was being delivered to Russia. Of course we would know. Certainly we could stop it, if we wanted to stop it. There is no question about it.

Also, Mr. President, there is no question in my mind if we specify to our allies we are buying this wheat and it is not to be resold I am convinced that they would not resell it, not simply because I have faith in them but because they have the brains to recognize that we would know that they did resell it and we could make it clear that we would not go out and sell it to them again under those circumstances. So the argument that the U.S.S.R. would get the wheat anyway does not stand up.

WHY SHOULD U.S. TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZE U.S.S.R.?

I think the most telling argument is that we are selling this wheat to Russia at a subsidized price. The world price is 55 cents below—roughly below the domestic price. In the first instance we pay a 55-cent subsidy for the benefit of the American farmer, a subsidy to keep his very low income from going even lower, a subsidy which the majority of the Members of Congress, and the administration, and past administrations, have supported.

To be honest, I believe we have to recognize that this is also a subsidy of the consumer, the foreign purchaser—a subsidy to both farmer and consumer; to the purchaser because he gets his wheat for less, the subsidies keep agricultural production up and thereby keep prices low. It is a subsidy in effect to the consumer.

Under any stretch of the imagination, this is a subsidy of substance to the Soviet Union if we make this deal because the Soviet Union will get the wheat for less. It is argued that this is not a subsidy to the U.S.S.R., because if the U.S.S.R. does not buy it from us at the world price they will buy it elsewhere at the world price. This argument does not hold up because obviously if the Soviet Union could in fact buy at the world price, that is, at the price we offer, under the circumstances they would certainly not come to the United States.

The sale of such a huge amount of wheat in a year of acute shortage, throughout the Eastern Hemisphere, is bound to affect the world price itself when we sell it at a subsidized low price. We keep the world price down. We keep it substantially below what it would be otherwise.

There is no question if Russia tried to buy this much wheat in the world market in the next 6 months, the price would be much higher—perhaps even higher than the domestic price. If Russia insisted on buying world wheat it would pay a price higher and probably much higher than they will pay the United States. So it is perfectly clear this does constitute a subsidy to the Soviet Union paid by the American taxpayer.

One of the distinguished proponents of this proposal asked the other day, what is our wheat for? He asked, "What is our wheat for, to look at, to store, or to pay storage on it?" He said, "Wheat is for human consumption and we want to have it consumed by human beings."

Now our wheat certainly is for human consumption. But there is no question in my mind that this wheat has not been produced to sell at a subsidy price to the Soviet Union. There is not a Member of Congress who would have voted for the Agricultural Act which would have had that consequence. Of course it was not produced for that purpose.

Let me sum up, Mr. President, and then I am through.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to commend the able Senator from Wisconsin for the sound position he has taken in this matter and for the logical reasoning on which his position is based. Does not the Senator consider that food is an important weapon of war, just as much so as a gun?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question about it, and further there is no question in my mind that the greatest weakness in the Soviet Union, and the greatest weakness in all the Communist countries, is their inability to produce food, the utter failure of collectivized agriculture. This is America's greatest economic strength and it is their greatest economic weakness. By making this kind of deal we are compensating them for their weakness and strengthening their economy.

Mr. THURMOND. Does not the Senator feel that if we sell wheat to Russia, we shall be helping them to make their system—which now is deficient in that respect—stronger?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct; there is no question about it.

Mr. THURMOND. Does not the Senator feel that if this wheat goes to the Soviet countries behind the Iron Curtain, the people there will never know that the United States furnished them this subsidized wheat? Would not the same thing happen there that happened, several years ago, when we furnished wheat to Poland, and the Polish authorities took the wheat out of the bags labeled "United States," and placed it in bags with markings of their own country, and the people of Poland never knew where that wheat came from?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct. The fact is that this wheat will be sold by the Soviet Union to its own satellite countries, and help Russia control its own satellite countries.

Mr. THURMOND. So the Senator is ably making the point that we would thus be subsidizing the Soviets to the extent of 55 cents a bushel.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. So I ask, why—and I believe the American people will wish to know why—should the United States subsidize the Soviet Union?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly there is absolutely no sound political reason and certainly there is no sound military reason for it. All those arguments are against it. There is an economic reason of course because there would be a temporary increase in income, I presume, for the American farmer and for the American wheat trader. We would make money out of it. As Lenin boasted if communism triumphs over capitalism it will be because the capitalists will sell the rope that the Communists will hang us with.

We would sell them the rope which will hang us; that is what we are doing—to "make a buck."

Mr. THURMOND. Thus we would be providing the Soviets with munitions, so to speak, if we sold them wheat, because if men are to fight, they must have both food and weapons. In addition, the people who are going to back up that war machine must be fed.

The Russians are now undergoing a very terrible ordeal, I understand, for lack of proper food. Would this be the proper time to put such pressure on the Soviet Union, rather than to try to relieve them of it, if we wish ever to free the countries which now are behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed. There is ample precedent for that. In 1921 or 1922 when the American Relief Administration under the direction of former President Herbert Hoover went into the Soviet Union, and it was then under Communist control, America was able to feed 9 million people. This is the way to solve the problem in an humane way, so as to see that people do not hunger. But to provide for a sale of wheat to the Soviet Government, the tyrants who control

the Soviet Union, so that they can control their satellites, makes no sense.

Mr. THURMOND. Does not the Senator feel that if we sell this wheat to the Soviet Union or to the countries behind the Iron Curtain, we will assist the economic systems of those countries, rather than be trying to injure those systems—which we should be trying to do if we are interested in trying to destroy communism?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Again I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for the able speech he is making and for the very sound position he is taking.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina very much.

Mr. President, to sum up this action, if we consummate the deal by selling a substantial amount of hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat to the Soviet Union, this clearly violates the sense of Congress as specified in the declaration of policy in the Agricultural Act of 1961.

Two, it will strengthen the economy of the Soviet Union. It will strengthen their military force and it will strengthen their political grip over their satellites. And it will strengthen their position with regard to the rest of the world.

Three, this situation could easily help Mao in Red China and Castro in Cuba. As a matter of fact the Canadian wheat deal specified that $33 million of that wheat be shipped directly to Cuba. If Cuba needs more wheat, this deal we might make would enable the Soviet Union to make additional commitments.

Fourth, the Soviet Union could not get 200 million bushels of wheat without this deal, certainly not at a price which we are willing to sell it to them. To get it, they would have to pay far more. No one else now has it. Certainly we can control the resale of this enormous amount of wheat.

In the fifth place, I am against the proposed arrangement because it means that the American taxpayer would subsidize the Soviet Union by more than $100 million. At the very least, it seems to the Senator from Wisconsin that the entire arrangement raises a very serious question, and that Congress should have an opportunity to debate, discuss, and act upon it. If Congress chooses to do so, it should be free to revise the declaration of the policy of 1961. It can do so through a simple resolution in a relatively few days.

I yield the floor.

During the delivery of Mr. PROXMIRE'S speech,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield 30 seconds to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, with the understanding that I will not lose the floor, and that the remarks of the Senator from Oregon will be printed either before or following my remarks, I yield 30 seconds to him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to have the RECORD show that I am leaving the Chamber to return to my office. I am not attending any drinking party in the precincts of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon takes a serious risk with this record of sobriety unless the Senator intends to make such a record every night. The Senator from Oregon is doing to himself what a certain first mate did to his captain. The captain logged in the ship's book that the first mate came aboard drunk. The next time the captain went ashore the first mate logged that it was a great and memorable day for the ship for on that day the captain came aboard sober.

So let public and posterity know that the Senator from Oregon always—not just on this occasion—comes aboard sober.

ADMISSION OF ATTORNEYS TO PRACTICE BEFORE FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION AGENCIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with S. 1466, a bill I cosponsored, dealing with administrative practices and procedures, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement published in the Federal Bar News, written by Edmund D. Edelman and Erwin G. Krasnow, titled "Admission of Attorneys To Practice Before Federal Administrative Agencies."

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

ADMISSION OF ATTORNEYS TO PRACTICE BEFORE FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES

(By Edmund D. Edelman and Erwin G. Krasnow)

A major issue pending before the 88th Congress is civil rights and "equal accommodations" for Negroes. However, there is a less dramatic legislative item being considered by the Congress which involves civil rights, States rights, and equal accommodations for lawyers practicing before Federal agencies. The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure recently concluded hearings on S. 1466, which eliminates the unequal treatment imposed by agency admission procedures for lawyers.

S. 1466 provides, in part: "Any person who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of any State, possession, territory, commonwealth, or the District of Columbia, in which he resides or maintains an office, may represent others before any agency."

This bill, sponsored by eight members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, is based on the right of a person to be represented by counsel of his choice. This right is now recognized by 36 agencies. However, four agencies require lawyers to submit to special admission procedures. S. 1466 also provides that agencies must deal with the attorney chosen by the citizen to represent him. Complaints have been registered against agencies who refuse or are reluctant to give an attorney information, serve him with notices, or confer with him on a client's matters. Section 2 of S. 1466 makes it clear that an agency must deal with the attorney in the matter covered by the representation, that notice to or service upon the attorney constitutes valid notice and service upon the party.

The situation present by Federal agencies requiring attorneys to make separate applications to practice can be explained more readily by history than logic. History shows that the "bewildering array of regulations" for attorneys practicing before Federal agencies arose mainly as an antidote to the corrupt practices of claim agents in the post-Civil War era. After the Civil War there were a flood of pension claims filed in Washington, D.C., by widows and relatives of deceased soldiers. Many persons held themselves out as experts in prosecuting these claims. Most of these "experts" were not lawyers. When the well of pension claims dried up, the so-called experts turned to prosecuting patent and Indian claims. Because of the highly flamboyant advertisements, fraudulent and questionable practices, a movement began to regulate these matters. The situation is vividly described in a statement contained in a report of the House of Representatives in 1873: "An Indian claims agent * * * is generally bankrupt in moral, religion and politics. * * * He will marry a squaw and become an Indian to secure influence with them, and will abandon his victim and children, if necessary, for gain. He will abandon American citizenship for that of a band of Indians solely to divide their property with them and with that done, will abandon them. In short, if there is anything that an Indian claims agent will not do, it is that he will not treat his clients, the Indians, honestly. (H. Rep. 98, Investigation of Indian Frauds, 42d Cong., 3d sess., Mar. 3, 1873, pp. 76–77.)

Congressional action first came in 1884 in a bill appropriating money to those who had "lost horses" during the Civil War. Persons representing claimants were required to possess "good character" and the necessary qualifications to enable them to render "valuable service to the claimants." (23 Stat. 258, 5 U.S.C. 261.) The Secretaries of the Treasury and Interior were authorized to prescribe rules and regulation governing the recognition of agents, attorneys, or other persons representing claimants before these Departments. In the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887, Congress provided that a party to a proceeding before the Commission may "appear * * * and be heard in person or by an attorney." Since no distinction was made by Congress between an attorney-at-law and an attorney-in-fact, most agencies concluded that Congress intended that nonlawyers should be allowed to practice before them. This grouping together of lawyers and laymen practicing before Federal agencies led to the same regulations being imposed on both. The regulations grew as the bureaucracy of the Federal Government increased in size. The situation became so confusing and annoying to lawyers that in 1957 the Office of Legal Counsel in the Department of Justice recommend that all agencies discontinue individual admission regulations and permit attorneys in good standing in the various jurisdictions to represent others before agencies. A number of agencies voluntarily accepted this recommendation. S. 1466 is directed at those agencies which have persisted in separate admissions, specialized bars or selective enrollment.

There are now four agencies that have separate procedures. The Interstate Commerce Commission, which does not oppose the enactment of S. 1466, requires an application under oath, a certificate of the clerk of the court or, in lieu of the certificate, the sponsorship of three practitioners (49 C.F.R., secs. 1.8 and 1.9). An attorney, in order to practice before the Patent Office, must make application on a prescribed form showing good moral character, good reputation, plus legal, scientific, and technical qualifications sufficient to render clients a valuable service. In order to handle patent cases, he must also pass an examination (37 C.F.R., sec. 1.341). To practice before the Veterans' Administration, lawyers must complete VA form 2–3186 and are required to file a power of attorney in each particular matter (38 F.R.F. 14.629).

The complex admission procedures for practice before the Treasury Department are specially set out in 70 sections, totaling 21 pages of fine print, in the Code of Federal Regulations. It is necessary to obtain enrollment cards which are issued only upon a showing of good character and reputation and the possession of necessary qualifications to render valuable service to clients (31 C.F.R. 10.0; 26 C.F.R. 601.501). A power of attorney must be filed with the department for each client before the attorney is properly before the agency in a representative capacity.

It may be argued that nonlawyer representatives who are not subject to an already existing code of professional ethics should be subject to standards set up by a Federal agency. Indeed, it would seem to be incumbent upon Federal agencies to impose such standards to insure protection of the administrative process. The question remains, however, whether attorneys, who are already subject to high standards of competence and character, should be further subjected to admission requirements imposed by governmental agencies. Are there substantial dangers involved in allowing a governmental agency to select those attorneys who may practice before it? Is the matter of competence and integrity of lawyers within the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts and bar association? If formal specialization is to be engrafted upon the legal profession, should the profession rather than a governmental agency undertake the task of establishing the requirements for specialization? Is a client rather than a governmental agency in a better position to determine whether an attorney is able to render valuable service? These and other basic questions were raised at the Senate hearings on S. 1466.

During the hearings, representatives from the Treasury Department asserted that separate admission requirements and procedures were necessary because membership in good standing in a State bar did not guarantee sufficient integrity in tax matters. It was alleged that all too often a lawyer might be convicted of a serious tax crime and yet not be disciplined by the State or local bar association. These assertions, of course, raise serious questions as to the policing ability of State bars to deal adequately with disciplinary problems involving tax matters. Even assuming arguendo that disciplinary measures have not been taken by State bar associations against attorneys for tax crimes, it would seem that this is hardly a valid reason to transfer the policing responsibilities of the local bar to a Federal agency in Washington. In this connection, it should be remembered that a lawyer is admitted to the practice of law upon a showing that is of good moral character and that he has the necessary professional knowledge. He subscribes to an oath of admission and a code of ethics. He is subject to investigation prior to admission and to continuous surveillance by bench, bar, and public after admission. All these requirements seem to afford the public the necessary degree of protection against incompetence and dishonesty.

S. 1466 has received the endorsement of the Federal Bar Association and the American Bar Association, as well as many State and local bar associations. Senator EDWARD V. LONG of Missouri, chairman of the Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee, stated it was his hope that "through the passage of this bill these cumbersome admission requirements for attorneys will be swept away, returning the general practitioner in this area to his traditional role as a recognized officer of the forum before which he appears as an advocate." Proponents of S. 1466 testified that restriction of practice before an agency is wrong in principle and has overtones of a closed shop or guildism. Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, stated the argument against agency control over admissions in unminced language: "It is absurd to bar from practice before a Federal administrative agency attorneys who are considered qualified to present cases before the highest court of a State or the Supreme Court of the United States."

A single admissions standard for all agencies would eliminate the maze of complex and differing rules and procedures for practice before Federal agencies. In addition to ending the "nuisance factor" for attorneys, the agencies would be freed from the time, money and manpower now being expended in administering these admission rules. The Second Hoover Commission Report stated that at least $3,000 a year could be saved by the Treasury Department alone if it eliminated some of its formal procedures for admission of attorneys.

A favorable report on S. 1466 is expected by the Senate Judiciary Committee. Passage of the bill by Congress would give to lawyers the "equal accommodations" before Federal agencies so long denied. Under S. 1466, disciplinary action could still be imposed by the agency but membership in good standing in a State bar would be sufficient to qualify an attorney to practice before the agency. In a sense, a corresponding duty would be placed upon State and local bars to insure that their members are fully qualified to practice before these agencies.

CORRECTION OF INEQUITIES IN CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1006) to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 457, Senate bill 1006, to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the bill represents one small step to save and preserve America's oldest and most historic industry—the fishing industry.

This is an industry that despite neglect and harassment in recent years still employs more than half a million of our citizens, today caught in a cold and losing wet war with Soviet Russia, Japan, and other foreign nations.

Enactment of this bill also is necessary to conserve the rich resources at our doorstep, resources now being plundered by massive fleets of foreign vessels and their foreign crews.

Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce have in their possession many documents, photographs and even motion pictures of the type of foreign vessels, Russian and Japanese, now involved in fishing on the high seas in historic American fishing banks.

These foreign fleets are stripping our nearby waters in preference to their own because the world's richest fishing grounds lie off our coast and that of Canada.

Heavily subsidized by their Governments, these fleets, some with as many as 200 and 300 modern fishing vessels, will remain in our waters as long as the fish are there.

Our fishermen have neither the ships nor gear to compete with or against them.

At the present catch rate in these waters there may be, within the next 10 years, no prized food fish left there for any fishermen, Americans or foreigners.

Already American fishermen and American consumers are suffering the effects of over-fishing by our competitors.

Our pollock catch in the Atlantic fisheries last year was the lowest since 1933.

The catch of ocean perch, among the prime targets of Russian fishing fleets off both New England and Alaska, was the lowest since 1944.

Yellowfin tuna landings dropped 66 million pounds below those of the previous year. So serious had become the depletion threat to this important species that the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and myself cosponsored a conservation measure in its behalf, which was approved by the Senate and the House and signed by the President.

The downward trend continues.

This year there has been almost a total failure of red salmon in Bristol Bay, Alaska, where several hundred Soviet and Japanese vessels, many of them huge factory ships, have scoured the waters in recent years.

Red salmon landings by American fishermen in the entire North Pacific area are only 25 percent of those last year.

The salmon catch of all species is 22 percent below what it was last year at this time.

Halibut landings are down 5 million pounds.

Albacore tuna is down 50 percent from last year, blue fin tuna 40 percent, skipjack 20 percent, and yellowfin, suffering the least decline, perhaps because of the legislation we enacted, 13 percent.

New England fishermen, competing against overwhelming foreign fleets, also are suffering depletion of their resources and livelihood.

The ocean perch catch is 15 million pounds below that of the previous year.

Haddock and scrod are down 4,500,000 pounds.

The pollock catch is 2 million pounds below that of last year which, as previously stated, was the lowest since 1933.

Cod landings are down 3 million pounds.

Unless this downward trend is halted, our billion-dollar fishery industry is doomed and we Americans will have been denied, during this decade of depletion, even our rightful share of the vanishing treasure from the seas around us.

The Committee on Commerce is convinced that both the industry and resource must be saved.

They must be saved because they have an important role in our military and economic security, and in the health and welfare of future generations.

How is this to be accomplished?

The committee has given long and searching thought to this problem; has held frequent and extended hearings to obtain the best judgment of union and industry leaders and of scientists and experts in this distinctive field.

As a result, three steps have been determined to be essential.

The bill before the Senate, which would provide a measure of assistance for the construction of modern fishing vessels to correct inequities imposed by statute, is one step.

A second step, to prohibit fishing by foreigners in our territorial waters, has been taken by the Committee in reporting S. 1988, which has now been passed by the Senate.

The latter bill does not attempt to define territorial waters, either in terms of width or depth. The discussion of the bill is in the RECORD today. I will not pursue it further, but it is the second step determined by committee.

Territorial waters have never been defined by statute. But nothing in the bill precludes our extending our territorial waters outward beyond the present accepted 3-mile limit, as many other nations have done. Soviet Russia, for example, enforces a strict 12-mile limit, but does not hesitate to invade the territorial waters of other nations, including our own.

A third and necessary step to preserve our fisheries already has been taken by the Senate, and will prove invaluable when the bill now before the Senate is enacted.

On September 14 of last year a group of distinguished Senators who have long fought to strengthen our fishing industry, joined me in sponsoring Senate Resolution 392, expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should propose an international conference on the conservation of fishery resources.

Cosponsors of this important resolution were the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and his colleague [Mrs. SMITH]; the Senators from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GRUENING]; the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]; my friend and colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and myself.

As a corollary to this resolution the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and I prepared an amendment to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

This amendment was adopted on September 18, was subsequently accepted by the House, and today is section 323 of the act. So important potentially to the fishing industry is this amendment that I shall take the liberty at this time of quoting it in full. It reads:

Upon a convocation of a conference on the use of conservation of international fishery resources, the President shall, by all appropriate means at his disposal, seek to persuade countries whose domestic fishing practices or policies affect such resources, to engage in negotiations in good faith relating to the use and conservation of such resources.

If, after such efforts by the President and by other countries which have agreed to engage in such negotiations, any other country whose conservation practices or policies affect the interests of the United States and such other countries, has, in the judgment of the President, failed or refused to engage in such negotiations in good faith, the President may, if he is satisfied that such action is likely to be effective in induring such country to engage in such negotiations in good faith, increase the rate of duty on any fish (in any form) which is the product of such country, for such time as he deems necessary, to a rate not more than 50 percent above the rate existing on July 1, 1934.

Six days later, on September 24, the Senate resolution previously referred to was approved by the Senate.

The proposed international conference has not yet taken place.

Although the resolution and the amendment have already been enacted they are, in fact, the third of three steps, the first two of which have not yet been enacted.

The second has now been acted upon by the Senate. The third is before the Senate. The culmination of the two is reserved for action by the House.

Pending enactment of S. 1006, the bill before the Senate today, I am not certain that we are prepared to participate on equal terms in an international fisheries conservation conference.

We have not utilized and are not utilizing our own fishery resources to an extent commensurable to our position or our needs as a great and relatively wealthy nation.

Instead we have let our fisheries decline, our fishing fleets deteriorate and become obsolete, our fishery resources in large measure unharvested. Other nations, naturally, have taken advantage of these inadequacies.

Conservation of these resources is in the interest of these other nations, in my opinion, if the Northwest Atlantic and the Northeast Pacific are not to become barren of commercial food and industrial species. But that interest is not to them immediate and pressing when the nation adjacent to these fisheries is neglecting their utilization and seemingly content with the fish that somehow have managed to escape their nets, or, in other words, the "leavings."

This is the argument Japan advanced in its efforts last fall to break down the barriers to halibut fishing in the Bering Sea, and Japan's arguments could or would set a pattern for other foreign fishing nations.

S. 1006 will help correct the inferiority of our fishing fleets and their ability to utilize our fishery resources realistically when sound conservation policies are established.

Enactment of S. 1988, to come before the Senate later, also will strengthen our position by serving notice on foreign vessels that they can no longer poach with immunity in our waters.

With enactment of these two measures and with prospects of an international conference in which all maritime nations will be invited to participate, the thoughts of sensible men in government and industry the world over will turn to tomorrow's supply rather than to today's landings.

Increasingly they will recognize that the world's fishery resources cannot be both abundant and at the same time subjected to unlimited exploitation and the consequent inevitable depletion. One cannot wantonly squander resources and retain them.

As world population expands the demand for the rich, high-protein foods from the sea will become urgent and insistent.

By the year 2000, the National Academy of Sciences informs us in its latest population study, the world population will have doubled to 6 billion people; that of the United States, now nearing 190 million, to around 380 million. Soviet Russia's population, as that of Canada and Argentina, also is expected to double in 35 to 40 years. In most European countries and in Japan the growth date is a little slower and it may take 50 years for the population to double, but in the underdeveloped areas of the world, in Africa, southeast Asia, and in most Latin American countries population is growing faster than in the United States, Canada, Soviet Russia, or the Argentine, in some areas doubling every 20 years.

More and more these peoples will be forced to turn to the sea for nutritious protein foods.

Will they find the oceans and the seas by then turned to biological deserts by man's profligacy or carelessness, or will they find these resources restored, increased, and abundant as a result of sound worldwide conservation policies?

The answers lie with the nations and their governments, and to a not insignificant degree with us sitting here today in the Senate. We have proposed and in part enacted a program which can save this resource for tomorrow's world.

The answer—the affirmative answer—will be found in a worldwide conference of all maritime, fishing nations mutually agreeing on limitation of catches to the scientifically determined reproduction rates of valuable species, and for that purpose specifying practices and gear and assigning quotas in productive areas as we have sought to do in the North Pacific Fisheries Convention and in the yellowfin conservation program.

To do this it is axiomatic that we must lead from a position of strength and not from that of weakness, the weakness that exists today with our obsolete and declining fishing fleet. That is why the enactment of the bill before us is so important.

But, someone may suggest, the year 2000 which is cited to indicate the full impact of the world population explosion on the world's terrestrial and marine food supply is far away. The projection given is long distant and, therefore, not urgent.

Not so—our fishing fleets are shrinking now. Many of our small and ancient fishing vessels are ready for the graveyard now. Our historic fishing ports are waning now with once-proud ships rotting at their docks. Our fishing industries are in distress now. Foreign armadas are infesting our traditional fishing grounds now, stripping their treasures from the sea. Long-prized fishing stocks are being depleted now. Population pressures are mounting now while our marine food resources dwindle.

Every 11 seconds in the United States there is an additional mouth to feed; every half hour another 165 citizens are added to our population. By noon today, the Census Bureau estimates, our population will have reached 190,102,175. By 1970 it will be 214 million; by 1975, 235

million; by 1980, approximately 260 million, 70 million more than today. Many of us, God willing, will then be still alive.

One reason for this population explosion is that Americans are living longer than previously in our history. Our longevity is increasing not only because of tremendous medical advances but also because there is a sufficiency of nutritious food. Americans always have insisted on nourishing, health-giving protein foods; and such foods spawn in our streams, swim at our doorsteps. More and more as population mounts we will seek from the sea these rich and delicious foods.

"Well," someone may say, "our population density of approximately 60 per square mile is still much lower than that of many European and Oriental nations. Isn't concern over our marine resources a bit premature?"

The very fact of heavy population densities in other countries intensifies their demands upon these resources, their pressures exemplified by their huge fishing fleets in our waters. To preserve these resources not only for ourselves, but for them also we must lead—and lead from strength—in the crusade for worldwide conservation and sound utilization of marine resources everywhere—and we must lead now.

We must do more than that. To feed our own people, to help feed the starving or undernourished children in foreign lands, to supply our Armed Forces here and overseas which last year consumed 9,024,000 pounds of American fisheries products, we must expand the scope of our fishing activities.

Japan has done this; Russia has done this; the Scandinavian countries, Belgium, the Netherlands, Portugal, South Africa, the United Kingdom and West Germany in the free world, Communist East Germany and Poland on the other side of the Iron Curtain all have done this; all are sending their big, modern, all-weather ships far from home to garner the treasures of the sea.

All, with the exception of South Africa, are fishing in North American waters on the other side of the ocean from where their vessels sail.

In contrast, our American fishing craft with few exceptions keep close to our own historic grounds; the industry remains dependent on coastal waters, venturing to sea for the most part only in favorable weather. Why?

Not because our sturdy fishermen are wanting in courage or enterprise. They are among the bravest of the brave. The reason is their small and aging boats which were not built for long voyages or heavy seas and which—if they did venture a considerable way from home, and if they did, by this venture, obtain a substantial catch—lack the storage and preservation facilities to return it in prime condition for the market.

Even in our home waters, our tiny fishing craft are being impeded, harassed, and driven from the seas by the fleets of massive, modern fishing armadas of foreign nations.

Fifteen thousand fewer U.S. fishing vessels are operating today than in 1950, and each year their number declines.

Thirty-two thousand fewer fishermen and 10,000 fewer shoreworkers are today employed than in 1950, driven from their jobs by foreign fishermen employed on superior foreign fishing vessels.

Our American fishing industry is simply being outnumbered and overpowered in our own adjacent waters.

It is fighting for survival and fighting, I may add, almost alone and with what I consider minuscule support from our Congress and our Government.

It is fighting for survival not only against the giant 200- and 300-vessel fleets of foreign nations monopolizing nearby waters, but against the foreign governments which subsidize their fleets, either heavily, as do our free-world competitors, or totally, as does Soviet Russia and her satellites.

The American fishing industry is at a tremendous disadvantage in this contest for the ocean riches along our shores. They suffer a disadvantage that if not corrected will doom the industry and mean the surrender, within a few brief years, of God-given resources at our very doors.

With command of these resources won through our default, foreign governments and industries would command the channels by which the fruits of the sea now reach merchant and the housewife, would command the price the housewife would have to pay for the Friday dinner.

The bill before the Senate today is a step toward removing the disadvantage under which our American fishing industry operates; a step toward correcting the gross inequities that confront it; a step toward rescuing the industry from its welter of despair; a step toward saving it and restoring it to new vigor so that again, as in the olden days, it may sail proudly in our own waters and face up to the competition of any nation.

The bill before the Senate provides for modest Government assistance—modest and limited assistance, may I say—to American fishermen for the construction of a necessarily small number of new and modern fishing vessels.

Someone, of course, might ask why the industry itself does not get busy and invest in new and modern ships. This has been done in a small, but very small way. It has not been done extensively, and cannot be done to a greater extent than formerly, for two reasons.

Mr. President, as I and other Senators have stated previously on this floor, the United States has dropped since 1958 from second to fifth place among the Nations in total fisheries catch: Japan, Peru, Soviet Russia, and Communist China all lead us, and Canada is close behind.

It may likewise be of interest that we now also are in fifth place in the total number of motorized fishing craft of all types, all of which are small.

Japan has 14 times as many motorized fishing vessels, Norway 3½ times as many, Canada and Soviet Russia more than twice as many. Russia in the past 5 years has more than doubled the number of her fishing vessels, and many of her new ships are the largest fishing craft the world has ever known.

This bill does not propose to attempt to match Soviet Russia, Japan, or Canada either in numbers or in dimensions of their fishing vessels. That is not necessary. We do not, like Russia and Japan need great fleets that can travel thousands of miles to the rich North American fishing grounds. What we do need are modern ships that can efficiently harvest the fish at our doorstep and by doing so preserve our right to preserve and save these resources from extinction.

S. 1006 will do that.

First, the fishery industries of the nations with whom we are competing can obtain newly constructed ships in those countries at from one-third to one-half the cost of American-built fishing vessels.

American fishermen cannot acquire ships from foreign yards. This is the law—and I consider it a wise law—enacted by Congress in the early years of the Republic. It has preserved our shipbuilding industry, so vital to victory in two World Wars, and while the law is a handicap to our fishing industry without it we would risk both the industry and the capacity and skills to construct ships.

When I speak of the low cost of building fishing vessels in foreign yards, I want it made clear that the fishing industries of most foreign nations only bear a portion of that cost, and in several countries none of the costs at all, while in some other countries the costs are financed by long-term, low-interest loans or other forms of subsidy.

Later in my remarks I intend to discuss at some length these foreign subsidies to their fishery industries. These subsidies place foreign governments as well as foreign ships and foreign fishermen in competition—cutthroat and ruthless competition in many cases—against our own crippled and hamstrung fishing industry.

Foreign governments are financing construction of giant stern trawlers, refrigerated vessels, floating canneries and mother ships not, with the exception of Canada, for taking fish in their home waters but for making greater catches in American waters, not only of pelagic species but of our anadromous fishes that spawn in our own fresh water streams.

Not only must the American fishery industry compete against massive, subsidized, foreign fishing fleets for the fish themselves; it must compete with them pricewise when the American landings are sold in the market—our market.

One does not have to be an economist to observe that foreign industry, using low-cost and subsidized ships and gear and paying subsistence wages to their crewmen, can land or dump their fishery products on our market at similar low cost.

Through efficient processing and marketing methods and by holding ex-vessel prices to a minimum—a hardship to the fishermen—shore branches of the industry have managed in the main to meet this foreign competition pricewise. Frequently this has been accomplished by industry's willingness to accept smaller returns on the American products than on equivalent foreign products.

Yet, as any housewife knows, many of the fishery products on our market shelves bear foreign labels, labels which

disguise the fact that the high-protein contents were taken from our own American waters.

Whatever the economies practiced by our domestic industry, our fishermen and fishing vessel operators who, in almost all instances are also working fishermen, have been left stranded on the shoals of indifference and neglect. No margin has been left them to acquire a more efficient ship or modernize their gear. No way remains by which the industry, at the very time when the resources on which its livelihood depends are being pillaged by ruthless, subsidized, and aggressive foreign competitors, can augment his capacity to produce and thereby increase his catch.

Each year as the American fisherman's ships and gear grow older his plight becomes more desperate. Within a very few years, unless some measure of relief is provided such as that projected in the bill before the Senate, the American fisherman and his ships will have vanished from the seas.

The demise of America's oldest and most historic industry would not be his loss alone; it would be the Nation's loss, and the loss to our Nation would be gain for Soviet Russia, for her Communist satellites, and for the other foreign nations fattening on the living treasure taken from American waters.

In more ways than one, Mr. President, it would also mean a significant and substantial military gain for those nations which may, after all, be as content to sink us as to bury us.

It cannot be imagined that Soviet fishing vessels prowling our coasts—east, south, west, and north—are not obtaining extensive military knowledge of these waters, their depths, currents, canyons, and channels, densities, sea mounts, and shoals; knowledge of our shores and inlets, knowledge that would facilitate navigation of enemy surface ships or submarines, the laying of mines or attack by missiles fired from underwater.

It is no secret that reserve officers of the Soviet Navy serve aboard Soviet fishing vessels as do also oceanographers and other scientists. Sophisticated scientific instruments also have been noted on certain of these vessels which are quite superfluous to the business of catching fish, and on some of these ships there has been no sign of any nets at all.

Soviet Russia may not yet know as much about the waters along our coasts as we do but they are learning fast—they have the facilities for learning fast—and most important they are here along our Atlantic coast, along our gulf coast, and along our Pacific coast which is longer than the others combined.

If they are not at any certain point along our coasts at this moment they have been there—from Newfoundland to the tip of Florida, from Florida to Mexico, from the Arctic Ocean to Lower California. They have been there with their innocent-appearing trawlers, large or small, singly or in fleets up to 300. They can and doubtless will again, cruise where they will along our coasts, and do so again and again.

But if we look across the Pacific and to the Siberian coast or to other Soviet or Communist coastal areas it is obvious that none of our own fishing vessels are there.

True, we have no desire to go there, and few fishing craft that would be capable of such a voyage, if that desire existed, would. Even if the desire existed we could not approach the Russian coast closer than 12 miles and the Russians have a very broad interpretation of their 12-mile limit.

The Japanese have had some very saddening experiences by venturing too near, or what the Russians considered to be too near, Red shores. Scores of Japanese fishing vessels have been seized and hundreds of Japanese fishermen tossed into Soviet prisons, many to remain there for months. One hundred seventeen Japanese fishermen were in Soviet custody the first of the month, many of them held there for over 2 years, but the Russians have promised now to release them.

Meanwhile, of course, both Russian and Japanese fishing ships have breached our own 3-mile limit of territorial waters with impunity, violations which should be halted by enactment of S. 1988 today.

May I apologize for this brief digression from my discussion of S. 1006, the bill presently before the Senate.

American fishermen neither need nor want modern fishing vessels to fish in Soviet waters or the waters of any other European nation. They want and need these ships to fish in waters traditionally and geographically American, although not necessarily U.S. waters or the territorial seas. They want and need these ships to fish in our home waters on a parity with the fleets of nations across the seas which are invading in depth and in strength our historic fishing grounds.

American fishermen want ships that would be capable also of serving as auxiliaries to our Navy in time of war, as they have done so eminently in every one of our past wars.

It is a matter of record, Mr. President, that in World War II, a total of 285 fishing vessels were acquired by our Navy to serve as patrol ships, minesweepers, degaussing vessels, diving tenders, covered lighters, net tenders, and for other purposes.

These were purchased or chartered from owners at fishing ports on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, the Gulf of Mexico, Hawaii, and Alaska. As a young naval officer, I once was flown hastily to Alaska to negotiate for a number of fishing vessels the Navy needed desperately for immediate service in the Aleutians where Japanese had occupied several strategic islands.

I doubt that more than a handful of our fishing craft today would be suitable for high seas use in another national emergency. The fleet in the main is still the fleet we had prior to World War II, which opened 22 years ago. Many go back to World War I, some to the Spanish-American War and one to the War Between the States.

I would assume that the six ships completed or under construction under the act of 1960 which we are now seeking to expand would be available on the east coast. On the west coast we have 10 purse seiners based at San Pedro which have been built since the World War II years, but the youngest was built 12 years ago, in 1951. At San Diego, we have 44 purse seiners constructed since World War II, most of them immediately following the war years, but only 11 launched in the past decade.

This is a pitiable record for the Nation that prides itself as the strongest and most prosperous in the world.

Mr. President, there are possibly a few more fishing craft that might be suitable for limited naval use in the event of a national emergency, but the total is far short of the 285 the industry made available for our defense in World War II.

Enactment of the bill before the Senate today will add potential strength to our national security while providing immediate peacetime safeguards to vital living resources in American waters.

S. 1006 provides a measure, a very modest measure it is true, of Federal assistance to our fishing industry for the construction of fishing vessels of advance design which will enable them to operate in expanded areas, or be equipped with newly developed gear, but which would not operate in a fishery if such operation would cause economic hardship to efficient operators of U.S. fishing vessels already operating in the area.

These would be all-weather ships such as the other major fishing nations have developed. They would be capable of preserving en route to market far larger catches than the small and inefficient craft we have today.

The Federal Government would bear up to 55 percent of the construction costs of these ships but the total assistance could not be more than $10 million in any one year and such assistance would terminate at the end of 5 years.

In other words, this is a 5-year, $95 million program to modernize and rehabilitate our fishing fleet, of which the Federal Government would bear $50 million of the cost, industry the remainder.

Later I will set out why I think the returns to the Federal Government and the Treasury from this investment will far outweigh the costs, but first I would like to summarize what some of our competitors are doing to expand and improve the efficiency of their fleets.

Soviet Russia's totalitarian government is investing $320 million a year in its fishing industry, or 32 times the assistance which it is proposed in the bill that the U.S. Government extend to the American fishing industry.

In Russia, of course, the industry is wholly a Government operation. The Government constructs the ships, designates the officers and crews, directs the operations, determines wages, and controls distribution of the catch. There are no privately owned production units in the Soviet fisheries.

Soviet Russia has the world's most modern and largest, tonnagewise, fishing fleet and it is being constantly expanded. Three percent of that nation's entire industrial investment budget has been allocated to this industry.

Soviet Russia is expanding its fleet of mammoth fishing vessels faster than Soviet yards can build them. For this reason Russia is and has been placing huge orders for ships in foreign yards.

Here are a few samples:

Russia has recently contracted with a Japanese yard for five 5,000-ton tuna factory ships to cost 6.3 billion yen or the equivalent of 17.5 million U.S. dollars. The first vessel was to be delivered within 13 months of the contract date, and the others at 3-month intervals.

Danish yards recently delivered to the Russians the second of four 2,600-ton, 300-foot, stern-ramp fish-freezer vessels with the remaining two still under construction.

These ships brought to 37 the number of fishing vessels constructed in this particular Danish yard for the Soviet Government, 25 of the 37 being large refrigerated vessels. I regret that I do not have the figures on the amounts paid by the Soviet Government for the sizable new fleet.

Ironically, at the same time Danish yards are building ships for Russia, the Danish Ministry of Fisheries has been plagued by cases of Soviet interference with Danish fishing operations in the eastern Baltic Sea where the Danes have long maintained a salmon fishery.

Danish salmon cutters have been apprehended by the Russians on the pretext that they were in Soviet territorial waters.

Yet in the Kattegat, the narrow straits between Denmark and Sweden, Soviet trawlers have been discarding worn out gear to foul the screws of Danish fishing craft. Denmark, a little nation, can do little more than protest.

Soviet trade officials recently placed an order in Sweden for 10 large refrigerated vessels to serve as mother ships for the Russian trawler fleets. The cost of these 10 ships, each of about 8,000 deadweight tons and with 450,000 cubic yards of refrigerated cargo space, will approximate $50 million.

West Germany 2 years ago completed a Soviet factory ship of 17,000 gross tons at a cost of $16 million which is now operating in the North Pacific, and another is scheduled for delivery.

As early as 1958 the British had completed a multi-million-dollar Soviet order for twenty 190-foot, 1,300-ton trawlers, far smaller than the Russians are now constructing. A Soviet world tender of $84 million for 16 vessels, 10 of which would be fish factory and processing ships, was reported in December by the London Times.

We do not have complete knowledge of how many large fishing vessels Soviet Russia has under construction in her own yards, but we do know of mother ships displacing 17,140 tons, floating canneries of 12,875 tons, and whale factory ships of up to 32,000 tons.

In a later speech I expect to give many more details concerning the Soviet fisheries expansion program.

Soviet Russia's objects, in my opinion, are not only to dominate the fisheries of the world to acquire the bulk of their rich food resources, but also to gain mastery of the oceans blanketing 72 percent of earth's surface.

The $10 million a year in assistance to our fishing industry which the bill before us would provide—and then only for the next 5 years—is indeed a small investment when compared with Communist Russia's annual $320 million outlay, a 100-percent subsidy for her fishing industry.

Small as our investment would be it will, I and a majority of our committee are convinced, save a sick and dying American industry.

Nor will this assistance be unusual. Every free world nation with a substantial fishing industry is providing substantial assistance to that industry through grants or loans or both.

Some of these nations are small, their revenues limited, but in most of them the financial assistance to the industry is greater than that proposed in this bill which we are now considering.

Great Britain 10 years ago became aware of the necessity of modernizing its white fish and herring fleets. This has been done through assistance provided by the British White Fish Authority and the Herring Industry Board.

Grants were and are being given to apply on the construction of new fishing vessels, the modernization of older vessels, the conversion of vessels to oil-firing or diesel propulsion, a program that is virtually completed, and to the procurement of new and more powerful engines.

From 1954 through March 1961—I am sorry that later figures are not available—the White Fish Authority had extended in assistance to the industry the equivalent of slightly under $112 million in loans and grants.

Of this the equivalent of $79 million had been in the form of loans and $32.9 million in grants. For fiscal 1961 loans totaled the U.S. equivalent of $16,520,000 and grants that of $7,140,000.

In addition to this, operational subsidies in the nature of allowances for each day the fleets were at sea were paid by the Government in both the white fish and herring industries.

Operational subsidies to the former in the last reported year were the equivalent of $5,880,000, and to the latter, $916,000.

That is not all. The British Government grants loans for acquisition of nets and gear by inshore fishermen, and subsidies under which it acquires surplus herring for reduction to industrial products.

Even the processing industry has been assisted by the British Government. From 1953 through 1959—later figures are not available—the Government extended 15 year loans to processors for financing 80 percent of the costs of new plants. The amount thus expended in this period totaled the equivalent of almost $4 million.

Japan makes loans for improvement, construction, or purchase of fishing vessels, and for nets made of synthetic fibers, waives any payment on the principal for the first 2 years. The loans are for a period of 10 years or less, and vary from 50 to 80 percent the cost of the project.

Canada, our neighbor to the north, and which has suffered with us the invasion by European and Asiatic fishing fleets of her historic fishing grounds, grants a capital subsidy of 50 percent of approved costs for the construction of steel fishing trawlers, and $250 per gross ton for the construction of Atlantic coast wooden vessels of 45 feet or over.

In addition to Federal construction subsidies the Dominion Government guarantees private loans for financing up to 60 to 70 percent the cost of acquiring new fishing vessels and equipment, modernization of existing vessels, and constructing shore installations. Loans approximating $150 million had been guaranteed in 1961.

Canadian fishermen also receive assistance from their Provincial governments.

Newfoundland grants bounties of $160 per gross ton for boats up to 150 registered gross tons, but the Lieutenant Governor also may approve grants for larger vessels. The Province also assists in providing bait service and other fishermen's needs.

New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec, and Prince Edward Island all have loan programs to support their fishing fleets or finance new construction.

Norway finances the construction and reconversion of fishing vessels up to 60 percent of their cost by long-term, very low interest loans, and pays an additional subsidy on cod landed.

Belgium makes loans up to 70 percent of construction costs and guarantees loans by Belgian credit institutions. Guarantees may not exceed 2½ billion Belgian francs and also maintains a 2 billion franc revolving fund to assist in enlargement of its fishing fleet.

Denmark makes loans to cover 85 percent of the cost of new fishing vessels at moderate interest rates and with long repayment periods. In one recent year the loans of this small country for construction of new ships totaled approximately $4 million. Additional assistance is granted fishermen in Greenland waters, and those fishing off the Faroe Islands.

Portugal, Spain, Sweden, South Africa, and Turkey are extending liberal subsidies to their fishing industries to build new and larger ships and to modernize those in existence. Spain and Portugal, in particular, are devoting substantial amounts from their limited budgets for this purpose.

Some of the countries I have mentioned, but not all, have been the beneficiaries of extensive American aid since World War II. To some fishing nations have gone millions and to several, billions either in direct aid or loans. I am not criticizing this assistance.

I have no doubt, however, that through these dollars we have helped a number of nations to rebuild and expand their fishing industries. And again I have no objection. Some of these foreign countries are dependent on the sea for almost all of their protein food supply. Perhaps their new and modern fishing fleets will help stir greater interest in our own long-suffering and decaying industry.

I think, Mr. President, that it is time we begin thinking more about our own, and about taking sound and constructive

steps to save our own and their vital industry.

One of these steps—to provide limited construction subsidies to modernize our fishing fleet—is being considered by us here on the Senate floor now. We can, and I believe will, pass it.

Passage will bring new encouragement and new hope to one of our most beleaguered and depressed industries.

It will benefit our Nation and help reduce our annual deficit in international payments, help stop the drain of American gold across the ocean, help restore employment and purchasing power here at home. To illustrate: Last year American processors paid out $381 million to American fishermen for their products. These dollars remained in the United States. They supported tens of thousands of American citizens and their families.

These citizens, through taxes paid out of their incomes, contributed to the support of American schools, American communities, States, and National Government.

At the same time American processors were paying out $381 million to American fishermen, they were impelled, to meet the public demand for fishery products, to pay out $474 million—nearly half a billion—for fish and fishery products imported from foreign countries.

These dollars did not stay in the United States. They contributed nothing to our schools, to local and State taxes, to our national defense. Instead they went abroad to support foreign fishermen, to help build new foreign fishing vessels, to increase the revenues of foreign countries, and to employ, not only foreign fishermen but foreign workers in foreign shipyards.

Ten million dollars, the amount of the subsidy proposed annually for 5 years for modernization of American fishing vessels, is less than 2.2 percent of the American dollars now going abroad for fishery products, many of which were caught in our own waters, and would have been caught by American fishermen had they but the ships and gear to harvest them.

I urge the passage of this bill.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator from Washington to yield for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent request which relates to votes on proposed amendments to the bill before the Senate, as well as to a vote on the question of passage of the bill.

I have discussed the proposed unanimous-consent agreement with the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I believe I have discussed it also with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

The idea would be to have 1 hour on any proposed amendment, the time to be equally divided between the proponent of the amendment and the Senator from Washington, and 2 hours on the bill, 1 hour to each side, for and against. Of course, time could be yielded from the time on the bill for any amendments which might require more time than one-half hour for each side.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I had hoped that the Senate would pass the bill tonight. That was also the hope of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and other Senators who have a deep interest in the bill. I know the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is interested in having it done.

Several Senators have left. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], who strongly supports the bill, had to leave. Senators understand why.

The Senator from Delaware and I and the Senator from Alaska have plenty of time. I was hoping that the bill might be discussed at length tonight, but I can appreciate the situation. If it is agreeable to the Senators from Massachusetts and the Senator from Alaska, I will agree to such a unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is certainly agreeable to me. The bill is of great importance. I congratulate the Senator from Washington for introducing it. I believe the proposed unanimous-consent agreement would permit ample time for discussion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How does the junior Senator from Massachusetts feel?

Mr. KENNEDY. I agree with the proposal which has been made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. I ask each Senator to be attentive, so that this time there will be no misunderstanding as to what the unanimous-consent agreement is, word by word, and its meaning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, October 2, 1963, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1006), to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]: *Provided*, That in the event the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand there is to be 2 hours debate on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One hour on each side.

Mr. MAGNUSON. One hour on each side. I would prefer to have only 15 minutes on each amendment. I do not believe any amendments will be offered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The time has been requested.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Senators can yield back time, in their generosity, if it is not needed. That is a noble precept. I would not wish to have it diminished in the request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I note that the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] is in the Chamber. He has had a deep interest in the bill. The Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE and Mr. PELL] are also interested and present, as are the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. The support for the bill is nearly unanimous geographically, because it also includes the Great Lakes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wanted to be sure we were included.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Great Lakes are included. There may be many requests for time, since Senators are interested in having the bill passed. I know they will wish to say something about it. I shall try to accommodate all Senators.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, since the distinguished Senator from Washington mentioned the Great Lakes, I hope he will not overlook the Gulf of Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there seems to be no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the order is entered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the acting majority leader of the Senate what the schedule will be after the pending business is concluded tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] indicated to me that

it was his intention, after the Senate completed action on S. 1006, to take up order No. 480, House Joint Resolution 247, which is known as the equal-time proposal. It is a joint resolution to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of the Communications Act.

If action is completed on that measure, which I think may be done tomorrow, the Senate may proceed to amendments to the Highway Act or to some of the resolutions relating to the organization and operation of the Congress. I am not sure of that, so I would not want to be held to it.

FISHING VESSEL CONSTRUCTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1006) to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska, who has a perfecting amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which is technical in nature. It need not be stated tonight, but may be stated tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Washington for his fine statement. He may have covered this statistic, but I did not hear it. Am I correct in saying that in 1946 the United States imported only 16.6 percent of its fishery supplies and produced 83.4 percent of the U.S. catch, and in 1962 the United States imported 47 percent of the catch and caught only 53 percent?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not only has the Senator cited a correct figure, but our own production is not increasing. We are a growing country and will still have to import many of our fishery products, and we expect to pay for them; but a growing country like this, with its great resources, ought to maintain its resources.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator from Washington is not attempting to cut off imports. He is attempting to aid American industry so it can compete with the new fast ships foreign countries are using to catch fish. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I recommend to Senators the reading of the report, which shows what other countries have done for their fisheries industry, because they realize its importance. The step represented by this bill is almost a minor step compared with what other countries have done.

Senators have seen pictures of the new modern ships. I had a film of Russian ships off the New England coast. The mother ship looks like the *Queen Mary*.

Even Senators whose States may not be involved in fisheries ought to realize that on every one of these new, modern ships, the Soviet Union and other countries have oceanographers. They are probing the oceans for scientific purposes, which is fine. We do not have any of that. We are far behind. This is one simple way to bring us up to date and to modernize our fishing fleet.

It is in the interest of all areas of the country. It is not merely a question of the so-called subsidy. We provided for 33 percent, but it did not work. This proposal is limited as to amount and time.

The Senator from Texas is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the Senator from Washington for his leadership, not only in the matter of American flag ships on the high seas, the merchant marine, and fisheries, but for his long and determined leadership in the subject of oceanography.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Washington has had much help from the Senators from Texas, Alaska, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maine, California, and other States, who have seen our fishing industry continue to go down because we have not paid attention to it.

Mr. President, if this had happened to any other industry, even to the extent of one-half of this magnitude, there would have been action almost immediately.

I do not accuse the present administration or the previous one, but it seems it is true of all of them. Even in international conferences on trade, the fisheries industry is some kind of orphan, for some unknown reason. There is today greater awareness in the State Department and the Commerce Department than there has ever been. That is because Congress has become more active on this subject. We have had a long, difficult time to get Congress to act. The Senator from Alaska and I have voted for many proposals, because we thought they were justified, to keep other industries alive and healthy. We hope other Members of Congress, whose States may not be along shorelines, will appreciate the magnitude of the problem of fisheries.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the Senator from Washington for pointing out that States that do not have a shoreline or are not on the Great Lakes also have an interest in this subject. Because the charts which are contained in the report cannot be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that since 1935, while the population of the United States has greatly increased our catch of commercial fisheries has gone down.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, reference has been made, in the colloquy between the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] to the report which accompanies S. 1006. I hope every Senator will find time to read the report. It is one of the best reports that has ever been printed to accompany a bill. I do not think anyone can read it without becoming convinced of the necessity for affirmative action on the bill.

Before the session closes tonight, I want to say with reference to the bill passed a while ago, S. 1988, that the junior Senators from Rhode Island and Massachusetts [Mr. PELL and Mr. KENNEDY], who are now in the Chamber, gave most effective support and help, as they did with reference to the bill now under consideration. They come from coastal States intensely interested in this problem. They testified before the Commerce Committee on this issue, which, as the chairman of the committee has said, is of paramount importance. Their work has been constructive and helpful in every way. I desire to congratulate them for their efforts in the field of building up our fisheries, which, as has been said here, particularly today, and will be said on tomorrow and on succeeding days, must be revived for the benefit of the whole Nation.

On a personal basis, I also wish to call attention to the effective and fine work done on S. 1988 by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wish to say to the Senator from Washington and Senator from Alaska that those of us who have entered this body recently have found the most inspirational leadership under the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Washington in the whole matter of fishery problems and the fishing industry.

As has been pointed out by the Senator from Alaska, I come from a fishing State. However, I believe that the service which has been performed by the Senator from Alaska and by the Senator from Washington has been a distinct national service, a service for the whole country. Those of us who have had the great privilege of living by the sea are keenly aware of the problems that the fishing industry has had to face for many years, and I believe the Nation is coming to have a greater appreciation of these problems.

Certainly the Senate has once more acted responsively and responsibly on the major piece of legislation it has passed today, dealing with adequate enforcement procedures for territorial waters and also for the protection of our own claims on the Continental Shelf, as interpreted through international law, and as they will be in the future interpreted under international law and as a result of appropriate domestic actions.

The vote today represented one more significant service by the Senators from Washington and Alaska. Both the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Washington, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, have performed a great service on this and other measures in behalf of seafaring States that will be considered in this session of Congress.

The State of Massachusetts, and also the States which those Senators represent, must recognize with no little satisfaction the great contribution that they have made. The Senator from Washington has pointed out that the Senate has responded to the will of the people, and that this has been done through the diligence and hard work that have been performed by the committees on which these Senators serve.

I wish particularly to express our gratitude to the Senator from Alaska and to the Senator from Washington for their devoted interest and great contribution to this industry, which has contributed so immeasurably to the welfare not only of the people who participate in the industry, and to the welfare of the many millions of people who depend on the products of the sea, but also to the welfare of the people of my State who may not be involved in the industry but who nonetheless appreciate the extraordinary efforts that have been made in their behalf.

I wish to underscore the very fine sentiments that have been expressed respecting the leadership in connection with these important pieces of legislation.

Mr. PELL. I thank my friend the Senator from Alaska for his kind words and congratulate him on the fine job he has done in guiding this bill through the Senate.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, one of the gravest problems facing our fishing industry is the obsolescence of our fishing fleet when compared with those of the other major fishing nations of the world. This situation is unfortunately becoming intensified each year.

Under Federal law a vessel built in a foreign shipyard cannot be documented for fishing in the United States. As steel vessels can be built abroad for about half of the cost in this country, our fishermen have to pay twice as much for a vessel as their foreign competitors. This places them at an obvious disadvantage and, in most cases, has made it uneconomical for them to build the new modern vessels needed for present day fishing. On the Pacific Coast, our fleet contains many vessels 35 to 40 years old, with few new vessels. Many of our fishing vessels designed for fishing in Puget Sound are being forced to fish as much as 300 miles offshore. In addition to being uneconomical they are unsafe. The high cost of construction has prevented their replacement with new, larger, modern vessels.

Public Law 86-516 was passed to assist the fishing industry to pay the increased costs caused by our vessel documentation requirements. It was passed for a 3-year period which has now expired. S. 1006 is vitally necessary to extend and expand this act so that our fishing industry may regain a competitive position with other nations.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I would like to urge passage of S. 1006, a bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of certain inequities in the construction of fishing vessels. I think that this is a very fair bill and seeks to right an injustice long endured by our domestic fishing industry.

I have received several telegrams from the State of Hawaii strongly urging Senate passage of S. 1006 in order to help stop further deterioration of an important part of our economy. Hawaii's multimillion-dollar fishing industry has suffered from foreign competition, along with other States. Foreign fishing vessels, mostly subsidized by their governments, have provided what amounts to unfair competition to ships of the United States.

In view of a clearly apparent trend among the world fishing vessels to larger and longer range ships, much more expensive to construct and operate, I feel that S. 1006 is imperative in order to help our domestic vessels compete on a fairer basis. This bill would make it possible for the United States to participate in the construction of a fishing fleet that will not fear competition from the best and largest government-subsidized fleets from other countries.

Up to the present, the U.S. fishing industry has been handicapped by the provisions of the act of June 12, 1960, which authorized a subsidy payment for construction of fishing vessels not to exceed one-third of the total cost. This bill would permit that subsidy to be increased to 55 percent with funds to be expended from a $10 million appropriation. Furthermore, the 1960 act has expired, for all practical purposes, as of June 12, 1963. S. 1006 would extend the date of effectiveness to June 30, 1968.

The necessity to favorably consider S. 1006 is sharply emphasized when we study subsidy grants made by foreign countries to their own fishing industries. In Canada, a subsidy of 50 percent of all approved costs is paid by the Government toward construction costs of long-range steel fishing trawlers. In Norway, fishing vessels are financed by their Government up to 60 percent by long-term, low-interest Government loans. Similar favorable government aid is accorded the industry in France, the United Kingdom, and Germany. The Soviet Union's magnificent trawling fleet is, of course, wholly subsidized. Japanese fishing vessels of modern design and construction have been blessed by lower construction costs, often running 50 percent less than comparable construction costs in the United States for steel vessels. I also understand that wooden vessels can be constructed at costs more than one-third less as compared to our construction costs.

What does this all add up to?

This has meant that the U.S. fishing fleet is probably the most outmoded of the larger fleets of the world. We have fishing boats built in 1865 and 1872 still operating. The California purse seine fleet which catches tuna is a good example of our outmoded fleet. Of 37 vessels out of San Pedro, none have been built since 1951. About 27 of them were built during World War II years. For boats out of San Diego, 56 out of 67 were built during the years 1927 to 1952. Only 11 have been built during the last 10 years. The story can be repeated for other fishing fleets. Eighty percent of the Chesapeake sail dredge vessels were built before World War I. The average menhaden seiner in the Chesapeake Bay region was built in 1915.

This outmoded U.S. fishing fleet has suffered in international competition. In 1956, only the Japanese outranked the United States as a fishing country. However, figures in 1961 indicate that we have sadly deteriorated since then. We follow Japan, Peru, Red China, and the Soviet Union. Each of the first three countries almost doubles our percentage of the world catch of fish, running 16.3 percent, 12.7 percent, and 12.2 percent, respectively, to our 7.1 percent.

Mr. President, unless we are completely satisfied to have our outmoded and outclassed fishing vessels of a bygone era compete with swift, modern, long-range foreign trawlers heavily subsidized by their governments, unless we are unconcerned to see our fishermen and the fishing industry having to cope with insurmountable handicaps imposed by the superior speed, range, and efficiency capabilities of these foreign ships, then I think it is crucially necessary to support passage of S. 1006.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am willing to yield the floor. Before I do so, I wish to reiterate—and I know I speak for the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] as well as myself—that we are gratified and pleased by the fine support given to us by our friends, the Senators from Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Hawaii.

RIGHT OF FORMER PRESIDENTS TO SPEAK ON FLOOR OF THE SENATE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am very glad that my resolution calling for the right of former Presidents to speak on the floor of the Senate has been approved by the Senate.

Similar legislation has been introduced 19 times in 19 years, but, for one reason or another, the idea has always foundered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a compendium prepared by the Library of Congress of the previous measures which have been introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives that are similar to Senate Resolution 78 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BILLS MAKING FORMER PRESIDENTS SENATORS AT LARGE—78TH TO 87TH CONGRESSES

THE 78TH CONGRESS

H.R. 5055, Mr. Canfield, June 19, 1944 (Judiciary): Ex-Presidents of the United States shall be eligible to hold office as Senators at Large except when holding offices which make them ineligible to serve in either House of Congress. Such Senators at Large shall have the same privileges, salary, etc., as Territorial Delegates in the House of Representatives, and the allowance for clerical assistants given Senators who are not chairmen of a standing committee and are from the most populous State.

THE 79TH CONGRESS

House Joint Resolution 231, Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts,[1] July 18, 1945 (Judiciary), constitutional amendment: Ex-presidents of the United States shall be made Senators from the United States at large, unless removed from the Presidency by impeachment. Ratification must be within 7 years after submission to the States.

THE 80TH CONGRESS

S. 1625, Mr. Brewster, July 14, 1947 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large for ex-Presidents of the United States.

H.R. 504, Mr. Canfield, January 6, 1947 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for ex-Presidents of the United States.

H.R. 4215, Mr. KUNKEL,[1] July 15, 1947 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large for ex-Presidents of the United States.

THE 81ST CONGRESS

S. 209, Mr. Brewster, January 5, 1949 (Rules and Administration): Creates the office of Senator at Large for ex-Presidents of the United States.

H.R. 154, Mr. Canfield, January 3, 1949 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for ex-Presidents of the United States.

THE 82D CONGRESS

S. 2757, Mr. Brewster, February 27, 1952 (Rules and Administration): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for ex-Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall not be entitled to vote.

S. 2956, Mr. HUMPHREY,[1] March 31, 1952 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for ex-Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall not be entitled to vote.

H.R. 6503, Mr. Roosevelt, February 7, 1952 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for former Presidents and former Vice Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall have the right to debate but not to vote.

H.R. 7362, Mr. CANNON,[1] April 2, 1962 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for ex-Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall not be entitled to vote.

H.R. 7396, Mr. CELLER,[1] April 4, 1952 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for ex-Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall not be entitled to vote.

THE 83D CONGRESS

H.R. 182, Mr. Roosevelt, January 3, 1953 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for former Presidents and former Vice Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall have the right to debate but not to vote.

THE 84TH CONGRESS

S. 1010, Mr. Kilgore, February 8, 1955 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for former Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall have the rights of a Senator except the right to vote.

Senate Joint Resolution 125, Mr. MAGNUSON,[1] January 25 1956 (Judiciary) constitutional amendment: Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for former Presidents of the United States who have served 2 years or longer and who have not been impeached. Such Senator at Large shall have all of the rights and privileges of a Senator except the right to vote.

H.R. 3886, Mr. CHELF,[1] February 10, 1955 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for former Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall be entitled to all the rights and privileges accorded to Members of the Senate except the right to vote.

THE 86TH CONGRESS

House Joint Resolution 613, Mr. CHELF,[1] February 16, 1960 (Judiciary), constitutional amendment: Proposes an amendment to the Constitution so as to make former Presidents of the United States Members of the Senate.

THE 87TH CONGRESS

House Joint Resolution 96, Mr. CHELF,[1] January 4, 1961 (Judiciary), constitutional amendment: Proposes an amendment to the Constitution so as to make former Presidents of the United States Members of the Senate.

House Joint Resolution 360, Mr. MONAGAN,[1] April 10, 1961 (Judiciary), constitutional amendment: Proposes an amendment to the Constitution so as to make former Presidents of the United States Members of the Senate.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it will be noted that many distinguished Members of both the House of Representatives and the Senate have sought to advance the concept of having ex-Presidents be given the privilege of addressing a House of the Congress. In fact Senator HUMPHREY in 1952 and Senator MAGNUSON in 1956 both introduced legislation providing for the concept of ex-Presidents being Senators-at-large. I thank Senators MAGNUSON and HUMPHREY for all their past labors in this regard as well as Senator COOPER, all three of whom cosponsored and helped secure the adoption of Senate Resolution 78 which unanimously passed this body today.

Furthermore, I wish to thank my old friend, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., who, when he was a Representative, submitted similar resolutions in two different Congresses and who helped stimulate my thinking in this regard.

It is obvious that the idea of introducing this type of legislation was not original with me and that many fine and able Members of Congress in both Chambers have given much thought to this type of resolution over the years.

Now that the Senate has approved this resolution, I believe that the luster of our body will be even further increased by the occasional presence of former Presidents. To be specific, I think it would have been very helpful indeed if former Presidents Hoover, Truman, and Eisenhower had given their views to the Senate relative to the test ban treaty right here on the Senate floor.

In a more personal vein, I know what a great advantage it would be to me or to any newer Senator to have the advice and know the views of former Presidents when, as sometimes happens, we find that the views of our President are in direct variance with the views of the committee chairman of the same party. Here, I am thinking specifically of the controversy of the RS–70.

Finally, the adoption of the resolution is a step in the direction of bridging the present schism between our legislative and executive branches. It could mean that we in the Congress will be more aware of the problems facing the Executive and thus avoid positions of deadlock.

Therefore, it gives me great pleasure to know that the Committee on Rules and Administration reported my resolution, as amended, to this body and it has secured its adoption today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MOSCOSO RECEIVES ANNUAL PEACE AWARD OF CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the past weekend, the Catholic Association for International Peace convened in Washington for its annual meeting. The theme of this year's conference was "The Christian Challenge in Latin America." It was most appropriate therefore that the association chose to honor with its Annual Peace Award the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso. I join President Kennedy and Secretary Rusk in congratulating Mr. Moscoso. I congratulate the association for its wisdom in honoring the man who guides U.S. participation in the Alliance for Progress. No American has done more—and been rewarded less—during the past 2 years, to bring peace and progress to Latin America, the area which President Kennedy again described this past weekend in his message to the Catholic Association for International Peace Convention as "the most critical area in the world." I am only sorry that I could not be present at the award luncheon at which Mr. Moscoso received the Annual Peace Award.

I am also pleased that the Catholic Association for International Peace honored me with an invitation to present my own views on "Latin America: The Challenge to Peace." I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks and an article entitled "Red Halt Called in America," published in the Washington Post of recent date, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LATIN AMERICA: THE CHALLENGE TO PEACE

(Address of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY prepared for delivery at the annual convention of the Catholic Association for International Peace, Friday, September 27, 1963, at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C.)

The "challenge to peace" in the world today is stated succinctly in a brief passage from Pope John XXIII's encyclical Mater et Magistra: "Given the growing interdependence among the peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic and social inequality among them persists."

The "challenge to peace" in Latin America today lies in the shocking economic and social inequality between privileged and impoverished, between glittering capitals and festering slums, between booming industrial regions and primitive rural areas. The challenge to peace in Latin America is the revolutionary challenge of an unjust social order, a social order in which true peace—peace based on justice—is impossible.

It is this peace based on a just social order that is the aim of the Alliance for Progress. This aim, as defined in the Declaration of the Peoples of America which precedes the Charter of Punta del Este, is to "unite in a common effort to bring our people accelerated economic progress and broader social justice

[1] Indicates present membership in Congress.

within the framework of personal dignity and political liberty." The first and foremost challenge to peace in Latin America is the accomplishment of this purpose.

In this nuclear age there is no area of the world whose peace is immune to the challenge of nuclear weapons. The external challenge to peace in Latin America today lies in a spread of the nuclear rivalry of the super powers to Central and South America. It lies in a repetition of the arms race that now plagues the Middle East, it lies in a nuclear rivalry which if extended to Latin America could only lead to the squandering of resources needed to overcome the internal threat to peace, the threat of violent social revolution. In examining the challenge to peace in Latin America today, we must consider both the internal threat of violent social revolution and the external threat of nuclear rivalry. It is to the first of these that I will now turn my attention.

I will not elaborate here on the conditions and circumstances which stimulated President Kennedy's call for a new Alliance for Progress in this hemisphere and which inspired 20 American republics to subscribe to the Alliance program in the Charter of Punta del Este. These conditions are known to all of you.

They have been discussed earlier in this forum on "The Christian Challenge in Latin America"; by Monsignor Gremillion in his paper on "The Challenge of International Justice," and by Professor Tannenbaum in his discussion of "The Challenge of Social Revolution."

It would be appropriate, I hope, to offer a brief appraisal of the Alliance for Progress as it looks to a U.S. Senator after 2 years of operation.

On the second anniversary of the Alliance, which we celebrated last month, we heard repeated cries of desperation, doom, and despair about the fate of the Alliance. I do not share this judgment of pessimism and gloom.

My own conclusion today remains approximately the same as stated in the opening sentence of my "Report on the Alliance for Progress" issued in March of this year: "In terms of where it was a year ago, the Alianza para el Progreso has taken a giant leap forward. In terms of where it has yet to go, it has taken only a short faltering step." I would only add that in a number of important countries, the pattern of progress has become less "faltering" in the past 6 months. I would like to elaborate on this conclusion in terms of (1) what we have learned in the past 2 years; (2) what we have accomplished; and (3) what remains to be done.

Much of the premature pessimism about the Alliance results from an underestimation of the magnitude of the task and from false expectations about what could be achieved in a brief period of time. Today we are well aware that nostalgic recollection of the dramatic success of the Marshall plan in restoring economic and social vitality to the war ravaged, but highly advanced modern societies of Western Europe should not delude us. We are aware that this European experience does little to illuminate the path to speedy economic and social development in underdeveloped areas in Latin America. The reform and modification of social and economic traditions that have persisted for 2 centuries are not going to be accomplished in 2 years—and probably not in a decade. It should be understood by now that the Alliance for Progress has just begun. It is premature to pronounce any definitive judgments on its success or failure.

It took most of the first 2 years to assemble the organization and find the qualified personnel to run the Alliance programs both in the United States and in Latin America. If all of the problems of organization and personnel have not yet been solved, sufficient progress has been made to permit Alliance programs to be launched in all of the 19 Latin American countries.

Among the more difficult lessons to be learned during the first 2 years, none proved more resistant than the fundamental truth outlined in the Alliance charter—that the Alliance is not just another U.S. aid program. Rather it is a cooperative endeavor by 19 Latin American countries and the United States to enjoy more fully the cultural, spiritual, and material riches available in the 20th century and to make these accessible to the whole population rather than to a select few. Following from this there is today a wider—if still imperfect—understanding of the fact that the actions of Latin American countries themselves in achieving the goals of the Alliance are far more important than those of the United States. In quantitative terms, it agreed that 80 percent of the material resources for Alliance programs must come from the Latin American countries themselves. But far more important, the leadership necessary to mobilize both the quantitative and qualitative resources of the societies must come from within. A key role will invariably be played by the political leaders of the countries who are currently in power. The political decisions taken or not taken will in great part determine the progress or failure of the Alliance in a given country. The ability of the U.S. Government to influence these political decisions is always limited, sometimes nonexistent. Political leadership is the most important ingredient in determining whether Alliance programs will progress in a given country. If we are today buoyant with hope about the prospects for Peru and Argentina, it is because of the promise engendered by the election of a new set of political leaders who are determined to convert the disillusions of the past into valid programs for the future.

If we are despondent this weekend about the Caribbean area, it is because we have witnessed once more the vulnerability of a government which could not rely on a strong, well-developed, democratic institutional structure. We need strong democratic institutions to support strong leaders. The assault on a recently elected constitutional government of the Dominican Republic by those who have not experienced a tradition of free democratic government is a cruel blow to political freedom in this hemisphere, and to the Alliance for Progress.

If a government can inspire confidence and hope among its people, it can advance toward the Alliance goals—regardless of where it starts. Disillusionment in this hemisphere has not been greatest in the least advanced countries—but in the most politically unstable countries—which in some cases means some of the most advanced economically.

We are likely to experience disappointment and disillusionment again in certain Latin American countries over the course of the next decade. In most cases these will be caused by a failure of political leadership, and a failure to build political institutions which are capable of sustaining and implementing the basic structural modifications in their societies called for under the Alliance for Progress.

I hope that the experience of the past 2 years has also shown that political democracy is an indispensable basis for the success of the Alliance for Progress. Although we have witnessed in several cases interference with constitutional governments and the suspension of political democracy, I hope that these represent only temporary aberrations, not a permanent trend. The restoration of free constitutional government in Peru and Argentina would seem to support this hope. The recent events in the Dominican Republic make me less confident. Although we cannot assume that juntas will vanish from the hemisphere, it remains my belief that the support in this country and in Latin America which the Alliance for Progress program requires for its success cannot be sustained if political democracy is readily sacrificed before some short-range expediency. Indulgence in short-range expediency is frequently the road to long-term disaster.

As the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress has stated, the Alliance includes not only a social revolution against the scourge of hunger, disease, and illiteracy, but a political revolution whose "single most important force" is "the quest for first-class citizenship." "Free countries," Mr. Moscoso concludes, "do not develop on bread alone." Political democracy and free constitutional government must remain an indispensable goal of the Alliance for Progress. The Alliance for Progress needs more than money. It needs the will to succeed, a dedication to social and economic change, and a faith in free, constitutional government.

It is of utmost importance for the Alliance in the years ahead that we have in the past 2 years managed to discard many of the old cliches which have governed our thinking about Latin America in the past. We now know, first of all, that Latin America is not a homogeneous unit, but a continent of widely diversified peoples, sharply varied economies, and both highly advanced and grossly underdeveloped regions.

Each country has its own history, background, and culture and each must be treated individually. Each republic or area has its own problems, as well as acknowledged assets, and each country must be looked upon as a separate and distinct entity. Our use of the term "Latin America" in reference to this geographic area should not conceal this fact of diversity.

Another cliche, now exposed in all its hollowness, is that which portrays the Latin American countries as being divided between avaricious oligarchs and primitive masses, the former united in a concerted plot to oppress the latter. This explanation will no longer do. There remain oligarchs and there remain oppressed masses—far too many of both. But such a dichotomy ignores the growth of a substantial middle class in most of the larger Latin American countries. It ignores the growing number of enlightened progressive leaders springing from the aristocracy, the military and the church. It ignores the growth of well-organized unionized workers in most metropolitan centers of the hemisphere. It ignores the growing awareness in the hemisphere of the truth of President Betancourt's statement that "If we cannot help the many who are poor, we cannot save the few who are rich." Although the middle-class citizen, enlightened aristocrat, and the unionized laborer may be far too few in number, it is from these groups, that the leadership for the Alliance for Progress program must come. It is time for the old cliches to be dropped and these new realities faced.

In summary, the experience of the past 2 years has taught us that the Alliance is a long-term program, that the Latin American continent includes a diverse and rapidly changing group of societies whose social, political, and economic systems cannot be explained in terms of the cliches of the past.

I would now like to shift from what we have learned to what has been accomplished. Despite the brevity of the period, there are concrete accomplishments one can point to after 2 years. President Kennedy has given us an excellent brief summary of these: "Some 140,000 new housing units have been constructed, slum-clearing projects have begun, there are 8,200 new school classrooms, more than 700 new water systems have been built. Land reform and tax reform measures have been adopted by many countries, more than 160,000 agricultural credit loans

have been made and more than 4 million schoolbooks have been distributed.

"Our Common Market agreements are gaining new impetus, a revolutionary step has been taken to stabilize the price of coffee in world markets.

"More than 9 million children are being fed in 18 countries in a food for peace school-lunch program. Road construction, especially in some agricultural areas, is proceeding rapidly."

This summary touches only very sketchily on the concrete accomplishments—many of which you have already discussed in greater detail at this conference.

For the long-range future of the Alliance, one of the major accomplishments of the past 2 years has been the beginning of a change in attitude within the traditional elite groups toward the problems of social and economic reform. A few years ago it could be said that the indifference and fatalism of the ruling groups of Latin America was well expressed in the remark of the late 19th century Chilean President Barros Locco: "There are only two kinds of problems facing society: Those which get solved by themselves—and those which defy solution." This attitude is no longer characteristic of all the ruling groups. There are individuals from the traditionally privileged groups—the military, the landowners, the businessmen, the universities and the church—who are beginning to take the lead in championing the economic and social reconstruction of their societies prescribed by the Alliance Charter. If they remain exceptions to the rule, if they are far too few in number, if they are a half century late in asserting their leadership—it is nevertheless a fact today that an increasing number are joining the representatives of the rising middle class to provide the leadership that will be necessary to insure the success of the Alliance. What is still doubtful is whether they will move fast enough and with the desperate sense of urgency that the situation calls for.

One of the most hopeful signs in Latin America in recent years is the renaissance of the Catholic church and a new awakening on the part of the church leaders to the shocking social and economic problems of the continent. Since the meeting of the Latin American hierarchy at the Eucharistic Congress in Brazil in 1955, church leaders have begun to focus sharp attention on the social injustice perpetuated by the traditional indifference of the privileged classes to social and economic problems.

Today in Chile, Panama, Venezuela, northern Brazil, Argentina, and Colombia, members of the hierarchy are pushing actively the reforms stipulated under the Alliance charter. Whereas formerly the active espousal of progressive social and economic policies was largely confined to religious orders like the Maryknoll priests or to isolated pastors, today they are supported by occupants of metropolitan sees.

The farsighted social and economic philosophy of Pope John's recent social encyclicals "Mater et Magistra" and "Pacem in Terris" is being strongly pushed by the Vatican. Men who once would have been promoted to mountain parishes for their advanced views are now being appointed bishops and cardinals.

Probably the best-known among those bishops and cardinals who are now providing progressive leadership is the Archbishop of Santiago, Chile, Raul Cardinal Silva Enriquez. Cardinal Silva's advanced social views are well expressed in the now well-known pastoral letter issued in November of 1962 by the Chilean bishops on "Social Reform and the Common Good."

The pastoral letter scathingly criticized existing social and economic abuses, deplored the inequality in distribution of incomes, and called on the Government to extend and speed up its reforms and its social welfare program. Offering its own example, the church in Chile is now redistributing most of its own lands to local peasants. At a luncheon which I gave in honor of Cardinal Silva during his visit to Washington in July of this year, he outlined to members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the pilot project which he is now sponsoring in the field of agrarian reform, a project utilizing the full resources of modern technology, scientific agricultural planning, and modern credit facilities. Such a model project is designed to demonstrate that agrarian reform is not merely a rhetorical slogan, but an achievable reality.

As many of you may know, Chile has become a veritable laboratory for experimentation and for developing new institutions to cope with new social problems created by modernization. Groups affiliated with the church are well represented. Today in Chile one finds specialized institutions exclusively devoted to training student and intellectual leaders; one finds some devoted to training labor leaders; some to preparing project applications and feasibility studies for submission to international lending agencies; some to training cooperative leaders; others to preparing special programs for the hundreds of thousands of slum dwellers that ring Santiago and Lima, Rio de Janeiro and Caracas; still others to educating businessmen, managers, and financiers on the role they must play in achieving social and economic justice in their societies.

The last mentioned of these, the Chilean division of the International Federation of Christian Employers (commonly referred to by its initials UNIAPAC) is part of a joint effort by socially enlightened businessmen, financiers, and managers in Europe and in Latin America to effect a basic modification of the social and economic order in the light of Christian social doctrine. To accelerate this movement, which is already well established in several Latin American countries, UNIAPAC is sponsoring a Latin American Forum in Economic Development in Sao Paulo, Brazil, in November of this year. I am much encouraged by this movement and have actively engaged in arranging for a strong delegation from the United States to participate in this conference.

If I dwelt at some length on Chile, it is because it is here that great progress has been realized in institution building—in the establishment of indigenous specialized institutions which will in time be able to stand on their own, well prepared to deal with the complex and highly specialized social and economic problems confronting a modern society. Outside help is needed in the beginning—and in many cases this external assistance should properly come from nongovernmental sources. I am told by Latin American friends that much of the remarkable success enjoyed by these recently established Chilean institutions can be credited to the unified, systematic program of regular financial support provided by the German Bishops Fund, which now raises $8 million per year for Latin America through an annual collection. I am confident that the increasing interest of the United States in Latin America, combined with the proven record of generosity on the part of the American Catholic community, will result in other appropriate systematic programs of support for establishing similar institutions in other parts of Latin America, programs of support that might perhaps be discussed by members of the Catholic Association for International Peace convened to discuss "The Christian Challenge in Latin America."

In the 2 years since the Alliance was launched there have therefore been significant accomplishments—even if these accomplishments rarely make a dent in solving the staggering problems of the hemisphere. We have begun to appreciate the cooperative nature of the Alliance. We have a better appreciation of the importance of political leadership and viable political institutions in achieving the aims of the Alliance. We have witnessed at least a beginning of interest among the traditional ruling classes in the aims of the Alliance for Progress.

I would like to turn now to assess briefly some problems confronting the Alliance which must receive our immediate attention.

First of all we must translate our new understanding of the cooperative nature of the Alliance into the formal machinery which administers Alliance programs. The spurning by certain nations 2 years ago of a U.S. suggestion to establish a multilateral system for making Alliance decisions contributed heavily toward the development of the present bilateral system under which the principal decisions are made by the U.S. Government. Former Colombian President Alberto Lleras Camargo's conclusion that this represents "the Alliance's greatest error in procedure" would appear to be valid. Writing in the current issue of Foreign Affairs, he states "Inter-American organs were set up to study and prepare plans for national development, but it was left entirely to the U.S. initiative not only to find the way in which its contribution should be made available, but also to arrive at some standard of judgment as to how and when and to whom support should be apportioned for carrying out Alliance plans. The result was to create a pattern of bilateral operation which, on the one hand, set the tone of the discussions between the United States and each separate Latin American nation for each particular case; on the other hand it caused an unending series of misunderstandings, resentments, conflicts, and—though quite exceptionally—opportunities for scoring in the political game."

President Lleras, joined by former Brazilian President Kubitschek, has proposed that the multilateral character of the Alliance (which he refers to as the "original character") be accomplished by establishing an inter-American body to administer the Alliance. The newly formed Inter-American Development Committee may be the body which could appropriately be entrusted with the responsibility of scrutinizing the extent to which each country, including the United States, fulfills the commitments it assumed at Punte del Este. Although I am in no way qualified to pass judgment on the particular procedure to be adopted, I accept the basic premise of increasing the role of the Latin nations in making the basic decisions which will govern the operation of the Alliance in the hemisphere as a whole. Our experience with the participation of European governments in the administering of the Marshall plan suggests that we should not fear this change away from a strictly bilateral approach and toward a multilateral system in administering the Alliance.

A second item which must receive the highest priority is a more rapid implementation of the new extensive Alliance programs in the rural areas of the Continent. I have long believed that the explosive political and social situation in many countries is due to continued neglect of the rural areas, where even today over half the population lives.

In my view Alliance officials were far too slow in recognizing this imbalance between urban and rural areas. Today much is being done to develop these areas and integrate the long neglected masses into the political and social life of the country.

Progress is being made in extending credit for agriculture and half of the countries of the Continent have received sizable Alliance loans for agricultural credit. Cooperatives are being formed in some areas. Programs are underway to open up new areas by building penetration roads. Land distribution under agrarian reform programs is

proceeding in Venezuela, Colombia, and Chile.

The importance of rural development can hardly be overstated. Over half of the countries of Latin America continue to spend sizable amounts of precious foreign exchange reserves to import food to feed their populations. This occurs in countries that are primarily agricultural. For the common man in half of Latin America, the key to a higher standard of living in the near future is still an increase in agricultural productivity. In this field the United States has a record of proven performance. We abound in technical expertise in the field of agriculture and the key to success appears to be our ability to secure the widespread adoption of known and proven techniques.

Another reason for increasing our emphasis on agrarian reform and rural development has been stated by President Lleras Camargo: the imbalanced growth of population in Latin America places an increasingly heavy burden on cities. "For there is no sort of economic expansion, however swift or successful, that can assimilate both the rural masses who cease to live by agriculture and the new surplus hands, whether in the town or in the country, who come year by year to glut the labor market." To the extent that rural modernization slows down the exodus to the city, it alleviates the problem engendered by rapid population growth.

The economic development of the rural sector is intimately linked to the progress of the industrial sector, for industrialization can flourish only if it has available progressively widening markets. The purchasing power of a modernized rural sector is of great potential stimulus here.

I am not disturbed by the criticisms that the Alliance is now focusing too much attention on rural areas and too little on Latin America's troubled cities. I would sustain this new emphasis on rural development and in many countries increase it. I am not suggesting that we attempt to reverse the long-range secular trend toward urbanization which is characteristic of our modern technological world. Nor am I suggesting that we attempt to discourage industrialization and encourage concentration on production of raw materials through a predominantly agricultural economy.

Indeed, today we are witnessing one of the ironies of Marxist determinism. Today we see the Soviet Union, which has for decades assailed the United States for preventing industrialization and keeping Latin American economies confined to producing raw materials, imposing upon Cuba a modern day mercantile system in which Cuba is the raw-material-producing colony for Russia, and the captive market for the Soviet Union's manufactured goods.

I insist that the Alliance programs must give special consideration to rural and agricultural development because it is necessary that someone redress the balance which events have tilted heavily in favor of urban development. Modern societies are governed by urban men, and financed by urban-oriented financial institutions. The whole complex of international lending institutions—the World Bank, the Export-Import Bank, the International Monetary Fund, private banking houses—is heavily geared toward urban and industrial development. Most of these institutions do not find it possible to channel substantial capital into agricultural programs. And yet the basis of the modern agricultural revolution—which we have experienced in the United States—is heavy capital investment. It is investment in machinery, in fertilizer, in seeds, in scientific research and in technical training. According to Dr. Earl Buty, dean of agriculture at Purdue University, agriculture is one of the biggest users of capital in the United States. The total capital assets of U.S. farms in 1963 is estimated at $214 billion. In a study of Indiana farms, the total capital investment per farm was $138,000, averaging out to an investment of over $78,000 per man. This is four times the average capital investment per industrial worker in this country.

If agricultural and rural development is to flourish in Latin America, large amounts of capital will be required. In the absence of other sources, the Alliance agencies such as AID and the Inter-American Development Bank must be principal sources for this capital.

But once again it is not only the economic consequences of rural underdevelopment that is of importance. The glaring gap between booming industrial urban regions and primitive rural areas is social and political dynamite. We are rapidly learning that the situation most susceptible to violent revolution is the existence of vast differences in the level of development, income, and growth within a country. To the oppressed peasant of northeast Brazil, the dazzling splendor of São Paulo is more of an incitement to revolution than the faraway places of the rich United States. Political and social stability demands that the gap between rich regions and poor be narrowed.

The growth of stable political and social institutions requires that the bulk of the citizens be integrated into the political and social life of the society. Today in most Latin American countries the mass of the rural people remain utterly cut off from the political life of the nation. Political democracy is the province of the few. It is not valued by the many who are hungry, impoverished and illiterate. Indeed, it is often viewed as a luxury for the few at the expense of the many.

If political democracy is to survive and flourish in Latin America it must be proven that the neglected masses can enjoy the benefits which we associate with it. This presupposes a decent standard of living, of education and of health as an essential prerequisite to active participation in the political processes of society. Rural development and modernization is therefore a requirement in the path to the goal of first-class citizenship for all.

In discussing priorities for the Alliance for Progress, I would like to include at least a brief reference to the role which private voluntary associations must play. As many of you know, I have long been a stanch advocate of emphasizing the people-to-people approach to foreign aid, of channeling aid through voluntary associations to the greatest extent possible. In Latin America there is a vast array of voluntary groups, made up of both local and U.S. citizens. These agencies are often closer to the people at the grassroots level than those in official governmental positions.

In Latin America today much of the success of our food-for-peace program is due to the tireless efforts of the two voluntary agencies that handle the distribution of the food under Public Law 480, the Catholic Relief Services, and CARE. They are largely responsible for our success in sharing American agricultural bounty with the 30 million Latin Americans who now regularly receive food under this program.

I am happy to note that the work of voluntary agencies in Latin America is receiving more attention from Alliance for Progress officials. I am happy to note a definite change in the attitude of Alliance officials in the past year toward voluntary associations. I believe that a good deal of the credit for this change in attitude within the U.S. Government should go to the man whom you have chosen to honor at this convention, the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso. Today there is a greater appreciation of the role voluntary groups can perform, not only in alleviating the sufferings of the poor, but also in fostering needed economic and social development and in introducing the political skills necessary for a functioning democratic government.

The important role played by voluntary associations of all types in promoting economic progress is also reflected in their contribution to the growth of stable political institutions. This is too often overlooked. If the masses of Latin America, who have for decades remained outside the political process are to be capable of achieving and exercising the rights of citizenship, they must acquire the skills and knowledge necessary for participation in the political process. These skills, and this knowledge cannot be acquired in an atomized society. It is the atomized society that is easy prey for totalitarian government. In one of the best capsule definitions of totalitarian government, Hannah Arendt once defined it as the elimination of all subgroups between the individual and the state. Tocqueville remarked over a century ago on the many private voluntary organizations in the United States which provide the training ground, the school for acquiring the knowledge and experience which are necessary for political participation. Such elementary things as how to organize a meeting, run an election, conduct a debate, or decide a disputed issue are learned primarily in private groups and associations. Once having been learned there, they can be easily applied to participation in local, State, and National political life. Voluntary associations have a vital role to play in accomplishing both the political and the economic aims of the Alliance for Progress.

Having considered at some length the internal challenge to peace in Latin America, I now turn to the external challenge to peace—the threat of nuclear rivalry in the hemisphere. Nuclear weapons are superfluous in Latin America. They would serve no useful purpose whatsoever in preserving the security of Central and South America. A possible external military threat to the security of the Latin American Continent can and will be repulsed by the United States. The U.S. action on Cuba in October 1962 proved our ability and our determination to defend this hemisphere, both north and south, from external military threat.

In visiting Latin American countries during the past year, a primary topic of conversation with the leaders and the people was the problem of the physical security of the regions south of the Rio Grande. In fact, this concern was so close to their lives, to their thinking, that I am sure it was distracting them from the urgent job of economic rehabilitation, economic progress and social improvement—a job that permits no delay for any reason whatsoever. In other words, the fear of attack, the fear of subversion, the fear of revolution, of disorder, all of which has been augmented by the flow of arms into this area, primarily into Cuba, and from Cuba, but into other countries as well—all this has weakened the programs of economic progress, or weakened the possibility of fulfillment of the Alliance for Progress.

I am convinced that the leaders of these countries do not want nuclear warheads and delivery systems, or delivery vehicles stored on their soil or ready for use in any other part of Latin America. The conclusion is inescapable that the United States, in concert with its sister republics in the Western Hemisphere, has a solemn obligation and a great opportunity to encourage a multilateral agreement banning the manufacture, the storage, the testing, and the combat use of nuclear arms and delivery systems in Latin America. The area is ripe for this type of pact—a pact embodying these principles. This is a pact that gets right at the problem of staged disarmament, better termed "arms control." The time is right to pursue this—in the wake of the test ban treaty.

A denuclearized Latin America should thus be high on the priority list of Latin American

diplomatic goals. Agreement on the establishment of a denuclearized zone should be worked out by the Latin American countries themselves—just as the formal proposal of such a zone was appropriately made by Brazil in April, joined by four other Latin American countries. The United States is just as concerned as any of the Latin American nations as to whether nuclear weapons are to be introduced into the Latin American area of this hemisphere. We acted firmly in Cuba because there was no alternative. But an agreement to keep nuclear weapons out of the Latin American area and to subject this agreement to adequate verification offers a hopeful way of preventing further incidents like the recent Cuban crisis.

I insist that we give some leadership to this project and not merely tacit approval by means of a statement from some official spokesman. We ought to embrace it; we ought to make it a primary objective. It would be an excellent follow-up to the recently ratified test ban treaty.

A denuclearized zone in Latin America could be negotiated through the Organization of American States. This is a functioning organization which has been surprisingly effective in handling hemispheric problems. The OAS, if it wished, might call upon the United Nations, or the United States in particular, for special services or assistance in connection with the implementation of such a denuclearized zone. The United Nations, for instance, might suggest some of the personnel for the zonal control commission in the event that the OAS decided some nonregional personnel should be involved in implementing that agreement. The OAS could give regular progress reports through the UN on the operation of the verification system so that other UN members could profit by the experience in Latin America.

A denuclearized zone in Latin America should, if possible, lead to the creation of a zone emptied of conventional weapons as well. Any curbing of the amount of arms going to Latin American nations under effective and balanced safeguards would have a healthy impact on the economies of that area. Yet each of them, with the possible exception of Costa Rica, is busily engaged in buying arms, and we have yet failed to place the matter of regional disarmament and a denuclearized zone at the top of the agenda.

I repeat that our Government should encourage the Latin American nations to make any arms control agreement as broad as possible so as to limit the large amount of funds which are so often wastefully devoted to armaments. The current situation in which the small countries compete for military forces which are too large for their immediate needs, and far too expensive to be maintained without outside assistance, is deplorable.

The whole matter of arms assistance to Latin America requires immediate scrutiny. And it is not enough for the United States alone to take this initiative. This is why I said it must be done in the OAS, because if we were to deny certain countries military assistance, they could get it someplace else. We must arrive at some kind of a hemispheric agreement on this matter, and quickly, for I am here to say that we will weaken and possibly cause the failure of the Alliance for Progress and all that the Alliance means unless something is done to implement an effective arms control agreement in this area.

What I am suggesting is that we will have to approach this matter methodically, carefully, and by plans. What I am advocating is a total approach which will strike at the multiple ills afflicting Latin America. In Latin America it is still possible to do something. Today there is a first-class arms race on in the Middle East, and these impoverished countries are destroying themselves.

The whole world stands on the precipice of disaster because mankind thought it was more important to concentrate on getting arms into the hands of people who did not know how to take care of them, but knew how to fight and how to kill. In Latin America, there is still time to prevent this.

Now, in dealing with the question of the prospects for a denuclearized zone in Latin America, I have tried to make clear that I advocate this step from two overriding points of view. First, from the point of view of other countries and regions which might wish to follow suit, and second, from the point of view of a region which desperately needs to devote a maximum amount of its resources for developing free, productive, diversified economics. Here the arguments in favor of a rational, adequately verified arms control agreement are compelling. We can approach this problem of regional or zonal arms control methodically, scientifically, carefully, in terms of the security interests of ourselves and others.

Unless we are successful in meeting this second challenge to peace—the challenge of nuclear rivalry—there is small likelihood that we can successful meet the first. If the Latin nations mobilize the resources needed to push ahead in implementing Alliance social and economic programs, they will not be able to indulge in the unnecessary and nefarious luxury of missiles, hydrogen bombs and nuclear submarines. If they should decide to indulge in the fallacy of competing for nuclear weapons, they will do so at the expense of the welfare of their people. Today all the time and money and effort of the Latin American nations is required to meet the first challenge—the challenge of social revolution. Today the Latin American nations must decide whether they will follow peaceful revolution leading to progress or violent revolution leading to tyranny. Today they still have a choice. Tomorrow they may not.

The choice between peaceful revolution leading to progress and violent revolution leading to tyranny is also a choice for the United States. Our commitments under the Alliance must be honored as well as those of our Latin American neighbors. Nothing is more harmful to our prestige, to our national image and to our foreign policy interests than the appearance of reneging on commitments made. The recent action of the House of Representatives in drastically reducing the Alliance for Progress funds requested by the administration is interpreted in every Latin American country as precisely that. Most of the major Latin American newspapers, including those most friendly to the United States, did not fail to note that the House figure approved for the entire Latin American continent was only slightly above the total Soviet aid to Cuba alone. I do not believe the Senate will permit this assault on America's prestige, this blot on America's reputation to stand. I know that at least one Senator is determined that the Senate will do its duty to honor in full the U.S. commitment under the Alliance for Progress.

With the firm support of the United States, the Latin American nations can meet the internal challenge of social revolution and the external challenge of nuclear rivalry. They can with our help meet the challenge to peace in Latin America today.

RED HALT CALLED IN AMERICAS

President Kennedy said yesterday that the United States and its Latin American neighbors are determined that there shall be no more Communist states in this hemisphere.

And the way to be sure this does not happen, Mr. Kennedy said in a message to the Catholic Association for International Peace "is to remove the grave social and economic inequities that are the breeding ground of communism."

The association, now in annual conference here, gave its annual peace award yesterday to Teodoro Moscoso, coordinator of the U.S. Alliance for Progress program for economic and social development of Latin America.

From the Vatican came a message saying Pope Paul VI sent his blessings to the conference, and an expression of gratification for its theme: "The Christian Challenge in Latin America."

Mr. Kennedy, who is now traveling in the West, congratulated Moscoso on receiving the association's award, referred to him as "this most valued public servant." The association is connected with the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which is an organization of U.S. bishops of the Roman Catholic Church.

The President's message to the conference did not mention Cuba by name in his reference to existence of a Communist state in this hemisphere.

He called Latin America "the most critical area in the world today," and recalled that he had previously used the same words.

"The critical situation in Latin America can best be met by the Alliance for Progress, a joint effort of the United States and the Republics of Latin America to stimulate economic growth and to provide better health and educational facilities and more adequate job opportunities for all of our neighbors south of the border," he said.

"Together, we are determined that there shall be no more Communist states in this hemisphere, and we know that the only really effective means to this end is to remove the grave social and economic inequities that are the breeding ground of communism.

"More than that, we realize that the United States has a responsibility in justice and charity to do what we can to make it possible for our neighbors in Latin America to enjoy a better life."

THE CRISIS IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today, in a discussion with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I said that it was my intention to comment on the crisis in the Dominican Republic—indeed, the crisis in our relationships in the Western Hemisphere—as a result of the military coup in the Dominican Republic, following several coups by military juntas in other countries.

Several times during the past year I have expressed the view that political democracy is an indispensable basis for the success of the Alliance for Progress. I stated this at the time of the inauguration of the new government of the Dominican Republic in February of this year. I repeated it at the time of the Peruvian elections, which saw the restoration of constitutional government to that country. I repeated it at the time of the Argentine election which chose the new government that will be inaugurated in October of this year.

On those occasions I voiced the hope that the several cases of interference with constitutional governments in Latin America during the past year would represent only temporary aberrations, not a permanent trend. The restoration of free constitutional government in Peru and now in Argentina lent substance to that hope. Today, however, after witnessing the third military coup in 6 months against legally constituted governments, I have less confidence in my earlier judgment.

The assault on the recently elected constitutional government of the Dominican Republic last week is a cruel

blow to political freedom in this hemisphere. It is also a cruel blow to the Alliance for Progress and all that that great program stands for.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield momentarily?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I know the Senator intends to speak at some length on this issue. I think I have a rather clear idea of his position. The Senator will recall that we both attended the inauguration of President Bosch.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. It was a memorable occasion, considering what had preceded in the Dominican Republic.

I express my solidarity with the position taken by the Senator from Minnesota, a position, roughly, taken by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]—although none of us agrees with the idea of military intervention, expressed by the Senator from Alaska—that our Government should not, under any circumstances, recognize the junta or the civilian triumvirate, or any part of it, until we have considered thoroughly what can be done to save freedom in that part of the world, where freedom has for so long been denied.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New York. I would have expected him to take a firm, strong stand in behalf of constitutional government and political democracy in the Latin American countries, as he does with respect to every area of the world. It is very necessary for Senators to do so. Since they have a unique responsibility in connection with the development of the foreign policy of this country, because of their constitutional prerogative to advise and consent to the nomination of ambassadors and to the ratification of treaties, it is very important that Senators speak up, so that at least the countries in the Western Hemisphere will know that the elected representatives of the American people who serve in the Senate are very much disturbed by the trend—which appears to be growing in the Western Hemisphere—toward the development of military juntas which take over and destroy the elected governments.

This afternoon the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] expressed my point of view with such clarity and with such determination that there is very little I can add now, except to state my views in regard to the kind of cruel hoax that takes place when elected governments are thrown out by a handful of military gunmen who, with brute force and weapons, take over the established government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for one interruption?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Before the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] leaves the floor, I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota for the position he is taking on the crisis in the Dominican Republic. His position does not surprise me at all, in view of the kind of leadership in foreign policy that the Senator from Minesota has given us in the Senate for many years.

I believe it is very interesting that the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota are taking this position today in the Senate. Many persons do not know what a great contribution these two Senators are making to United States-Latin American relations. I speak of the program the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New York are spearheading, in connection with private investments in Latin America. To date their emphasis has been on Mexico. They have been leaders in a movement that seeks to encourage American investments in Mexico—a program, with proper safeguards and restrictions, that provides for securities investments in better economic relations between the United States and Mexico. In my judgment, this program goes to the heart of the great need for strengthening the relationships between the United States, Mexico, and all the rest of the countries of Latin America, for it goes to the question of exporting—as many Senators have heard me say almost to the point of boredom, I am sure—economic freedom, as the only guarantee for the establishment of a democratic way of life in Latin America.

I want to congratulate both Senators. As they know, I am an enthusiastic supporter of their program; and I underwrite and endorse every detail of it.

Mr. President, since I spoke earlier this afternoon, and since I had a brief conversation with the two Senators some hour and one-half ago, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has reported to me that this afternoon he has had a conference with Mr. Moscoso, the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, and that he put to him the $64 question: "Have you yet withdrawn the AID personnel from the Dominican Republic?" He elicited the information that there are some 21 members of that personnel; and the answer was "No." The reason why the answer was no, so Mr. Moscoso reported to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], was that the State Department did not approve it.

Mr. President, I want to know from the State Department, not later than tomorrow, why it does not approve it. I want to know what kind of double-talk and hypocrisy the State Department is engaging in, in connection with the Dominican Republic, for I know the Department's pattern, and I am perfectly satisfied that it has brought back the American Ambassador only as a grand gesture which means nothing, and that the test of whether the State Department is cutting off our relationships with the Dominican Republic is to be found in whether the Department gets the AID personnel back here quickly. Let the Department bring the AID personnel back here, and then the people of the Dominican Republic will know that we are beginning to mean business when we say we are not going to support the military junta and the three civilian stooges who are carrying out the dictates of that military junta. Those civilian stooges are trying to sell the bill of goods that within several years there will be an election in the Dominican Republic. But what kind of an election would it be?

It would include only the procedures to which the military junta would agree.

Furthermore, since I talked this afternoon to the two Senators, I have received more information in regard to American business intervention in connection with the junta and the coup. I am satisfied that American business interests are involved over their heads in supporting that military junta—to the everlasting disgrace of the United States; and in connection with the coup, the hands of the United States are not clean.

To the President of the United States I say, "Mr. President, I am satisfied that you have not known these facts. But now you have a duty to call on the State Department for the necessary action and to get the Secretary of State back to Washington. There is no place more important for him to be right now than in the city of Washington. You should get a briefing from the Secretary of State and you should get a briefing from the CIA; and you should wash America's hands of any involvement there, and should make perfectly clear to those responsbile for the coup, to the military junta, to the civilian stooges, and to the American business interests that our country is washing its hands of the Dominican Republic until democratic government is restored there, and that that means the return of the constitutional President of the Dominican Republic until the people, by the exercise of their democratic processes, under their constitution—that the military junta has destroyed—take their constitutional action, whatever it may be."

Mr. President, we cannot countenance the overthrow of the constitutional government in the Dominican Republic, and then, 10 days or 2 weeks from now—which, I am satisfied, is the present plan of the State Department—recognize the military junta. Let me say now to the President of the United States, "If that is done, your administration will be disgraced."

The President must decide whether all the talk we have heard during past years about supporting democratic procedures in Latin America is only talk, or whether it represents the policy of the United States. I am satisfied that if we follow the policy presently contemplated by the State Department in regard to the Dominican Republic, there will be a coup in Honduras, too. And we must also watch out for Venezuela and for several other hot spots in Latin America. If we wish to have Latin America or a large segment of Latin America delivered to the Communists in the immediate future, we have only to follow the course of action—which I believe is contemplated in the State Department—of an early recognition by us of the military junta.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, again I commend the Senator from Oregon for his forceful, eloquent, and unmistakably clear statement as to what he believes should be the policy of this Government. I am sure many other Senators also believe it should be the policy of this Government.

To condone such military juntas is to condone a plague in this hemisphere, because it is a fact that other countries are threatened. More than 2 months ago, I said, here in the Senate, that there was danger of a military coup in the Dominican Republic, and that the President of that Republic knew that his reform program was meeting with this kind of resistance. I also said there was danger of a military coup in Honduras—and there is; and there can be the same danger in Colombia and in Venezuela.

Mr. President, we had better make unmistakably clear to all parties that this Government does not intend to sit idly by and permit those constitutional Governments to be destroyed by lieutenants, captains, colonels, generals, or trigger-happy, would-be dictators.

I remind my fellow Americans that the Republic of Venezuela stands in mortal danger every hour of the day because of the gunmen, the Communists, the Castroites, and the followers of the former dictator. The extremists and the ragtag ends of dictatorship of the right and the would-be dictators of the left, backed up by a handful of the military who know only how to shoot and bully their way into power, are threatening to end constitutional, democratic government in country after country in this hemisphere.

Mr. President, we talk about the problems of Africa, Asia, and Europe. But if there is any one area in the world where the influence of the United States of America ought to be evident for good and constructive purpose, it is in this hemisphere. We have told other nations to stay out of the Western Hemisphere. Senators have spoken time after time about a more modern application of the Monroe Doctrine. If we tell other nations to stay out of the Western Hemisphere, we had better try to help other peoples of this hemisphere who want freedom, democracy, and an opportunity to survive as free people. We are witnessing an increasing trend toward military dictatorship, which does not defeat communism or bring progress, but rather provides a fertile seedbed for a Communist takeover once the dictatorship of the military or of the extreme radical right has served its time.

The military coup in the Dominican Republic, so lacking in justification, indicates once more the vulnerability of a government which could not rely on a strong, well-developed democratic institutional structure. It indicates once more that we need strong democratic institutions to support democratic leaders. Under the Trujillo dictatorship, the basis of a democratic institutional structure was all but totally destroyed.

Dictatorship adulterates. It corrupts. It erodes a society. Any country that rids itself of a dictatorship that was as firmly and entrenched as, for example, the Peron dictatorship in Argentina or the Trujillo dictatorship in the Dominican Republic, has a difficult time. Such a country has a difficult time to survive in the fresh sunlight and air of freedom. It requires care, patience, and the help of friends to make crystal clear that the tender plant of democracy needs time to gain roots and to be more firmly implanted in the soil of that country, and the plant must be protected in order that it may survive.

The training of political leaders, the development of a competent civil service, the growth of a responsible free press—all of these were impossible under the Trujillo tyranny.

When constitutional government was restored to the Dominican Republic and the President chosen by the Dominican people in a free election was inaugurated in February of this year, it inherited a political vacuum.

Worse than that, it inherited almost chaos. It lacked trained political leaders on which to rely. It lacked a strong political party to mobilize support for the government's programs. It lacked trained, honest, competent administrators to carry out the government's policy. It lacked an effective security system to guarantee social stability. Nevertheless it was a free government which attempted to implement the social and economic programs prescribed by the Alliance for Progress Charter.

I invite the attention of Senators to an article entitled "Time Sewed Up Bosch's Hopes," by Max Freedman, published in the Washington Evening Star, Monday, September 30. I ask unanimous consent that the article, which is pertinent to my remarks, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TIME SEWED UP BOSCH'S HOPES

(By Max Freedman)

When I saw President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic in June, he told me to remember that his greatest enemy was time itself. He did not know whether he would be granted the margin of time to carry out his reforms. Now he has been plucked from power by a union between the army and the plutocracy, who both repudiate his hopes and ideals for the Dominican people.

Seated outside his office in the palace were two soldiers with sawed-off shotguns in their laps. A third soldier carefully checked my appointment card and the purpose of my visit. In the inner office, together with President Bosch's two senior secretaries, sat a general with a gun strapped to his waist. Then I came to the President's own office and his first words were an apology for the show of force.

He said these pitiable trappings of military power were imposed on him by his own security officers. During the Trujillo dictatorship, the palace had bristled with military arrogance to hold the nation in the grip of fear.

All his anxieties centered on the reform movement. The tragedy was that he himself embodied those reforms. Without him they had no meaning and no future. So the generals struck at him to destroy a movement which they feared and hated. They dreaded its success even more than its failure, for its success would mark the decline of their privileges and power.

On most days President Bosch came to his office at 5 in the morning and worked late into the night. So oppressive was the shortage of trained people to help him when he took office he found only two professional agronomists working for the Government. All the rest were on Trujillo's vast estates. Without the help of specialists from the United States and Puerto Rico he could never have made his brave start.

Before he talked about his own country's problems, he wanted to hear about President Kennedy and the new stirrings in Washington. He thought of himself not as an isolated reformer in a small country, but as part of a larger tradition which sought to lift the burdens from people cast into the bondage of poverty and illiteracy. With flashing phrase and imperious conviction he explained the differences between Castro's false revolution in Cuba and his own program for the Dominican Republic.

He thought the greatest threat of a revolt against his rule would be in the first year. During these early months the country would be chafed by change; the peasants in the countryside would not yet have their promised reforms; and the irritation of the privileged classes would be sharpened into fury. Despite these omens of danger, he believed his opponents would be afraid to strike because they might provoke a sullen national uprising. He was wrong. His fear was a better prophet than his hope.

President Bosch knew the risks of not moving more strongly against the Communists. Two different reasons explain his policy. He had the strongest evidence for believing that a drive against the Communists now would soon become a cover for reaction and would destroy the reforms which alone could end the grievances on which communism feeds. In the second place, he believed that President Betancourt of Venezuela, his great friend, had actually increased the danger of Castroism by his stark and premature challenge to the Communists.

Fate put a finger on the wheel of fortune, and robbed him of a chance to prove the wisdom of his cautious policy. He has been overthrown by forces eager to exploit the cry against communism for their own selfish ends. Meanwhile, the workers and peasants—mute, dispersed, intimidated—have raised no shout of anger at the return of evil. Perhaps he yet will return to power in coming months.

The United States has no cause to reproach itself for the sad result. It did the right thing in supporting President Bosch, and its policies could not have been better applied than by Ambassador John Bartlow Martin and his colleagues. The odds against success were simply too great. A lament over failure is the negation of statesmanship. The United States must move now to save what it can from the wreckage, and to lighten the agony of the Dominican people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, whatever have been the shortcomings of the President of the Dominican Republic, Juan Bosch, the fact is that he was a democrat with a small "d." He believed in freedom. He was an idealist. He may not have been the best administrator. He may have had many shortcomings. But he was elected in a free election. I suggest to those who are also the recipients of victory in free elections that we protect the institution of the election process, and that we speak out in every way we can to guarantee its security and safety. Of course, there are honest differences of opinion as to whether President Bosch did as good a job for the Dominican Republic as some of us had hoped he would. Apparently there are honest differences of opinion in the United States as to whether any President does as good a job as some people think he ought to. That is why there are opposition parties. In every State in our Union there are political differences. We have elections when the opponent of the incumbent seeks the office of the incumbent. He points out

the shortcomings of the present Governor, Senator, Representative, mayor, President, or the occupant of whatever office is up for election. Obviously, President Bosch can be criticized. I heard criticism this afternoon about the fact that he permitted the Communists to come back to the Dominican Republic. The Council of State, the government that preceded the present President of the Dominican Republic, also had in its constitution a provision that exiles could return, because the Trujillo tyranny and dictatorship exiled anyone who stood in its way.

I hold the view that Bosch would have found out in due time, as he was beginning to find out, that we can be so idealistic in terms of the principles of democracy that we lose the capacity to govern in times of crisis and emergency. President Bosch would have learned.

But I am not merely arguing about the personality of Juan Bosch, the President of the Dominican Republic. And he is still President. He was elected. I am arguing about what happened in the Dominican Republic to destroy constitutional government, the attempt made to destroy what we in the Senate and our President said would be the showcase of democracy.

We thought the Dominican Republic could be a demonstration of what free people could do in cooperation with the great free United States. We thought that it could be an example for the world close at hand and the tyranny of Castro in Cuba—in close physical proximity. We thought—and when I say "We," I mean the Dominican people, supported by the help of the people of the United States—that it would be possible to show what a free people in a free society with a constitutional government could do as compared with what a puppet government, a dictatorial government, a Communist-sympathizing government, and a Communist-motivated government could do in Cuba.

Mr. President, what have we to show today? All we have to show is that we could do little or nothing, or that we did little or nothing to prevent a handful of trigger-happy, gun-toting, machinegunning military officers drive out of that country the duly elected President, destroy the Cabinet, close up the Congress, and, for all practical purposes, make illegal two of the most important political parties in the Dominican Republic, the party that elected Juan Bosch and the Christian Democratic Party.

Then, of course, they made illegal the Communist Party, too. In the name of fighting communism, the military in the Dominican Republic are paving the way for a Communist-Castro takeover or for complete chaos in that sad and unhappy island.

Mr. President, as a free constitutional government whose program was patterned on the Alliance for Progress, the United States supported the new Dominican Government. In view of the almost insuperable obstacles facing the new government, in view of the high priority which we placed on restoring both stability and social and economic progress in the Caribbean, the U.S. Government not only supported the new government, but supported it enthusiastically.

Now the Government that we supported has been overthrown—the victim of machinegun-toting colonels who understand neither the virtues of political democracy nor the nature of the Communist threat which they insist is the pretext for their action.

I say to the Senator from Oregon that it is common knowledge that far too many "fast-money artists," far too many plain ordinary "crooks" from the United States and elsewhere, moved into the Dominican Republic in the hope that under the new government they would be able to gain some special favor in the name of freedom.

It is a well recognized fact that the President of the Dominican Republic, Juan Bosch, who is accused of being a poor administrator, was so much aware of the possibilities of corruption that he approved any appropriation of funds or use of funds personally if the amount involved was more than a few hundred dollars. It was obviously an insuperable task. The man loved his country. He believed in political freedom. He wanted to see corruption erased from his nation. He made the effort. The fact that he was incapable of doing it as well as some of us hoped he would in no way diminishes him and in no way justifies his destruction by illegal methods.

There are ways under the constitution of the Dominican Republic to remove a President. There are ways to call for new elections. Surely it is not proper to do so at the point of a gun.

I say that this pretext of action—namely, to save the nation from communism—is pure unadulterated bunk.

This pretext is a hollow mask—and should fool no one. Although we may not have been completely satisfied with the efforts of the Dominican Government to crack down on some leftist-oriented individuals that have returned to the country before the new government was inaugurated, the available evidence does not indicate that Communists had gained appreciable strength in the Dominican Republic. On the basis of all information available to our Government, the claim of a Communist threat by the military junta should be rejected.

The Cuban Communist leader Che Guevara has stated that Communists find it much easier to overthrow dictatorships than democratic governments, because democratic governments provide some kind of anodyne for the people which inspires popular support of the government. One can imagine Guevara and Castro and their Communist cronies in Cuba rejoicing today. A new military dictatorship in the nearby Dominican Republic could well become for Castro a ripe plum to be picked in the Caribbean.

As I understand it, it is the U.S. policy in Latin America, the area which President Kennedy just last weekend again described as "the most critical area in the world," to oppose dictatorship and to support freely elected constitutional government. This is the assumption on which our Congress is operating in support of U.S. participation under the Alliance for Progress.

I believe that now is the time to enforce this policy in the Caribbean.

I call this to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate tonight. The time to enforce this particular assumption and principle of political democracy is now. Just as we recently have decided to stop talking and start acting in our belief in racial equality in this country, it is now the time to act on the basis of our belief in constitutional government. The President demonstrated in October of 1962 that this Nation is capable of decisive action, that this Government is capable of decision action. I believe that if we are capable of forcing the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba, we are capable of taking decisive action to bring about the downfall of the present illegal government and a return to constitutional government in the Dominican Republic.

I would dislike to have it said that the same government which could meet Mr. Khrushchev head on and make Mr. Khrushchev back down and withdraw his missiles cannot get rid of a handful of gun-toting colonels who have taken over a duly constituted government in the Dominican Republic.

We have wisely suspended diplomatic relations and called back our Ambassador and our economic mission. We should call back our military mission immediately—not only the head of the military mission but the entire mission.

We have no desire to intervene in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic or any other Latin American nation. But we do desire to promote and protect free constitutional governments in this hemisphere. That is our objective. I do not claim any qualification to prescribe the specific means for returning to constitutional government in the Dominican Republic. There may be several ways, and I am confident that the responsible Dominican leaders, assisted by their freedom-loving friends in this hemisphere, can find suitable ways of shifting to a constitutional pattern of government. They need the unqualified support of this Republic.

We need to make it crystal clear that we are not going to tolerate, or help, or accommodate ourselves to this military junta that has taken over.

The brazen attack on Dominican democracy by an unprincipled ambitious military clique is an attack on U.S. policy in this hemisphere—represented by our support of and participation in the Alliance for Progress. It is an attack on everything we stand for. It is a blow to our prestige—a blow which should not be allowed to stand. It is a blow to free constitutional government in this hemisphere. If it is permitted to stand, it is an open invitation to those military groups in Venezuela and Honduras who are already plotting to emulate the coup of their Dominican cohorts. If the anti-constitutional military groups in other countries are convinced that coup d'etats are compatible with continued U.S. economic and military assistance, the temptation to overthrow constitutional government will surely prove irresistible.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and other Senators have made this point

again and again. We must let these fellows know that if they use guns to force their way into office over duly elected free governments which are friendly to this country we are not going to help them, we are not going to give them one nickel—not even a penny. In fact, we should do everything we can to destroy them, to bring down their military coup into a rubble and into the wreckage it ought to be.

Certain of our responses to military coups in the past are not likely to discourage them in their plotting. The time to take a firm stand is long overdue.

In the confines of this Government I have made this unequivocally clear not only on the Senate floor but also in private consultations.

Mr. President, we are in trouble in this country with the foreign aid program. Let the record be crystal clear. We are going to be in more trouble. It does not advance the cause of the administration's foreign aid bill this year to have another body blow to the Alliance for Progress. If this administration means what it says about high priority of the Alliance for Progress—and I believe it means exactly that—it certainly will not permit a military clique to prevent the restoration of constitutional government in the Dominican Republic.

I say to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State—men to whom I am dedicated in terms of my political loyalty and my friendship—"If you want to strike a blow for an effective foreign aid bill, if you want to see funds restored for the Alliance for Progress, then do what needs to be done to the little outfit which has just taken over in the Dominican Republic. Make it crystal clear that military juntas are out, that they will not be given any help, that they will not be recognized, that they will not be tolerated." I can think of nothing that would do more to save the Alliance for Progress. And I can think of nothing that would do more to destroy the Alliance for Progress and literally to destroy the foreign aid program than to condone what is being done by these military juntas in the Western Hemisphere.

Frankly, it becomes very difficult for a Member of Congress to support such a well-conceived program if such a program can be turned aside by a crowd of colonels and generals.

The Alliance for Progress is put forward as the orderly, progressive way of accomplishing the economic and social reforms needed within a framework of political liberty. This is the alternative to dictatorial rule. If we permit some power-happy gang of generals that wants to take a crack at ruling a country to flout the whole concept of the Alliance, then perhaps it is time to say that we just cannot afford to be involved in the affairs of that particular Latin American country. The American people and the American Congress are not interested in spending money to finance military cliques.

I regret that, with all the military assistance we have given those countries, we apparently have not been able to indoctrinate the military of those countries in democratic value and virtues. We have taught them how to use our tanks, but apparently they have never read the Declaration of Independence or the Emancipation Proclamation; nor do they understand the responsibility of constitutional authority.

It is to the everlasting credit of the military in America that it has brought forth some great generals, who have loved their country more than they have the particular unit of their professional service—men of the qualities of General Marshall—yes, of General Eisenhower; men of the competence of General Bradley and General Bedel Smith, to mention only a few, and men in our Military Establishment today who understand the relationship of the military to constitutional government, who understand the importance of military and civil authority.

Why do we not inculcate these ideas into others? Do we teach at our military schools only tactics, strategy, the use of weapons; or do our military programs for hundreds of officers from Latin-American countries has something to do with social science, the humanities, the virtues and values of democratic institutions? It seems to me we might well examine into what is being taught in these military programs.

Mr. President, I have been a firm supporter of the Alliance for Progress. I believe in it. I have worked in the Congress to gain approval for the appropriations needed to support our participation in it. I hope to be able to continue supporting it, but I am going to be very watchful and observant as to what we are doing in this instance, when a military junta has taken over. I do not believe in idle threats, nor do I want to be governed by emotions, but it becomes very difficult even for the most ardent and avid administration supporter to ask his colleagues to support additional appropriations for the foreign aid program and the Alliance for Progress when we see those funds utilized and captured by little, tinhorn dictators.

The military junta in the Dominican Republic today presides over millions of dollars of American taxpayers' funds that have been given to that country, and I do not want any more given—not 1 nickel, not 1 dollar—until constitutional government is restored there.

I cannot be sure that Senators who have fought hardest and longest in the support of the Alliance for Progress will continue to do battle in this cause if the result is to see constitutional government fall before the assault of military schemers with only a mild protest by the United States. I know who in this Congress supports the Alliance for Progress program and who does not. I can say that most of those who are its strongest supporters, most of those who will fight the long hard battle to win the appropriations needed for it, firmly adhere to the belief that political democracy and constitutional government are as essential to the success of the Alliance for Progress as economic progress. They will not take lightly this latest assault on constitutional government.

Those in the executive branch who are most interested in and concerned with the success or failure of the Alliance might do well to note that those in the Congress who are most concerned with this latest attack on the Alliance are not those who regularly attempt to slash and defeat the program, but rather its strongest backers.

Now is the time to bring this illegal Dominican Government to its knees and to assist the responsible democratic Dominican leaders in returning constitutional government to that troubled island.

This could be said of other countries, but because we have a great stake in this little land not so far away from our shores, because of its unusual relation to developments in the Caribbean, where Castro and his Communist stooges seek to spread their poison and system, I believe any Senator who can speak up now for freedom, democracy, constitutional government, and free elections in the Dominican Republic and other countries will be doing his country great service.

I want to be sure the President of the United States, who has to make difficult decisions, gets our support. I want him to know that, as his best friends in this body, we are asking him to take positive, determined action, and that in so doing he will not weaken his administration, but, to the contrary, he will see his programs carried out. We must face the fact that we do not have too much of a choice left. That is why I have spoken up on this matter.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I know it is very late. I do not wish to detain the Senate or the staff.

According to the familiar harbingers, the standard preliminaries, and the hackneyed hoisting of trial balloons, we are soon to be officially informed of a radical shift in our foreign policy.

Without any approval from Congress, in fact in the face of expressed congressional disapproval, our Government is to sell to Russia subsidized wheat at a price substantially below that paid for it by the American taxpayer. This would be, in effect, an initial subsidy to Russia of more than $100 million.

Only a few weeks ago this would have been unthinkable, as it was in 1961 when Congress passed Public Law 87-128 which states the sense of Congress that subsidized agricultural commodities should not be made available to the Soviet Union or to countries dominated by the U.S.S.R.

But this morning's press states:

> Official American sources are not too impressed with Congress restrictions against selling subsidized grain to unfriendly nations.

This proposed policy shift has not yet been officially announced, it is reported, because the President is still weighing the political consequences.

I believe that there will be many adverse political consequences, both in the broader sense of the term, and in the narrower sense.

And, while the decisionmaking process is still going on, I wish to state my opposition to any wheat deal with Russia, and the reasons for this opposition.

It is generally considered that we are in the midst of a cold war, forced upon us by the Communists.

This cold war is said to threaten our survival and because of it 3 million young Americans are in uniform; the larger part of our national budget is devoted to military purposes; and we have given away $100 billion to help other nations protect themselves.

Since the days of World War II when the slogan "Food Will Win the War" was on everyone's lips, we have all known that foodstuffs, and especially wheat, are strategic materials.

This is particularly so in the cold war and especially so with respect to Soviet Russia and Red China, for whom the agriculture dilemma has posed insoluble problems on a massive scale.

These problems have gravely impeded the aggressive capacity, the unity, the stability and the scientific and productive potential of the Communist world, and before we propose to bail them out with cutrate wheat, let us look carefully at what we are doing.

We know that the Soviet agricultural failure is one of the major sources of discontent and internal weakness within the Soviet Union.

It confronts every man, woman and child behind the Iron Curtain with daily evidence of the abject failure of the Communist regime and of the bankruptcy of Marxist doctrine.

It obliges the Red leaders to consider permitting some freedom in Soviet agriculture, which could have revolutionary consequences.

It forces the Soviets to divert huge percentages of their manpower, machinery, and scientific effort to the farm problem, and away from cold war purposes.

It constrains them to welsh on their commitments of grain to their satellites, with grevious consequences for Communist unity.

It compels them to abandon or to scale down their use of food exports as a weapon of subversion in the cold war.

It requires them to cancel their trade agreements with non-Communist nations and thus to lose the chemical and machinery imports which they need to build their industrial and military machine.

This being true, and I know of no one who disputes it, the proposed wheat deal with Russia will have, inevitably, the following consequences:

Every bushel of subsidized wheat we ship to Russia will help divert manpower from the farms and into the Soviet military and industrial machine.

Every bushel of wheat we ship to Russia will help to lessen discontent within the Iron Curtain and will help to mask the Communist failure in agriculture.

Every bushel of wheat we ship to Russia will help the Communists to carry on their export programs to their satellites, an important source of Soviet control.

Every bushel of wheat we ship to Russia constitutes a subsidy to the Communist regime of about 50 cents, and there are to be 250 million of these bushels as a beginner.

These are the larger political consequences of the proposed wheat deal. And there are others.

Congress, which puts up the money of taxpayers to pay for this wheat has said that it does not want it shipped to the Russians, but administration spokesmen are not too impressed with what Congress wants. This ought to expose for all time the worthlessness of sense resolutions as a substitute for airtight restrictions on the executive branch. And this is not all.

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

Mr. DODD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join the Senator in the observation he has made about so-called sense resolutions in the Senate. I have always opposed them.

Mr. DODD. I know the Senator has, and I commend him for it.

Mr. MORSE. I have always recognized them for what they are—face-savers. However, they do not save faces. If the Senate has reached an opinion with regard to a matter of policy, it should express it in legislation.

Mr. DODD. I, too, think so.

Mr. MORSE. Back in 1955 the then Senator from New York, Mr. Lehman, persuaded me to go ahead with him on this kind of resolution, for a congressional expression of opinion relative to a policy that had developed with respect to discrimination against American Jews and Catholic priests in certain places abroad. I was persuaded that the way to do that was to adopt a sense resolution.

I always try to learn from experience. I joined in that resolution. I thought perhaps there was something to the argument of those who said, "WAYNE, when are you ever going to agree to take half a loaf?"

All I got was the cellophane wrapper. One cannot eat that. We soon recognized that although we had adopted a sense resolution, the State Department proceeded to ignore it.

It was not until the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I, in 1955, had the language added as an amendment to the foreign aid bill that it took on any meaning at all. It still has some shortcomings. I only mention this point as an example of my experience with the so-called sense resolutions.

I therefore join the Senator from Connecticut in the observation he has made that we ought to stop doing it, that we ought to enact legislation, and not engage in this kind of legislative gesturing.

The Senator is raising a subject matter which perplexes me very much. I believe we must have a more thorough consideration of it in the Foreign Relations Committee than we have had up to now. The Senator from Connecticut knows that yesterday there was an informal meeting in which members of the Foreign Relations Committee and of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and other Senators also, participated in a rather informal discussion with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Ball.

The Senator from Connecticut knows that tomorrow the committee will return to a markup of the foreign aid bill. I predict that the administration will travel a rocky road, and that a good many tires on this juggernaut will be punctured before it reaches the end of that journey.

It is very important, I believe, that we have the top man at the meeting, the Secretary of State himself, and that we raise with the Secretary of State some of the problems the Senator from Connecticut is raising this evening. I intend to reserve my judgment until we have had an opportunity to discuss in some depth with the Secretary of State the implications of this and related economic policies that are impinging upon it in the field of foreign relations. There are many facets of this situation which disturb me. I am greatly disturbed, from the evidence that has been submitted. We were asked, "Why should we not sell the wheat to Russia? We sell it to West Germany, and West Germany manufactures it into flour and sells it to both East Germany and Russia, at a neat profit for West Germany." So the argument is made—how plausible it is, I do not know, "If you are going to countenance that sort of international sleight of hand, we had better do it directly."

I am troubled also by the conduct of our allies, including our friend to the north. Frankly, I say to the Senator that for the life of me, I do not know what the answer should be. The Senator and I owe it to our constituency to do exactly what the Senator from Connecticut is doing tonight, as he so frequently does; namely, to get all the facts out on the table for full public disclosure. As the Senator has heard me say many times, America's foreign policy belongs to the American people, and they are entitled to know all the facts before the Government, either in the executive or in the legislative branch, takes a final course of action.

Therefore, I commend the Senator from Connecticut for taking the time tonight to lay this problem out before us. I hope he will take it a step further and in the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee tomorrow bring up the problem and officially request that the Secretary of State be brought before us at an early date.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from Oregon. It comforts me greatly to hear his statement. He knows how much I respect and admire him. He is a great figure in the Senate. I admire him for his ability, his independence, his insight, and his integrity. I assure him that I will raise this question with the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, for many years, the American people, with many misgivings, have endured a sacrifice of several billion dollars annually to pay for a national farm policy that sought a fair return for the farmer and a stable economy for the Nation. In seeking these goals I have voted for farm subsidies and I voted for the administration farm program, despite the fact that they are opposed

by the farmers of my own State. I shall not do so again, if this deal goes through.

There are others who will not do so.

The farm program is not so invulnerable that it can afford these defections.

Before we commence to use the farm program as a vehicle for trade with Soviet Russia, I think we might well ask ourselves—can an already unpopular program stand another crushing liability in the eyes of a patient people who must foot the bill?

There is another political consideration, a partisan one, which I do not hesitate to pose.

I believe that millions of Americans in both parties are willing to make tremendous sacrifices to carry forward the cause of freedom but who will not willingly give a single dollar for aid and trade with the Communists.

This new course of action, of which the wheat deal will be only the first step, will help erode the confidence of millions of citizens in the foreign policy of their country and in the wisdom of those who make that policy.

Those who trifle with that sentiment may reap a harvest far different from their expectations, and it won't be in wheat.

The shopworn arguments that have been dredged up to support this wheat deal are among the most insubstantial ever brought forward to sustain a shift of policy.

One argument is that such a deal will be useful in combating the outflow of gold and in reducing our bulging surpluses.

Does anyone contend that our international fiscal position is so flimsy that we must turn to our enemies to bail us out? Or that our surplus problem is so hopeless that we care not who gets it? If this is true, here indeed is an admission that will shock the Nation. Here indeed is a new light in which to evaluate our foreign aid program. For if we are so weak that we must seek relief at the price of materially aiding our enemies, how can we continue to pour out our gold to aid our friends?

It is argued that this is a true horse trade. They get wheat, which they need. We get gold, which we need. What nonsense! Gold means nothing to the Communists; wheat means everything. We do not need their gold. They desperately need our wheat. Let them pay the price for it, not in gold bars, but in concessions to the cause of freedom.

It is argued that this will be good for the farmers. On this basis, spokesmen for farm groups, in and out of Congress, have come out in its support.

This argument is understandable but ignominious. It has a surface plausibility but an essential shortsightedness that may be the last straw for people who are already fed up with farm politics and farm raids on the Treasury.

I say to those who claim to represent the farmers of this Nation:

Each year you come before us and ask us to tax our people billions of dollars to support a wasteful, extravagant, unpopular farm subsidy program on the ground that the national interest and the interest of common justice compels it. And we have supported you, with American gold. Do you now tell us that a little Russian gold and a few cents increase in the price of wheat is more important than that same national interest and that same sense of justice?

If you cannot rise above the selfish interest of some of your constituents, in behalf of the Nation's welfare, then there are many of us who will never again support the welfare of your constituents at the expense of the Nation's interest.

It is argued that since the Canadians have already begun to sell wheat to the Russians, and since other nations may do so, we might as well get in the game while the getting is good.

If this is true, is not every aspect of our foreign policy at the whim and at the mercy of every selfish allied interest, even those of minor allies?

Our course is not to abandon our policy because an ally decides to play both sides of the street.

Our energies should be directed, not to joining in the race for Communist markets, but toward influencing, even pressuring and sanctioning, our allies to refrain from such trade.

It is argued that this trade agreement is a step toward peace. It is not a step toward peace. It is a step toward war because it helps to heal a fatal, debilitating weakness of our enemy. It helps them to maintain their control over their own people and over their enslaved peoples, and it helps them to solve a problem which otherwise would force them to slow down the growth of their technology and their industry and thus their capacity to wage war.

These are some of the practical reasons for opposing the wheat deal. There is another reason, a less tangible reason.

Yesterday morning's cartoon in the Washington Post touched upon it. It showed a representative of the wheat producers on the telephone, and the caption was:

Wait a minute—did you say those atheistic warmongers are willing to pay cash?

This caption leads me to my final argument against the wheat deal. It demeans our national integrity; it makes a mockery of the noble and costly struggle we have made against the Communists; it resurrects in every nation in the world the infamous legend that the dollar sign is the all-important factor in American policy. It forces us to ask ourselves why are we allowing American boys to die in South Vietnam at the hands of an enemy to whom we now propose to distribute our largesse.

We cannot, we must not do this. If there were a famine behind the Iron Curtain, of course, we would help; we would send wheat but we would send it under the American flag so that all would know that these shipments represent, not Communist success, but Communist failure, not American greed, but American compassion.

So I speak out today, hastily and without adequate preparation, in an attempt to protest against this transaction before it is an accomplished fact.

If we do this deed, we will be subsidizing those who are sworn to destroy us; we will be strengthening the Communists at their weakest point; we will be helping them to enslave their own people and other people; we will enable them to continue to sustain Cuba and their other puppet states; we will lower the floodgates to a deluge of East-West trade which we will use for dollars and which they will use for aggression; we will establish vested interests in the United States which depend upon the Soviet Union in part for their livelihood; and we will abandon our golden opportunity to use their great need and our great abundance to wrest concessions from them in the cause of freedom around the globe.

Surely these considerations are more weighty than a temporary monetary gain.

And so, in friendship and in deep concern, I urge the President and his advisers not to do through questionable executive action what they could not accomplish through the legislative process.

Let us solve our gold problem and our farm problem with an honest fiscal policy and an honest farm policy and not through an infamous tactic of giving away the physical and moral heritage of the American people for a paltry return that will haunt us through many a dark day.

This problem belongs, first of all, with Congress. It ought to be fully discussed here. I feel strongly about it. That is why I have spoken without preparation at this late hour tonight, and have detained my colleagues and our aides in the Senate, something which I ordinarily try to avoid. But I believe the hour for speaking is late. It may be too late. The decision may have already been made. What a tragedy if that is so.

I fear that we in the legislative branch, who represent the people of the 50 States, are seeing whittled away almost every day our responsibility toward those whom we represent. For by Executive fiat and by the decisions of unknowns in the executive branch the will of the American people has frequently been thwarted in the past.

So I earnestly urge all Senators, however they may feel about this question—and I know there are many different views, I do not claim infallibility; I merely try to honestly state my own views—I plead with them to urge the President not to take this step until we have had an opportunity to fully explore it in every detail; until, as the distinguished Senator from Oregon suggests, we have heard more witnesses in the Foreign Relations Committee. This is not a trivial matter; this is a matter of great importance, both in substance and in procedure.

I say to the Senator from Oregon, in closing, that I am deeply grateful for his observations. I know his mind is open, as it always is, on these matters. I know he will think it through, as he always does; and I appreciate the comments he has made in the course of my remarks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut for raising this issue tonight, for I think it must receive much more careful consideration than we have been able to give it thus far.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 2, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 1, 1963:

U.S. District Judge

Spottswood W. Robinson III, of Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia, vice James W. Morris, deceased.

California Debris Commission

Lt. Col. Robert H. Allan, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U.S.C. 661), vice Col. John A. Morrison, Corps of Engineers, to be retired.

Col. Robert E. Mathe, Corps of Engineers, to be a member and secretary of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U.S.C. 661), vice Col. Herbert N. Turner, Corps of Engineers, reassigned.

In the Navy

Vice Adm. Edward N. Parker, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

In the Marine Corps

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Walter A. Churchill.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Richard A. Evans.
Robert B. Bell.

In the Navy

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Benavides, Jaime M., Jr.
Boyd, Winton R.
Burke, Francis W.
Callis, Charles M.
Climie, Charles F., Jr.
Davis, Robert L.
Dobbie, Robert P., Jr.
Doohen, Donald J.
Doolan, Paul D.
Edwards, Donald W.
Erdbrink, Wayne L.
Fultz, Robert E.
George, Frederick W., III
Greenburg, Rolland E.
Hosp, David H.
Jones, Kenneth P., III
Jones, Roland W.
Kent, Donald C.
Loweecey, Edward D.
Margileth, Andrew M.
McClenathan, James E.
Millar, Jack W.
Mitchel, Robert E.
Montgomery, Duncan O.
Parmelee, Kenneth A.
Peckinpaugh, Robert O.
Preston, Frank "R"
Reinhardt, Roger F.
Sanborn, Neal D.
Spicer, Donald W.
Trier, William C.
Troy, John W.

SUPPLY CORPS

Becker, Charles
Berning, John R.
Bishoff, Jack T.
Breen, Owen J., Jr.
Brosseau, Oswald J.
Busby, John C., Jr.
Byrd, Hugh D.
Cummings, Newell J.
French, Ferris L., Jr.
Gardiner, Charles V.
Hanson, Earl J.
Jensen, Harold B.
Johnson, Carl P.
Keers, David B., Jr.
Kenyon, Lawrence H.
Kovar, Isadore M.
Lascara, Vincent A.
Law, Kenneth S.
Lee, Charles R.
Maggard, Talmadge P.
Maiden, Robert W.
Mason, Stanley R.
Neely, Carroll E.
Neely, Joe B.
Nelson, George C. Q.
O'Connell, Arthur W., Jr.
Owen, Charles S.
Pawson, Richard P.
Rehberg, Jerome A.
Reid, Donald P.
Russell, George D.
Sanford, Edward A., Jr.
Scharf, Samuel L., Jr.
Sherman, Joel H., Jr.
Simpson, Harold W.
Smith, Joe G., Jr.
Starr, Donald A.
VanPelt, James C.
Warren, James A.
Wieseke, Edward M.
Williams, Earl O.
Winkels, Fred C.
Woodard, William K.
Wright, John E. C.
York, Edward S.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Austin, Henry E.
Humphreys, David M.
Jones, Robert Q.
Sneary, Earl D.
Walsh, William J.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Beaver, John F.
Burke, John L.
Christensen, Wayne J.
Graves, Lenson, W.
Harper, Milton J., Jr.
Loeffler, Harry H., Jr.
Scanlan, Melvin E.

DENTAL CORPS

Benson, Lambert A.
Boyne, Philip J.
Brauer, Frank J.
Bruce, Robert W.
Cave, Amos W., Jr.
Courage, Guy R.
Evans, Joseph R.
Fedi, Peter F., Jr.
Firestone, Dale L.
Gossom, John N.
Gunther, Lewis L.
Kratochvil, Frank J., Jr.
Marble, Howard B., Jr
Parry, Donald E.
Perkins, Robert R.
Prince, Clifford H., Jr
Rigterink, Ray A.
Robinson, Jack W.
Sorenson, Adrian E., Jr.
Webre, Harvey P.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Bell, Gordon C.
Beretta, John J.
Edrington, Harold G.
Gilpin, John H., Jr.
Goldman, David E.
Herrmann, Robert S.
Hooper, Robert F.
Jacobs, Joseph J.
Johnson, Calvin F.
Madden, William F.
McGehee, William G.
Sanders, Ernest
Skow, Royce K.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Alspach, Rodger L.
Anderson, Richard R.
Arnest, Richard T., Jr.
Arthur, Ransom J.
Barrick, Richard H.
Beckwith, Frederick D.
Bishop, Calvin F.
Brown, Dudley E., Jr.
Burgoyne, David S.
Cady, Gerald W.
Cox, John W.
Dalave, Daniel P.
Dobel, Gerald F.
Esterly, Harold D., Jr.
Edens, Fred R.
Ewing, Channing L.
Gossett, Clarence E.
Gregg, Paul C.
Hart, George R.
Hinton, Benjamin F.
Horgan, Joseph T.
Johnson, John D.
Johnson, Thomas S.
King, Lawrence M., Jr.
Kirk, Robert F.
Kitrinos, Nicholas P.
Lynch, Mary T.
Meekings, Walter J., Jr.
Mitchell, George D.
Ninow, Earl H.
Nuredini, Skender
O'Connell, Fred H.
Oftedal, Sverre J., Jr.
Osgood, Morgan F.
Ragland, Stuart, Jr.
Richter, Tor
Simpkins, Carl N., Jr.
Sode, Jonas
Spaulding, Raymond C., Jr.
Szakacs, Jeno E.
Trabaudo, Lawrence E.
Trostle, Henry S.
Turner, Thomas W.
Watkins, Tommie K.
Wilson, Almon C.
Wire, George E., Jr.
Wurzel, John F.

SUPPLY CORPS

Anderson, William "B" Jr.
Anweiler, Calvin R.
Armstrong, Edmund S.
Audino, Joseph R.
Austin, Robert C.
Banchart, Robert J.
Barnett, William H., Jr.
Bassing, Bernard H.
Beale, John W.
Benfell, Leonard H., Jr.
Bliss, Roger C.
Borchert, William H.
Braley, Charles R., Jr.
Bray, Walter H.
Bristow, John M.
Broili, Robert T.
Butler, Herbert F., Jr.
Byrd, James L.
Calhoun, Thomas N.
Carlson, John C.
Carmer, Elwood A.
Carrington, James H.
Cecil, William A.
Chadwick, William A.
Chegin, George I.
Chester, Francis J.
Chetlin, Norman D.
Child, Arthur L., III
Colbert, Bryan R.
Coryell, Rex S.
Cosby, Francis B.
Coughlin, James E. M.
Crozier, Wayne R.
Culwell, Charles L.
Daley, Edward J.
Dasovich, Michael
Dickson, Holton C., Jr.
Doddy, William F.
Donnelly, Joseph A.
Downs, Thomas R.
Dunbar, Robert F.
Edsall, Arthur R., Jr.
Edson, Stephen R., Jr.
Edwards, Howard R., Jr.
Ellingwood, Leonard D.
Elwod, Joseph L.
Fabian, Robert G.
Ferrell, Reginald G.
Finn, John F.
Foil, John L.
Forehand, Joseph L.
Frahler, Andrew L.
Funk, Raymond W.
Futral, Hershchel E., Jr.
Garbelinski, Walter
Ghormley, Robert L., Jr.
Gifford, Robert L.
Graziadei, John D.
Growden, Ellwood W.
Haberthier, Jack H.
Hagedron, Lawrence D.
Hamill, William T., Jr.
Hardy, John F.
Hatfield, John H.
Hausold, Robert P.
Heindel, Donald D.
Henker, Donald E.
Higgins, Evertt C.
Hobkirk, Carl M.
Hopkins, Leroy E.
Houkem, Leif A.
Humphrey, Harvey R.
Ingram, Thomas J., III
Johnson, William H.
Kapp, George H.
Kocher, Edward M.
Kolinsky, Jaromir J.
Kulczycki, Alfred S.
Leventhal, Robert S.
Levine, Alan Y.
Lillis, James F.
Linthicum, Walter E.
Martin, Donald V.
Martin, John T.
McCrory, Walter J.
McEnearney, John E.
McGovern, Austin F.
McKeen, Edward N.
Morgan, James P., Jr.
Morphew, Karol M.
Murphy, George A.
Murphy, Ralph F., Jr.
Naismith, James A.
Newman, Carl H.
Nicol, Robert G.
Packard, Harrison G.
Pillar, Samuel A.
Prestwich, John P.
Purnell, Rodney K.
Rampey, Alvin H.
Rendelson, Paul L.
Roberts, Calvin W.
Ryon, George G.
Sartor, Alvis D.
Schmidt, Robert V.
Scott, Harold K.
Selden, Claiborne T.
Sharp, Herbert C.
Slattery, John G.
Smeds, James H.
Smith, Charles M.
Smith, Roy F.
Snyder, William J.
Speer, Wilburn A., Jr.
Stark, Warren H.
Stratton, Ogden K.
Sundberg, Daniel G.
Swanke, Charles C.
Swenson, Darrell E.
VanMalsen, Wesley W.
Vantol, Peter H. B., Jr.
Veazey, John W.
Vogel, William J.
Wagner, Paul F.
Wallace, William E.
Walters, Melville J., Jr.
Webster, Kenneth B.
Welch, Gordon E.
White, Warren P.
Wier, Richard A.
Wilson, Dorsey V.
Witte, Anton L.
Woodbury, Orpheus L., Jr.
Woodworth, Fred I., Jr.
Ziegler, Bryan W.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Barlik, Robert F.
Bodle, Harold D.
Boyd, George T.
Carlson, Kenneth W.
Carnes, John H.
Cohill, John W.
Crabtree, Roger L.
Doermann, Martin J.
Eaton, Hal H.
Frank, Joseph A.
Fulfer, George W.
Gibbons, Alan R.
Griffin, Gordon H.
Hardman, Samuel R.
Hawkins, Elmo M. T.
Hershberger, George M.
Ivers, Victor J.
Jones, Edwin S.
Kirkbride, Donald L.
Leonard, Guy M., Jr.
Little, James S.
McMillan, Robert C.
Michael, Don M.
Nickelson, Jay V.
O'Connor, John J.
Odell, Robert W.
Osman, Robert E.
Prickett, Albert D.
Roberts, Stacy L., Jr.
Robertson, Alla W.
Richardson, Edward L.
Riess, Paul G.
Rogers, Lowell R.
Saeger, Alfred R., Jr.
Seiders, Marlin D.
Sire, Elwin N.
Solomon, Charles W.
Spinney, William J.
Symons, Harold F.
Trett, Robert L.
Vanderpoel, George E.
Vinson, William H.
Weber, Oscar
Weidler, Edwin R.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Anderson, Gordon A.
Bacon, Howard I.
Bafus, Raymond A.
Bibbo, Domenico N.
Bird, David R., Jr.
Birnbaum, Philip S., Jr.
Brown, Warren F.
Cavendish, Lynn M.
Clements, Neal W.
D'Ambra, Rudolph F.
Day, Francis W.
Day, James C., Jr.
Dickman, Robert E.
Dobson, John F.
Dunn, Robert H. P.
Fluss, Richard M.
Galloway, James E.
Graessle, Howard D., II.
Hardy, Richard T.
Hoffman, George L.
Howe, Charles M.
Johnson, William M., Jr.
Jones, Frank W.
Kauffman, Steven K.
Kirk, Randolph
Lemmon, William R.
Loomis, Raymond W.
MacCordy, Edward L.
Marquardt, Walter E., Jr.
Marron, James P.
Marsh, Edward H., II
McManus, Edward A.
Michael, Edwin M.
Nelson, Robert H.
Padden, Thomas J., Jr.
Parsons, John E., Jr.
Richeson, William J.
Schley, Gordon W.
Semple, William H.
Swecker, Claude E., Jr.
Tinklepaugh, Richard L.
Vivoli, Pierre L.
Washburn, Jack E.
Watson, John D., Jr.
Welton, Dexter M.
Wittschiebe, Donald W.
Woodworth, Robert P.
Wynne, William E.

DENTAL CORPS

Amman, Fred M.
Atkinson, Ray K.
Bagby, Robert W.
Baird, Daniel M.
Barrow, Paul E.
Cullom, Robert D.
Davy, Arthur L.
Farrell, Paul E.
French, Gordon K.
George, Raymond E.
Glasser, Harold N.
Hartnett, Joseph E.
Hickey, Loren V.
Hotz, Philip C.
Howard, Roger H.
Janus, John T.
Johnson, Walter N.
Kresl, Bernard F.
Leupold, Robert J.
Lyons, James J.
Mendel, Robert W.
Nelson, Jack D.
Oenbrink, Philip G.
Pennell, Ernest M., Jr.
Sachs, Samuel J.
Schweitzer, John R.
Scruggs, Charles "S"
Slater, Robert W.
Smith, Scott M.
Thomas, Julian J., Jr.
Weber, Irving J., Jr.
Wyda, Andrew, Jr.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Allen, Cleo R.
Allen, Robert V.
Arm, Herbert G.
Duckworth, James W.
Green, Irving J.
Hull, Edward F.
McWilliams, Joseph G.
Munroe, Barbara
Walter, Eugene L., Jr.
Werner, Gordon W.
Williams, Wayne E.

NURSE CORPS

Bittle, Miriam E.
Chelf, Anne J.
Dalton, Marie F.
Dehler, Erma J.
Heimberger, Peggy S.
McCleary, Catherine M.
Miller, Lucile P.
Richman, Anna
Rothermel, Alice M.
Shedyak, Alice M.
Sterner, Doris M.
Tidwell, Dorothy C.
Tomichek, Martha A.
Vitzkievitch, Helen V.
Walker, Ella M.
Yankoski, Adelyn M.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be majors

Barclay, Kenneth K., O65285.
Cory, Rennie M., O65207.
Dean, George B., O87500.
Nachtsheim, Henry J., Jr., O61139.
Replinger, Richard T., O61277.
Woodman, Richard T., O61779.

To be captains

Brown, Beauregard, 3d, O75964.
Brown, Gene L., O87693.

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be colonel

Dunlap, Clarence R., O29975.

To be lieutenant colonel

Barker, James W., II, O30001.

To be major, Army Nurse Corps

Belsit, Hazel, N2122.

To be major, Women's Army Corps

Herbert, Selma L., L47.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be colonel

Benade, Leo E. (MSC), O37433.

To be second lieutenant

Foulds, David G. (MSC), O94388.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Verser, Fort A., Jr. (CMLC), O65321.

To be second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Hockenberry, Earle W. (Armor), O93199.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Ey, Bruce H., O1913356.
Hayes, Douglas W., O967069.

To be captains

Downs, Charles E., O4021304.
Green, James A., O1020383.
Headley, Fred C., Jr., O1936668.
Jones, Albert F. P., O1926754.
Lacy, David W., O4002203.
Lazenby, Ray D.,O4027026.
Malcom, Archie G., O4030824.
Miller, Frank C., O4041972.
Moran, John F., Jr., O4005590.
Norris, William S., Jr., O4003573.
Phelps, John F., O4059967.
Rich, Jordan M., O4026569.
Rose, Harold P., O4033719.
Schwarz, Robert L., O4071249.
Spencer, Joseph L., Jr., O4010822.
Tansey, James, O2274230.
Tharp, Bobby E., O1936371.
Tito, William J., Jr., O4039012.
Ward, Felker W., Jr., O4012341.
Zabcik, Franklin M., O2207177.

To be first lieutenants

Anderson, James P., O5210348.
Baena, George, O2295960.
Bennett, Edward L., O5202119.
Campbell, Jerry P., O5310328.
Daniels, Wesley E., O5304104.
Davis, Wayne B., O5304750.
Dilworth, Robert L., O5306176.
Dolan, Edmund J., Jr., O5005369.
Dunn, Carle E., O5309168.
Eames, Robert F., O5208279.
Flack, Louis E., O4074809.
Mullin, Robert E., O5308594.
Piper, Larry D., O5400818.
Plaster, Roy C., O5307515.
Slaby, Charles O., Jr., O5508891.
Thomas, Dale D., O5310694.
Torrans, Michael E., O5408257.
Trebbe, John M., O5307546.
Westmoreland, Verlon E., O4025892.
Williams, Michael K., O5704557.

To be second lieutenants

Alligood, Ray L., Jr., O5211475.
Amlong, Thomas K., O2307531.
Binzer, Solomon V., O5701829.
Buttner, Peter, O5009441.
Canavan, Thomas J., Jr., O5210701.
Drum, Ted E., O5309902.
Eggleston, Daniel M., Jr., O5215608.
Evans, Donald A., O5315208.
Hollis, Glenn D., O5411751.
Jones, Theodore S., O5209023.
Kara, Miles L., O5515245.
Kish, Joseph P., O5514076.
LaBay, Paul H. M., III, O5008657.
Lambert, Jerry V., O5007216.
Langley, Larry L., O5405857.
Millet, James S., O5705940.
Paul, Gerald D., O5410416.
Poole, Joseph L., O5310929.
Ray, David E., O5515698.
Richardson, Johnny L., O5405932.
Richardson, Joseph L., O5314741.
Riley, James E., O5412878.
Sandquist, David L., O5513497.
Schaibly, John W., O5211204.
Spicuzza, William L., O5211869.
Staten, Eugene B., O5213078.
Stepan, Jacob F., O5707611.
Swan, Dayle L., O5503188.
Tipton, James D., O2306830.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, and 3294.

To be major, Dental Corps

Norlind, Gunnar, O1933975.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Adams, John C., O4027880.
Atwood, Robert B., Jr., O5301104.
Byzewski, Lewis R., O5501238.
Conley, Patrick J., O4055622.
Endicott, William R., O5518400.
Hart, Richard I., O5500586.
Jones, Richard A., O5501264.
Krakowiak, Francis J.
LeBourdais, Robert L., O5213670.
Nelson, Robert N., O5408645.
Rubin, Morton, O5217244.
Shelton, David W., O4076787.
Shepherd, John R., O5202605.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Blechschmidt, George F., O2291585.
Croft, Carl L., O73654.
Donovan, John A., Jr., O5012550.
Holtzapple, Kenneth E., O5212276.
Lipp, Edward B., O5215474.
Love, Jack W.
Peterson, Hugh D., O3045415.
Reisz, Peter B., O5212260.
Smith, Roger H., O5518137.
Witschi, Thomas H., O5013011.
Wright, Robert H., Jr., O5306869.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Blair, James D., O805785.
Coyle, George B., O991737.

To be captain, Veterinary Corps

Anderson, William L., O5500709.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Dietrich, Maryanne T., N901219.
Foltz, Mary J., N2311576.
Morse, Elsie K., N2311932.
Small, Norma R., N2293566.

To be first lieutenants, Dental Corps

Patterson, Jimmie F., O5518915.
Walowitz, Charles, O5210046.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Bowman, Forest J., O5212941.
Nelson, William W., O2313938.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Blight, Edward M., Jr., O5303843.
Calamita, Frank P., O2309199.
Carter, Tom E., O2305300.
Colton, John W.,
Cooper, John D., O2309202.
Hedlund, Kenneth W., O4085567.
Henderson, Robert L., O5306613.
Hering, Herman D., O2309164.
Hollander, Arnold I., O5210028.
King, Everett G., O5408136.
McIver, William J., O5304643.
McNamee, Philip I., O2309406.
Schettler, William H., O5306739.
Stucker, Paul J., O2309177.
Thibeaux, Albert Jr., O5408345.
Whiting, Edward G., Jr., O2309175.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Dudek, Peter G., O2302281.
Edwards, Lewis M., O4027012.

Lanier, Daniel, Jr., O2296609.
Vance, William M., O5213408.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Robinson, David M., O5219966.
Sims, William M., Jr., O2305363.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Cusick, Judith M., N5519079.
Knox, Rhona M., N5411589.
Scott, Lois E., N5707226.
Surowitz, Andrea B., N5411591.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Hill, Arthur E., O5007440.
Hill, Thomas W., O5213442.
Lyons, Gerard A., O2306081.
Martin, Mathis G., O5410388.
Montgomery, Gordon K., O5412504.
Spencer, William R., O1934976.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Coppin, Thomas D.
Sadberry, John R.
Segal, Herbert E.
Waters, Henry J.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Adams, Doye W.
Amos, Albert R., Jr.
Anderson, Dennis K.
Bagley, Philip J., III
Banner, David K.
Barrett, Thomas P.
Benton, Robert B.
Bidwell, Robert L., Jr.
Blakely, William M., Jr.
Bloodhart, Raymond G.
Brown, Kent R.
Caffrey, John P.
Choate, Pat
Corrigan, Robert E., Jr.
Crane, Jay L.
Dueland, Richard C.
Fitzpatrick, Edward A., Jr.
Franklin, William W.
Freeland, T. Clyde
Freemyer, Norman D.
Galster, Robert W.
Getman, Charles L.
Goodwyn, Eugene R., III
Greenlee, Ronald E., III
Haecker, George P. C., O5531598
Hansen, William G.
Harris, James A.
Hawk, Richard V., Jr., O5319275
Hickey, Joseph M., Jr.
Hill, Richard F., III
Hilliard, Tommy L.
Holscher, Richard W.
Ingram, Charles W.
Kasprzyk, Richard C.
Korecki, Eugene M.
Leckey, James G.
Lessard, Paul A.
Levinson, Philip J.
Makarewicz, Theodore W.
Maupin, David L.
Meinke, Gary E.
Monroe, James W.
Nordwall, Paul R.
Pahris, James M.
Perez, Anthony R.
Pierson, J. Terry
Poole, Barry G.
Reese, Thomas S.
Roberts, Terry R.
Sawyer, John M.
Schweitzer, Jeffrey S.
Sheetz, James R.
Stafford, Billy W.
Steinberg, Barry P.
Stephens, Robert F., Jr.
Sutton, Melvin J.
Timmerman, Washington P., III
Warvari, Harold E.
Watz, James H.
Wengert, Walter D.
Winch, Gerald J.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Independence Day of the Republic of Nigeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today Nigeria celebrates the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe; and His Excellency, the Nigerian Ambassador to the United States, Julius M. Udochi.

The Federation of Nigeria is a populous and prosperous country on the southern coast of west Africa. This anniversary is a special one for Nigeria, since October 1, 1963, will also mark the date of Nigeria's transformation into a republic under a new constitution. Nigeria will remain a member of the British Commonwealth, but a President, elected every 5 years by the Nigerian people, will replace the Queen of England as Nigeria's head of state.

The first 3 years of Nigeria's independence have been a transitional period during which the Nigerians have modified and adapted the political structure bequeathed by the British to the realities of independent Africa. A fourth federal region has been created, based on a referendum vote which resulted in overwhelming approval for establishment of the new region. The new midwest region is seen by many Nigerians as the logical outgrowth of an old tribal kingdom; its creation is viewed as a recognition of, and attempt to utilize, tribal solidarity in molding a viable federation.

The democratic Western World is impressed with Nigeria's constitution-writing and nation-building process, for the Nigerians, in modifying the institutions and political framework created by Britain, have built on, not destroyed, their parliamentary heritage. We are wholly sympathetic to Prime Minister Balewa's point of view—that Nigeria must evolve its own type of democracy—and we congratulate the Nigerian constitution drafters on the judicious decisions of the recent constitutional conference. We found particular satisfaction in the conference's rejection of a proposed preventive detention act. It is only too easy for a new country faced with the many difficult problems of developing a national consciousness in peoples of different tribal loyalties to succumb to the temptation of political repression of the opposition. A preventive act provides a good excuse for such repression. Rejection of the proposed preventive detention act confirms Nigeria's dedication to democratic principles and gives evidence of that country's determination not to succumb to the trend to authoritarianism so enticing to new nations.

It must not be thought that Nigeria's transitional period has simply been a period of suspension, of changing gears, for Nigeria has made noteworthy progress in the economic and educational spheres in the first 3 years of independence. Educational facilities at all levels have been expanded considerably since independence, with the result that whereas only 40–45 percent of the total school-age population was attending primary school in 1960, today free and nearly universal primary education is being provided everywhere but in the north where progress has been somewhat slower. The economy has been enjoying a steady rate of growth amounting to an average annual increase in national output of about 4 percent. A 6-year development plan initiated in 1962 is focused on increasing and diversifying Nigeria's agricultural output as well as encouraging additional industry. Already Nigerian petroleum, a rich but until recently largely unexploited source of wealth, has increased in export value from nil in 1957 to $45 million in 1962. Before the end of the year work is scheduled to begin on the nearly $200 million Niger River Dam, one of three major hydroelectric projects planned in Nigeria.

Nigeria's natural resources, her human potential, her steady rate of economic development, and her skillful political leaders have already made her a leader among the new African states. We congratulate you, President Azikiwe, Prime Minister Balewa, and the Nigerian people on the third anniversary of your independence.

Congress Looks at Electronic Data Processing Automation in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks:

CONGRESS LOOKS AT ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING AUTOMATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Remarks by Chairman ARNOLD OLSEN, Democrat, of Montana, Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, before the Washington chapter of the Systems and Procedures Association, September 25, 1963)

When you sent an invitation to our subcommittee for a speaker for your meeting this evening, I decided that I would like to accept the invitation myself. This gives me the opportunity of becoming acquainted with your association, and at the same time telling you something about our work.

My understanding is that you would like me to discuss automatic data processing in the Federal Government and the results of our subcommittee hearings and reports. This is a good subject, and of interest to all of us, but I shall talk about EDP (electronic data processing) rather than ADP (automatic data processing), if you don't mind. In addition, I should like to tell you about some of the other EDP activities of Congress so that you can appreciate how deeply we have become involved in this new technology. With the