orderly development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 8756. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 1 year to 6 months the period for which an individual must have been married (in most cases) in order to be considered the wife, husband, widow, or widower of his or her spouse for benefit purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 8757. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 8758. 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. CLANCY:

H.R. 8759. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of any agricultural commodities to such nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 8760. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code to provide for the training of certain Reserve units organized to serve as a unit; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 8761. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 8762. A bill to validate payments previously made by conservation district employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 8763. A bill to provide a particular designation for the proposed dam and lock now under construction known as the Millers Ferry lock and dam, Alabama; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 8764. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 770. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting nonsectarian prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 217. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HORAN (by request):

H.R. 8765. A bill for the relief of Kenneth York Sue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 8766. A bill for the relief of Ki-soon Park and his wife, Ryo-bong Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 8767. A bill for the relief of Algonac Manufacturing Co. and John A. Maxwell, individually; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 8768. A bill for the relief of Roger and Sandra Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 8769. A bill for the relief of Remedios R. Yankton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 8770. A bill for the relief of Lessie Mae (Saxon) Wilson and Mrs. Beatrice Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

352. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to publishing as a House document a research paper entitled "State Compacts With Foreign Governments, With Congressional Approval, as Provided for by Article I, Section 10, U.S. Constitution"; to the Committee on House Administration.

353. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to various joint United States-Canadian problems; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1963

(Legislative day of Thursday, October 3, 1963)

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

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

Eternal Father, in the midst of toiling days when the constant pressure of national decisions weighs heavily and takes its toll of bodies and spirits, we are grateful for quiet cloisters of peace and prayer where at an altar of contrition we may bow for Thy forgiveness and cleansing. Without Thee, our striving would be losing, for our strength is unequal to our tasks.

Here on this battlefield of ideas and commitments, help us to consecrate ourselves anew to the fulfillment of the aims and dreams of a new world of justice and equality, for which America's sons are even now dying on the far frontiers of freedom.

In today's anxieties and commotions, steady us with the certainty that though willful men imagine a vain thing and though the earth were removed and the mountains cast into the midst of the sea, the Lord of Hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the Senate now operating under limited time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. Under the order of yesterday, the Senate, after having taken a recess, now resumes the consideration of the unfinished business, House bill 4955; and under the order its further consideration will be under limited debate and with controlled time.

The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday be dispensed with, and that it be considered as read.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of the secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Douglas Henderson, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Bolivia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it take a recess until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

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

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield 3 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported yesterday that the United States is the only remaining source for wheat throughout the world.

To newspapers speculating on the possible sale of wheat by this country to the U.S.S.R., this suggests only that we might ask a higher price—cash price, that is.

Mr. President, the big fact that this country alone has the world's surplus

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

wheat should suggest to this Government, not a higher cash price, but, as some of us have already suggested, a genuinely meaningful price for freedom: We sell the wheat Russia badly needs only if Russia makes a real concession to freedom. I have listed a large number of possible concessions, such as removal of Russian troops from Cuba, or knocking down the Berlin wall. Then we make a real gain for freedom. But if we sell for cash, regardless of the price, the gain is sure to be for Russia and communism.

Mr. President, the established fact that this country has the only surplus wheat should put at rest, finally, the big argument that has been used by those who defend this "deal" as a cash transaction: The argument that Russia will get the wheat, anyway.

The fact is that they will not get the wheat, anyway. We alone have the wheat—not Canada, not France, not West Germany, but the United States of America.

Russia will get wheat only if she gets U.S. wheat.

Certainly, Mr. President, this central fact should dissuade this country from selling wheat to the U.S.S.R. at a subsidized price. Such a subsidy would be a gift to Russia, as it is to the nations to whom we now sell our wheat.

In any event, Mr. President, as the New York Times reported yesterday—

> Because of the gloomy outlook in farm production, it is expected that the Soviet Union for the next few years will have to emphasize the production of more food to feed its expanding population.

This means less war production, less big space breakthroughs with military implications, less control over Communist satellites, such as Cuba, who look to the U.S.S.R. as the world's biggest wheat producer to provide their food. It means all this, Mr. President, unless we bail out Russia by selling her at subsidized prices all the wheat she cares to buy, with no concessions that might permit freedom to gain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles, published in the New York Times and the Washington Post, and an editorial from the Drovers Journal, reporting on this country's wheat monopoly and powerful bargaining position in this situation.

I yield the floor.

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

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 1963]

WHEAT SURPLUS DWINDLING FAST—SOVIET PURCHASES SOLVING PROBLEM OF AN EXCESS FOR MANY NATIONS—BASIC SHIFT IS NOTED—THIS COUNTRY NOW HAS ONLY LARGE SUPPLY AVAILABLE—FLOUR ALSO INVOLVED

(By J. H. Carmical)

Trade circles watched with rapt attention last week a mystery melodrama entitled, "Will the Russians Buy Wheat in the United States?"

Despite a statement by Premier Khrushchev that the Soviet Union had acquired enough wheat to meet its domestic needs, there was lively speculation that a large sale to Russia would still be consummated. By the weekend, traders were waiting impatiently for some word from Washington.

Even if no direct sale of wheat is made to the Soviet Union, however, the Russian crop shortage has already caused a fundamental change in the world wheat situation this year.

Heavy purchases of wheat in recent weeks by the Soviet Union have practically solved the wheat surplus problems that have plagued many nations since shortly after World War II.

No large free supply of wheat is available now except in the United States. Faced with an acute shortage of that vital cereal, the Russians have bought all they could.

FLOUR PURCHASED

The first large purchases were of flour in Western Europe. Reports in the trade are that these have amounted to the equivalent of some 100 million bushels of wheat. Of these, more than one-third were obtained from West Germany, with the rest obtained largely from Italy and France.

Involved in these sales of flour by West Germany were some 28 million bushels of wheat purchased from the United States. Some of the purchases of flour in the other European countries probably represented wheat purchased here, which had been sold at bargain prices. Thus, this country already has furnished indirectly a large amount of wheat to Russia.

Australia, which will start to harvest her crop in a few weeks, has sold 58,500,000 bushels of wheat to Russia, all that she felt safe in selling at this time. Argentina, which soon will start harvesting her crop, is expected to have practically no wheat for sale.

Little, if any, wheat is now available for export from Canada despite her record harvest this year. Canada has contracted to deliver to Russia by July 31, 1964, an estimated 239 million bushels. With her other commitments, Canada is expected to be scraping the bottom of her wheat bins by that time.

In the purchase of the equivalent of about 400 million bushels of wheat, the Soviet Union apparently bought all it could before turning to this country. With no more available elsewhere, Russia is now seeking to buy some 110 million bushels in this country.

Since the Soviet Union started buying, the world price has advanced from around $1.60 to $1.80 a bushel. The Russians paid about $1.90 for the Canadian wheat. Although there is some opposition in the Kennedy administration and other quarters to the sale of wheat to Russia, it is understood that about the only real question is that of price.

As a result of the Government's support policy, the domestic price of wheat has been held at some 50 to 60 cents a bushel above the world level. If the price should be at the world level, it would mean that the U.S. Government was supplying wheat to the Russians cheaper than to the people here, but no higher than to other foreign nations.

To make wheat grown here competitive in the world market, the Government has been paying a subsidy of up to 60 cents a bushel for wheat exported in the regular commercial way. Should the wheat be purchased by the Russians from private sources and the Government make its usual subsidy payments, the result would be the same, since the Russians still would be able to obtain wheat here cheaper than domestic users.

The argument is made that Russia is going to get what wheat is wanted either directly or indirectly, and why not sell directly in the hope of improving relations. Any wheat or flour sales made by Western Europe would have to be replaced largely by wheat from this country, since Europe does not produce enough of the cereal for its needs.

It is difficult to determine accurately the food situation in Russia. However, Premier Khrushchev last week termed the situation "difficult" and has demanded that more irrigation projects be developed and that the fertilizer output of Russia be increased.

According to some agricultural experts who have just returned from Russia, much more is needed to strengthen Soviet agriculture than additional irrigation and fertilizer projects, both of which would require years and then a further long period to determine how to use them efficiently.

NEW PLANS IN EFFECT

Apparently, Premier Khrushchev's new plans already are being put into effect. Reports from Western Europe indicate that heavy purchases of fertilizer materials already have been made by Russia and that West Germany, an important factor in that industry, has advanced prices and is not making new commitments to other countries.

Russia has inquired here about plants to make ammonium nitrate, one of the three main ingredients in fertilizers.

This fertilizer ingredient is made from hydrogen gas, largely a product of oil refinery operations, and nitrogen obtained from the air. These are blended in the presence of a catalyst to make the ammonium nitrate.

Since the Soviet Union is the second largest oil-producing nation and has a large number of refineries, the development of an ammonium nitrate industry would be a logical step for the Russians. Other petrochemical operations probably would follow, with the result that Russia might shift emphasis from the sale of oil products abroad to petrochemicals.

Because of the gloomy outlook in farm production, it is expected that the Soviet Union for the next few years will have to emphasize the production of more food to feed its expanding population.

[From the Washington Post]

UNITED STATES, AS LAST MAJOR WHEAT SOURCE, MAY BOLSTER PRICE TO RED NATIONS

(By Frank C. Porter)

The United States is the only remaining source for wheat purchases by grain-hungry oversea nations, the Agriculture Department reported yesterday.

This confirmation of a widely held assumption is expected to bolster the demand of some legislators that any wheat sale to the Russians be at the roughly $2-a-bushel domestic price rather than at the world or subsidized price, which is about 60 cents less.

This reasoning holds that the United States, as the only substantial source of supply, can afford to dictate price and should recoup the 60-cent subsidy paid farmers if any wheat is sold to the Red bloc out of Government-held reserves. The administration is considering sales at the subsidized price.

Meanwhile, Government officials said an administration decision on sale of a reported $250 million worth of wheat to the Soviet Union would be forthcoming in a day or two.

The White House is understood to be delaying its ruling, expected to be favorable, until sentiment in Congress crystallizes in favor of the deal.

(It was also learned that the U.S. Government has been in direct touch with Soviet officials for the first time on the proposed sale, Robert J. Donovan of the Los Angeles Times reported yesterday.

(The first official contact occurred secretly in the last few days. Llewellyn E. Thompson, the President's adviser on Soviet affairs, met with Soviet Embassy officials here to try to ascertain what terms the Soviets intend to offer. Heretofore the Russians had made their overtures solely through American trade channels.

(Exactly what the Russians told Thompson is not known. Reliable information indicates, however, that while some short-term credit may be involved, the Russians will make substantially a cash offer that may run as high as $250 million. Thompson's talks were described by his colleagues as "satisfactory.")

At a foreign policy briefing at the State Department yesterday, newsmen were told that Russia is expected to spend nearly $1 billion for food purchases abroad this year. Hobbled by severe crop failures, the Soviet Union has already committed nearly $700 million for Australian and Canadian wheat.

Administration officials also explained that these purchases are particularly costly to Moscow since the Soviet Union must sell gold to pay for them. Russian production costs of gold are double its worth on the world market, they said.

One spokesman estimated that the U.S.S.R. probably has gold reserves of $4.5 billion to $8 billion. American gold reserves top $15 billion.

The Agriculture report noted that of other major wheat exporters, Canada has sold about all that port and delivery facilities can handle. Australia has sold most of its crop. Argentina's crop doesn't appear large enough to permit heavy exports. In addition to the big drop in Soviet production, the Department said the Western European harvest may be 300 million bushels below last year's.

The flat endorsement by Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon Sunday of wheat sales to Russia has been interpreted as preparing the climate for a favorable White House decision.

[From the Drovers Journal, Oct. 1, 1963]

LET'S NOT BE FOOLED

If we don't miss our guess too far, it is quite likely that Americans are about to behold a grand Indian summer rapprochement with Soviet Russia reminiscent of the great United States-Russian togetherness binge of World War II days. And if such a mood of warm and good feeling develops, as it appears to be doing now, it is going to take an awful lot of individual straight thinking on the part of all Americans to keep a clear image of the Communists as the ruthless apostles of totalitarianism that they really are.

Apologists and fuzzy thinkers are already painting the big picture, trying to gloss over the deficiencies of dictatorships on the way to making them more acceptable to good Americans.

For example, a nationally respected news commentator recently noted that Russia is probably headed for a bad harvest, but that "in all fairness," much of the blame must be attributed to "the poor climate." He failed to mention, however, that the poor harvest in prospect will be the fifth in a row, and if it weren't for the opening up of new lands to cultivation, Russian agriculture could be said to be in a virtual state of stagnation.

Experts, however, are not limited to this apology for Russian farm failures. They point out that "Soviet farming is much less abundantly supplied with tractors and other farm implements, fertilizer, herbicides, fungicides, etc.—in short, with capital and modern technology," than we are. Nothing is said, of course, of the fact that the Russians have had the same 45 years that we have had to develop all these things, but they have not done so.

These and other apologies for Russain failures usually lead up to the classic general apology of all. That is that the Communists (not just Russians, but all Communists) have been really just misguided. They are like adolescent boys and are merely in a stage in their progress toward common-sense adulthood. It is implied that once they see the light, they will, of course, all become free enterprisers. All it takes on our part is reasonableness and good will.

But this is utter nonsense. We know by their own statements that Communists are dedicated to dictatorship of the proletariat, which can be conveniently shortened to dictatorship, period. We know that in actual fact, privileged classes of gangsters operate Communist countries, and that these gangsters are ruthless, cunning, utterly self-serving, faithless, and unreliable. And we must not fall for their bunk—especially when they talk about agriculture.

Let's not forget that the Canadians have a poor climate for raising food, too. But they have managed to come up with huge wheat surpluses. Let's not forget that the Scandinavian countries have a northern clime and a Socialist bent, yet they manage societies of abundance.

Let's not forget that the Russians have had almost a half century to build an agricultural industry as well as a housing industry, consumer goods industry, steel industry, and armament industry, and so far they haven't matched us in any of these things. Certainly, they have had the same 18 years the Japanese and Germans have had to develop a food industry. But bread is in tight supply in huge Russia today, while overcrowded Japan is self-sufficient in rice—unbelievable as it may seem.

Let's face it and capitalize on it. Communism is a failure as a system. Democracy is a success; free enterprise is a success. Yes, we may have a thaw in the cold war, but communism is still dedicated to the destruction of capitalism, true democracy and liberty. Let's not rush to bail the Communists out of their troubles—food troubles or otherwise—unless it is to our real advantage. Let's keep our heads and remember that the last time we were all good friends, the Russians stole half of Germany, most of the Balkans, took a Japanese island, and declared they won the war by themselves. Since then, they have tried to run us out of Berlin; they have put a base at our backdoor; and have threatened us almost without ceasing. It takes more than one swallow to make a summer. It should take more than one test ban treaty and one Canadian wheat deal to make a Communist a good guy.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY C. McPHERSON

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, yesterday, several Senators expressed their appreciation of the services of Harry McPherson, who has left the Senate and his position of general counsel for the Democratic policy committee, to enter service in the Department of the Army.

I wish to associate myself with all the things that were said about Mr. McPherson. He is one of the most gifted young men I have met in recent years. He was a very valued servant of the Senate, a man of character and integrity. Even when a Senator knew that his views did not coincide with those of Mr. McPherson, one trusted him implicitly in any matter of advice or in any matter of research.

He will be missed in the Senate. I extend to him my very best wishes for success in his new position.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield me 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 1 minute on the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am pleased to note the widespread support throughout the United States for selling our surplus wheat to Russia for gold or hard currency. The support in North Dakota comes from all shades of political thinking—conservative, middle-of-the-road, and liberal—from farmers, businessmen, professional men, and others.

At the present time, nearly all of the approximately 200 food commodities produced in the United States are available to the Russians; only wheat, cotton, and about two other farm commodities are not now available at world prices to the Russians.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial—from the Bismarck Tribune of October 5, 1963—entitled "Wheat Deal Considerations;" one—from the Fargo Forum of October 5, 1963—entitled "Wheat Won't Lift Nikita Off His Self-Made Hook;" and another—from the Fargo Forum of October 6, 1963—entitled "Law of Supply and Demand Spurs Wheat Sale to Russ."

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

[From the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, Oct. 5, 1963]

WHEAT DEAL CONSIDERATIONS

As usual, irrational emotions cloud the issue in any discussion of such a matter as sale of U.S. wheat to Russia.

Although it is good and proper to do humanitarian deeds when such deeds are not in conflict with the national interest, the basic and main reason for selling wheat to Russia would be to benefit the United States—not Russia.

If we refuse to do something that might possibly benefit Russia even when we know it is certain to benefit this country more, we injure ourselves more than we aid the cold war enemy.

It has to be demanded that the wheat be paid for in gold, and that there be no side commitments of any kind, of course. U.S. agreement to a sale under any other conditions would amount to betrayal of this country's interests. That we could not approve.

But we have wheat to sell, and we want to sell it. If Russia wants our wheat, and is willing to deplete its gold reserves to get it, instead of buying it someplace else, it is hard to see how it could do anything but benefit this country. And that should be the No. 1 consideration in this as in every other international negotiation: If it's to be to our benefit, we go along; if it isn't, we don't.

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum, Oct. 5, 1963]

WHEAT WON'T LIFT NIKITA OFF HIS SELF-MADE HOOK

German experts on Soviet economy differ sharply with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer about the wisdom of selling wheat to the Soviet Union.

Shipments of grain and flour will not in themselves "lift Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev off his self-made hook," they say.

So far as the transactions are for cash or short-term credits, they say, they actually may complicate the Soviet leader's problems and increase the pressures for eventual political concessions to the West.

Only if the Soviets were granted long-term credits on generous conditions could Khrushchev achieve the kind of relief he seems to be seeking, says the well-regarded Soviet expert of the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung.

The argument of German experts is based on the premise that Khrushchev has been and will be compelled to sell Soviet gold in large quantities to finance his crash program for grain purchases.

The very speed at which this is being done is proving to be expensive.

Experts at Radio Free Europe in Munich point out that freight rates from Canada's St. Lawrence River to the Soviet Black Sea ports have risen by 25 percent in recent weeks as a result of the demand for shipping space.

Soviet gold sales in large quantities are serving meantime to depress the world price. Gold prices have fallen 4 cents an ounce on the London market since the end of August, a period in which the Soviets have unloaded some $220 million worth of their hoarded stocks.

Soviet gold sales in September alone were about equal to their average annual sales since 1957.

More fundamentally, a writer in the scholarly journal East European Economy, points out two additional factors.

One is the gold probably actually costs the Soviets about 2½ times the current world prices to produce. Before the Soviet ruble was boosted in value in 1961 the cost of Soviet gold may have been 5 times the world price, writes Michael von Berg.

For this reason the Soviets are desperately eager to pay for their free world purchases in raw materials, primarily in oil. But the market for Soviet raw materials in the Western world is decreasing.

The writer's second point is that the Soviets are compelled to rely more and more on gold to finance the imports of Western machinery and equipment, which still are essential to the ambitious industrial plans.

In their early phases the Communists had a very cavalier approach to the question of gold. Nicolai Lenin once boasted it was not important in a Communist economy.

Before his death Lenin was altering his views, and by Joseph Stalin's time the great importance of gold in Soviet dealings with the West was recognized. Since then the closest official secrecy has been maintained about Soviet gold production and stocks.

Berg agrees in his conclusion with that of the Frankfurter Allgemeine's expert.

In the economic competition between communism and the free world it is Moscow that is pressed for time—not the West.

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum, Oct. 6, 1963]

LAW OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND SPURS WHEAT SALE TO RUSS

What a difference the law of supply and demand makes in trade relations between the United States and Russia. This Nation may soon OK the sale of wheat to Russia.

All kinds of reasons will be given as to why the United States should make such a sale. The Democratic reasons will be different from the Republican reasons. President Kennedy's reasons will be different from those of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, Republican prospect for the 1964 Presidential nomination.

Yes, there are all kinds of explanations, but when you boil out all of the political gobbledygook, there remains this simple economic explanation:

The United States has too much wheat and Russia has too little; in addition Russia has gold with which to pay for the wheat, and the United States is anxious to recover some of the gold it has been paying out in world trade circles in recent years.

Of course, the wheat deal is far from consummated, and the odds are that Russia will come up with some gimmick which will make the deal politically impractical for the Kennedy administration. The Washington Democrats aren't about to sell wheat to Russia if there is going to be a major political backfire from such a trade in the 1964 election year.

The statement by Senate Republican Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN that he is in favor of a wheat sale paid for by gold on the barrelhead doesn't bind the entire Republican Party or all its potential candidates for the presidency. For instance, House Minority Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK hasn't taken a stand on the sale itself, but he has posed a series of questions which should be answered before a deal is made.

The wheat deal may look bipartisan at the start, if it is made, but if anything goes wrong, we can hear the "I told you so" chorus of Republican critics who are against any deal with the Russians for anything.

But the law of supply and demand has been in existence since long before the United States became a nation, and before communism took over Russia. The idea of getting gold for unneeded wheat is so inviting that many critics of Communist Russia now see nothing wrong with such a deal. As a matter of fact, any deal which would reduce the U.S. wheat surplus in return for an inflow of gold would be welcome.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have received a number of communications from persons who, I believe, are familiar with the farm problem in the Communist countries. The communications state that the farmers of the Communist countries are sabotaging the government by deliberately failing to produce food, for the purpose of bringing to an end the Communist domination. The letters I am receiving also state that by selling wheat to Russia, we would sabotage the efforts of the farmers of those Communist nations in their efforts to emancipate themselves.

We are, of course, motivated to a minor degree by humanitarian purposes in urging the sale of this food. We are also motivated by the prospect of obtaining gold for our country.

The decision which, I believe, ultimately must be made, is how we are best to insure the future life of our Nation, and how best we can induce the farmers of the Communist countries to continue their efforts to break down the entrenchment of the Communist governments.

A few days ago I stated my opposition to this proposal. My opposition is growing stronger, rather than weaker.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

HURRICANE AND SUFFERING IN CUBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we have a very disturbing and perplexing problem of foreign policy in connection with the humanitarian aid that ought to go to the victims of the terrible storm that has been raging in the Caribbean. We are a religious nation. The overwhelming majority of our people are Christian. I believe that we have an obligation always to try to put into practice in the affairs of government our religious principles. I find it very difficult to see any moral justification for any policy that does not go immediately to the relief of the suffering of people, even though their governments may be our enemy. I cannot reconcile such a course of action with the teachings of Christ, in which I believe, and I do not share the view that we should wait for the government to ask us to help their people.

So on the religious-moral basis, I would that my Government were proceeding now with full speed to supply the many hundreds, if not thousands, of fellow human beings who are also the children of God, who are suffering untold agonies in Cuba as a result of the storm. The same is true of Haiti. We ought not to wait for Communist Castro to make any plea to us.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

If we wish to move beyond the religious justification for the plea that I am now making, in my judgment it also would be in the national self-interest of the United States, worldwide, in respect to our prestige, for I know of no more effective lesson that we could teach in regard to the superiority of the system of freedom over a system of enslavement than that free men practice their religious principles.

I hope that before the day is out the American people and the world will be reading that we are seeking to bring the relief of medicine, food, and supplies of sustenance to the thousands of Cuban people who are living in such an hour of agony at the present time.

Lastly, we must reach the people behind the Iron Curtain if we are ever going to help them lift the Iron Curtain that denies them access to the world. In my judgment, the best way to weaken communism is to reach people behind the Iron Curtain; and therefore, as a Christian, I suggest to my Government that in the present hour it not forget the religious basis of our form of government.

FIASCO IN GUINEA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the September 27, 1963, issue of the Washington Post there appeared an article written by Mr. Rowland Evans and Mr. Robert Novak, entitled "Fiasco in Guinea."

This article points up the complete failure of our policy in regard to this country. On September 9, I submitted to the Senate a report calling attention to the manner in which, under our AID program, we were furnishing aviation fuel to Guinea while at the same time this country had made a deal with Russia to refuel their planes en route to Cuba. These planes were being refueled from the same tanks in which our foreign aid gasoline was being deposited. Yet in that instance, just as in this case, the State Department hid behind a cloak of secrecy to conceal the real facts from the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Fiasco in Guinea," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, September 27, 1963]

FIASCO IN GUINEA

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

In the steamy West African Republic of Guinea, where the cold war is a daily occurrence, Uncle Sam has just fumbled a golden opportunity to score a few points.

Last spring American diplomats shouted from the housetops—and we reported—how a small American airline called Alaska Airlines, Inc., was replacing Soviet aircraft in Guinea. But until today it has been a well-kept secret that the deal has gone sour.

Alaska Airlines planes were grounded some 3 weeks ago. Although the United States is working discreetly to replace Alaska Airlines with a big American line, the Russians now are flying the commercial routes again. Furthermore, nobody knows whether a $700,000 U.S. loan ever will be repaid.

That is bad enough. But intensive inquiry reveals a breathtaking amount of bureaucratic buck-passing. As usual, the bureaucrats seem less interested in solving the problem than in making sure they don't get the blame for it.

The story dates back to 1958, when Guinea became the first French African colony to win independence. Refused help by both France and the United States, Guinea turned to Moscow for long-term aid.

But Russians are even worse than Americans at administering foreign aid. Guineans are particularly displeased about how much it costs government-owned Air Guinea to operate four-engine turboprop Ilyushins.

So, Guinea negotiated an agreement with Alaska Airlines to sell them less sophisticated aircraft, four-engine DC-4's and single-engine Lockheed.

When Alaska Airlines could not find private financing, AID—the U.S. foreign aid agency—bought $700,000 worth of Guinean notes. In other words, Uncle Sam lent Guinea $700,000.

Trouble began May 14, 2 weeks after the first DC-4 arrived, when it nosed into the ground during a landing. After that unhappy start, trouble multiplied until Air Guinea grounded the Alaska planes, citing safety reasons.

Alaska Airlines claims that Air Guinea is so infested with Communist-bloc personnel that life is impossible for an American line.

The State Department laughing off these charges as something strictly from Ian Fleming, puts most of the blame on Alaska Airlines—but will not give details.

All that is sure now is that the Government's attempt to escape responsibility by calling this a private affair between Alaska Airlines and the Guinean Government just won't wash.

The government could have stopped this deal any place along the line. AID could have refused the $700,000 loan, which was approved 3 days after the DC-4 accident.

Buck-passing reached the ridiculous when an AID official privately sought to blame the Federal Aviation Agency for giving the DC-4's pre-export approval. Told of this, a furious FAA official raised the roof, denying any prior knowledge of the deal. AID then backed down, admitting there was no special report inspection by the FAA (the planes had passed routine inspections, however).

Whoever is responsible, nobody can deny that the fiasco has hurt United States-Guinean relations and helped the Soviets. An international lawsuit, and a congressional investigation are distinct possibilities. Moreover, AID lawyers now are puzzling whether to make Guinea pay up that $700,000.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY C. McPHERSON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois yields himself 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a matter of genuine regret that the Senate loses the able services of Harry McPherson. In my memory, he is by all odds one of the most affable, most agreeable, and most accommodating persons to ever serve the Senate. His departure is obviously a great gain for the Army, but a distinct loss to the Senate. I wish him Godspeed. I wish him well. I know that anything to which he turns his hand will be successful. He is a scholar. He is a young man of high competence. It was a real delight to have him in the service of the Senate and to have the benefit of his wisdom. We shall certainly miss him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join Senators who have spoken so highly of Harry McPherson's personal service to the Senate. Many times, in his official capacity as a staff officer of this body, he has performed service for me that created a great debt of gratitude on my part. He is one of the most able young men with whom I have been associated in recent years. I congratulate him on his promotion. His promotion is our loss, but I am certain that he will perform a dedicated service in his new assignment.

RESIGNATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER AS SECRETARY FOR THE MAJORITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a minute on a very delicate subject. I do not cease to be appreciative of the services and acts of friendship of a friend even though that friend may follow a course of action that leads to a situation that may cause him to resign a position. It is a matter of great regret to me that circumstances have developed that resulted in the resignation from the staff of the Senate of Mr. Robert G. Baker. I know nothing about the merits or the demerits of the controversies and troubles that led to his resignation. But I do know that there is not a man or a woman in this body who over the years has not received some very effective service consonant with and consistent with Mr. Baker's duties as the secretary to the majority. I am very sad about the whole occasion. But I am not one to forget the services and the best qualities of a friend, merely because a situation develops in which he may have made mistakes that result in a course of action, in this instance, that has lost us the services of Mr. Baker. I regret that very much. But I am human enough to say to a friend who needs help that I am not going to walk out merely because a friend may have made mistakes. Anyone may draw from that statement any inferences he wishes to make. Bobby Baker performed many effective services for each one of us in the Senate all within the framework of his duties to us and his obligations to his position as secretary to the majority. I thank him for his services and trust and pray that he will be able to resolve his difficulties in a manner commensurate with the facts and justice which will enable him in the future to make full use of his inherent fine abilities.

I am very sad about the whole thing. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that under the circumstances he followed the wise course of action—in my judgment, the only course of action that should have been followed. That was typical of him, too, because when all is said and done he recognized, because of his long association with the Senate, that, after all, the Senate had to come first, above the personal interests of anyone connected with it.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENTS NOS. 215 AND 216)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the bill H.R. 6143, which is Order No. 535 on the calendar, is a bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education. In my judgment, the provisions of that bill, which permit the making of such grants and loans to universities and colleges which are owned, operated, or controlled by religious denominations, are in violation of the first amendment to the Constitution. When that bill is reached for consideration by the Senate, I propose to offer two amendments to it.

One amendment would provide that grants and loans shall not be made to universities and colleges which are controlled or operated by religious denominations. The other amendment would make it certain that any taxpayer would have a right to have a judicial review of the constitutionality of any loan which the Federal Commissioner of Education proposes to make.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may send forward the texts of the proposed amendments and have them printed at this point in the body

of the RECORD, and also have them printed and laid on the desk to be called up when the bill is reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 215

On page 68, line 10, insert the following: between the word "institution" and the semicolon: "which is not owned, controlled, or operated by a religious denomination, or which has no sectarian religious requirements applicable to its students, to its teachers, or to the members of its controlling board or trustees;".

AMENDMENT No. 216

On page 71 insert the following new section between subsection (c) of section 303 and section 304:

"SEC. 304. Not less than 60 days before making any grant or loan to any institution of higher education under the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner shall cause to be published in the Federal Register a notice that he proposes to make such grant or loan on a day to be specified in such notice. At any time before the day so specified, any taxpayer of the United States suing in behalf of himself and all other taxpayers may bring a civil action in the nature of an action for a declaratory judgment against the Commissioner in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia alleging that the proposed grant or loan is inconsistent with the First Amendment, Fifth Amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution of the United States. Notwithstanding any decision, statute, or rule to the contrary, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to entertain, try, and determine such civil action, and to enjoin the making of the proposed grant or loan in case it adjudges that the proposed grant or loan is inconsistent with the First Amendment, Fifth Amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution of the United States. Upon the bringing of such civil action, the Commissioner shall refrain from consummating the proposed grant or loan and withhold the amount of the proposed grant or loan until the final determination of the civil action. In the event two or more civil actions are brought under the provisions of this section challenging the constitutional validity of the same proposed grant or loan, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia may consolidate such civil actions for the purpose of trial and judgment."

Renumber section 304 on page 71 as section 305; section 305 on page 73 as section 306; section 306 on page 73 as section 307; section 307 on page 73 as section 308.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

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

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I call up my amendments numbered 214 and ask that they be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, line 1, it is proposed to strike out the figure "$153,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$160,000,000".

On line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$198,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$258,000,000".

On line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$243,000,000" and insert "$400,000,000".

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to consideration of the amendments en bloc? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I rise today in behalf of those who cannot now serve in this body, those who do not have the opportunity to vote for those who do have the honor to sit in the Senate of the United States. I rise to speak on behalf of the youth of America.

H.R. 4955, the bill being considered by the Senate, is designed to increase the effort being made by the Federal Government in the important field of vocational education. Its enactment will enable more Americans to receive better training in the skills and trades needed to find and maintain employment. Its provisions will provide countless numbers of Americans with a better way of life.

I intend to support H.R. 4955 as a step toward strengthening the American economy. I have only one reservation in pledging my wholehearted support. H.R. 4955 is only a half a loaf. It does not provide enough of our national resources to cope with the greatest economic problem of this age: providing millions of Americans with the skills needed to keep the wheels of industry humming and idle hands harnessed with adequate, fulltime employment.

Yes, H.R. 4955 is a step forward. But the race for more rapid economic growth and the race against unemployment will not be won by the timid. Just as we would not delegate one beaver to dam the roaring Colorado, the junior Senator from Indiana contends that less than a total effort will fail in stimulating an economy which finds 35,000 workers losing their jobs each week to automation and a total of more than 5 million Americans who are unable to get jobs.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have offered an amendment which would by 1967 implement the minimum recommendations of the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. Note that the President's consultants urged the Federal Government to provide at least $400 million in 1963–64, whereas my modest amendment would postpone reaching this goal until 4 years later. Even this prolonged increase will considerably add to the long range resources provided for vocational and technical training under H.R. 4955 as it is now presented to the Senate.

I am aware, as the committee was, that it is impossible to expect the States to absorb an immediate increment of $400 million. But I do feel that with a graduated program, such as that proposed in my amendment, we can easily attain the needed amount by 1967. I am proposing that for fiscal year 1965 we authorize additional Federal expenditures of $160 million. This is $7 million more than the amount proposed by the Senate committee. I have talked with many who have been connected for many years with the problems and needs of vocational education, and they have assured me that if they can usefully program an increment of $160 million in 1965—and they feel that they can—they will be able to use almost twice as much additional Federal assistance by 1966. I have therefore proposed an authorization of $258 million for 1966. In 1967 my amendment would authorize a $400 million addition to the current Smith-Barden program, to fully implement the program as proposed by the President's Advisory Committee.

It is my feeling that if $400 million is a minimum figure to meet today's needs, we will need at least that much more than Smith-Barden by 1967 when the number seeking vocational education will be far higher.

I urge the adoption of this amendment for the three basic reasons:

First. History has shown that for each Federal dollar expended for vocational education, State and local governments have provided more than $4. Few other programs provide this incentive for increased effort to meet a problem on the grassroots level. Few other programs have such a multiplying effect on the total resources applied in a given field.

Second. The demand for skilled and highly trained workmen has never been greater. The demand for nonskilled workers has never been less. With the rapid technological changes occurring today in industry, this trend not only will continue but also will accelerate. If the 2½ million new workers who will enter the labor market each year of this decade are to find jobs, they must possess the skills required to run space-age machines. If the 35,000 workers being replaced by machines each week and the 5 million of their fellow workers who preceded them on the unemployment rolls are to find means to provide a livelihood for their families, they must be equipped with space-age know-how.

Third. Although the amendment would considerably increase the long-range allocation of resources for vocational education, the increase would be comparatively gradual. This step-by-step, 4-year increase would enable the development of adequate programing and planning to insure the efficient assimilation of all additional funds.

But the pressing need for increased efforts in the area of vocational education cannot be fully understood unless this problem is placed in proper perspective with numerous other problems which confront our Nation today.

It is no exaggeration to say that the boys and girls of today face problems of unparalleled proportions. Our youth face the frequent frustrations of a world which is changing so rapidly that the solutions to today's problems are antiquated and made obsolete by the rush of tomorrow's technology.

What other generation has faced such a population explosion as now faces the United States? In 1945, there were 46 million persons under 20 living in the United States. In 1960 there were 70 million. And by the end of the decade—by 1970—there will be 86 million. These young people are faced with the stark reality of a growing labor force. Twenty-six million new young workers will enter the labor market during the next decade. They will find tomorrow's jobs seriously affected by automation. But already one of four young workers is unemployed, and the unemployment rate for young people is twice the national rate.

But the problem facing American youth today is not solely a matter of numbers. The winds of change are swift and the labor needs of our Nation are changing at a phenomenal rate. For example, the total number employed as electronic technicians in 1960 was seven times the number so employed just 10 years earlier in 1950. In that same decade our need for airplane repairmen was up by 50 percent, and our need for tailors down 50 percent. We employed almost 3½ times as many mathematicians in 1960 as we had 10 years earlier; but only a third as many coal miners; twice as many pilots, bank tellers, and office machine operators, and half as many farmers and fishermen.

Vocational education helps prepare our Nation's youth to meet the changing demands of our society. Here again statistics tell the story. The unemployment rate of those receiving vocational training is less than 5 percent; while the unemployment rate of those in a comparable age group who have not had any vocational training is over 15 percent.

A greatly expanded vocational education program is not a panacea to the trials and tensions facing our young. But most assuredly such a program is an important part of the comprehensive effort which our Government must make to solve problems ranging from automation and agriculture to education and employment.

Yes, the youth of America today face a changing world. The problems are numerous, complex, and interrelated. Only a comprehensive, farsighted approach can solve the problems facing today's youth and make America an even better place in which to live tomorrow.

There are those in this body who say Government should not interfere, should not expand, should not offer assistance to individuals or groups who are incapable of solving critical problems themselves. Yes, there are those who refuse to recognize the need for an active role on the part of our Federal Government.

It seems to me we should recognize that the purpose of the Federal Government is not the proliferation of elaborate Government programs for their own sake. Rather, our goal is the development of opportunity for success in our society, which places its highest value on the twin virtues of individual achievement and social diversity. This diversity is best served by cooperative, unregimented relationships between the governmental partners in our system. The Federal role is best conceived as one of compassionate self-restraint, with maximum emphasis upon the stimulation of State and local activities where possible, and upon Federal programs in those areas where a concerted national effort is clearly required. Each individual citizen must chart his own destiny, but it is the duty of our Federal Government to provide opportunity for the individual to develop to the full extent of his capabilities.

I am concerned about the full development of the resources of youth in this great land of ours. Quite frankly, I am alarmed by those who place more importance on the conservation of gold and silver, oil and water, timber and wheat. I am alarmed by those who apparently ignore the past value this Nation has placed on the full development of its youth, who ignore the imperative national need to continue this policy today.

When we look at the other countries of the world, we realize how fortunate we are. In totalitarian systems young men and women are valuable chiefly as additional increments of power in the hands of the ruling elite. Totalitarian youth policy is successful to the extent that younger generations aid in the achievement of objectives prescribed by dictatorial governments. In principle, such a policy is uncomplicated and easily administered. It is far simpler to manage youth than to enable them to manage their own affairs and achieve their own ambitions.

Still, if we look at other areas of the world, we find that in other societies, youth problems are solved by the uncontrolled interplay of natural forces: death in childbirth, malnutrition, exposure to the elements, disease, and short life expectancies. In some instances, the means of effectively combating these scourges to human life are lacking. In other cases, the will to combat them is absent.

In the United States, as we in this body know, we reject such approaches to youth policy. We condemn the equally unsavory notions that youth is, on the one hand, merely a tool of Government, or, on the other hand, that it is a surplus commodity without value to itself or society, which must live or die by the law of the jungle.

But the development of youth will not result from the mere repetition of obvious truths. Rather, it will follow from a clear understanding of the stakes involved for both youth and society generally, of the barriers to individual development, and of the nature of public responsibility in this field.

Just as our predecessors recognized the need for child labor laws and the Civilian Conservation Corps, so today we must recognize the need for legislation to assist the country's youth toward the fullest development of their capabilities.

No President has better expressed this need than President John F. Kennedy. He fully recognizes the complex and interrelated problems facing our youth today. Consequently in the first Executive message on youth in history he has presented a comprehensive program designed to eventually solve these problems.

The omnibus education bill, the Manpower Training Act, the Youth Employment Opportunities Act, the National Service Corps, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act are all part of the overall program to assist the young men and women of this Nation. Individually these programs will do no more than make a dent in the challenge facing us. Enacted together, they provide a mighty phalanx which will determine the difference between success and failure in the development of our youth.

But the Kennedy administration realizes—and I believe most of us in this body realize—that the final solution to the problems facing our youth must include programs which do more than treat the immediate ills of the younger generation. The strong, economically and emotionally well balanced family unit is the bulwark of our American way of life. Any threat to this structure is a threat to America herself.

As a consequence we see the need for legislation which will strengthen the environment of the American home. For example, the proposed tax cut which provides more job opportunities, and more take-home pay for Dad, is a direct benefit to Junior. Manpower training programs and unemployment compensation for the adult unemployed also have benefits for their families.

It is not difficult to argue that the school dropout problem can be immeasurably improved by a better standard of living in the home, a better education for the parents—the creation of conditions which provide more incentive to achieve on the part of the children.

Certainly the inferior housing, inferior education, and inferior job opportunities which result from discrimination against minority groups have a lasting effect on the children of these families.

Much attention has been directed at the increase in juvenile delinquency and youth crime. According to the FBI, youths under 18 account for 44 percent of the arrests for all major criminal offenses. Twenty percent of the Nation's youth will have police records before they are 18. And last year arrests of persons under 18 passed the 1 million mark for the first time in our history—a 9 percent increase over 1961 arrests.

One cannot condone these acts of violence. It is wrong to seek excuses for law violators. But what effect would good jobs, adequate educations, or suitable living facilities have on these statistics? Certainly many a first offender is the victim of his environment, and yet there are those who say that government has no responsibility to sponsor programs which seek to change this environment.

In many ways the United States is a contrast in irony. To be sure, we are the strongest and richest Nation in the history of civilization. And I wholeheartedly concur with President Kennedy when he said in his inaugural address:

> I would not change places with any other people or any other generation.

But, can we afford to remain content? Can we afford to remain complacent?

American today has more men and women employed than ever before. Yet, can we be content so long as there are over 5 million unemployed?

America has the highest overall standard of living in the world. Personal and corporate incomes are at an all-time high. Yet, can we remain complacent so long as 450,000 children of migrant farmworkers live in poverty? So long as the children of more than 6 million rural families live in conditions close to poverty?

The American system of education is the best in the world. We educate more people in a wider number of subjects than any other nation. Yet, can we be content so long as 1.5 million children sit in overcrowded classrooms? So long as 2 million children attend schools with substandard health and safety conditions? So long as 10 percent of all classrooms are fire hazards? So long as 3 of every 10 children in the fifth grade today will not graduate from high school? So long as 11 million Americans can barely read and write?

Can we as Members of the U.S. Senate, the greatest deliberative body in the world, declare with great conviction that "The youth of America is her most valuable resource" and yet by our very deeds refuse to take every available means to protect and develop this resource?

Yes America is a great nation. The President is dedicated to making it an even greater nation. But, we did not achieve this status by complacency. We will not maintain our status by complacency. And unfortunately some of this complacency exists within the sacred halls.

H.R. 4955, the bill I seek to amend and strengthen, is one of a series of measures designed to strengthen the educational capabilities of the United States. These bills combined are the most important measures before the Congress.

Our system of public education has been responsible for the protection of the basic American freedoms and for the growth and development of our free enterprise economy.

However, although the free enterprise system permits us to place our own price tag on the value of a commodity, we have not yet placed the proper value on education.

What is our education worth to us in America? The value of the educational system in a democracy cannot be calculated in dollars; nor can it be measured simply by the number of engineers, mathematicians, and scientists it produces. A democratic educational system is best evaluated by the degree to which it permits the individual student to assert his individuality, to develop his own capabilities and interests to the utmost. Our educational system seeks not simply to turn out doctors, lawyers, and Indian chiefs; but to encourage the fulfillment of individual goals. Where the curriculum is limited—as it is in so many parts of our country—individuals are denied this chance to assert themselves. Less than 5 percent of our school systems today offer the range or alternatives that this vocational education bill would help them establish. Mr. President, some of my colleagues frequently aver that they oppose government activities which impinge on the rights and choices of individuals. I submit that vocational education, by opening new alternatives to students all over the country, in fact broadens this realm of free choice and thus makes a positive contribution to the cause of individual liberty. How free is the student who has both the aptitude and ability for a given trade, but who is unable to train for that profession because his community cannot provide for such training.

But what does an education mean to the individual American citizen? Education means a job. We know, for example, that 1 out of 10 workers who fails to finish elementary school is out of work, while only 1 of 50 college graduates is unemployed. We know, also, that in March of 1962, workers 18 years and older who were high school dropouts accounted for 64 percent of the Nation's unemployed.

The statistical evidence of the value of education is staggering. For example, the difference between a seventh grade education and a high school education is $128,000 in wages during a lifetime; the difference between a high school education and a college education is $188,000. If present trends continue, by 1970 there will be 8 million children who do not graduate from high school. The total loss in wages to these 8 million individuals over the period of a lifetime is the astronomically high figure of $1,024 billion—a tragic loss to the individuals involved and to the economy as a whole.

In addition to the loss of wages resulting from inferior education the remedial costs of such deficiencies is equally staggering.

Let us look at the costs which all the taxpayers of the country must bear. For example, unemployment benefits total over $3½ billion, public assistance programs total over $2 billion, health and medical payments total almost $3 billion per year. Public loss as a result of crime and juvenile delinquency amounts to more than $2 billion per year. It is true that providing the best educational opportunities will not entirely eliminate this $10½ billion public expenditure. But what more accurate application can be found for the adage "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure"?

The statistics of loss caused by decreased wages plus those necessitated by remedial programs do not tell the entire story. They do not tell the story of greatly needed technicians and specialists yet untrained.

Our universities are producing 3,000 Ph. D.'s in engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences each year. But by 1970 they will need to turn out 7,500 a year. Our medical and dental schools must increase their enrollment from 46,000 today to 75,000 by 1970. Our nursing schools must double their graduates by 1970. We also have the problem of a decline in the number of trained pharmacists and optometrists. Pharmacy graduates dropped from 5,800 in 1950 to only 3,700 in 1962. Optometry graduates declined from 2,400 in 1951 to 1,400 in 1962. Without sufficient numbers of these highly skilled professionals, America will be irrepairably damaged.

What value do we place on education in this country? The most important ingredient of a good educational system is the teacher. Despite this fact, the average salary of classroom teachers in large urban centers in the academic year 1960–61 was $6,096; while the average salary of persons in eight other professions requiring a college degree was more than $3,000 higher—$9,474.

The President's omnibus education bill calls for an expenditure of $5 billion. Unfortunately, only a part of this bill will become law. Yet $5 billion—the amount needed to enact the entire program—is less than half of what we spend in 1 year on alcohol, less than we spend on tobacco, and less than we spend in 1 year on barber shops, beauty shops, and cosmetics.

The American public spends approximately the same amount annually for recreation as it does for its entire educational program, including all Federal, State, and local programs combined.

Admittedly, much of my previous discussion has been directed toward the general problems facing young Americans with particular emphasis on the entire area, the broad area, of education. I have taken this liberty, quite frankly, because it is my deepest conviction that the major problems confronting this country cannot be solved on a piecemeal basis. Rather, a comprehensive, all-out effort must be made.

The vocational education bill before the Senate is not intended as a cure-all. It will not solve all the problems. But it is my contention that no other legislation better exemplifies the need to revise our efforts to cope with the new, highly technical problems of this age.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time allotted to the Senator on his amendments has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield the Senator time on the bill. How much time does the Senator need?

Mr. BAYH. Three minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the Senator from Indiana 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. BAYH. That will be more than adequate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in the past, we have tended to downgrade technical education. It has played what could be called the role of Cinderella to its more glamorous stepsisters in the field of education. It is time that we stopped thinking that vocational education is for the deadheads, that it is the solution for the culturally deprived, or that it is a convenient dumping ground for those problem youngsters whom the regular teachers cannot handle.

This has never been the case, but now, more than ever before, we must look upon vocational education as a part of a balanced, overall program designed to meet the manifold complications of our industrial society. We must look upon vocational education as one means of meeting the need for specialization, as one way

of preparing our youth for the more diversified labor market of tomorrow. In short, vocational training is one means of preparing our young people for useful roles in modern society.

Mr. President, I should like to make one final plea for my amendment, a plea for more resources in vocational education. In this era, when a diploma does not guarantee a job, let us fully implement this program designed to see that each student is "job-trained." "Job-trained" with the skills needed today and tomorrow.

Let us insist that the vocational programs of this country be large enough to do the job. Let us not be satisfied with half a loaf. We must not be content to send a boy to do a man's work—unless, of course, he has been trained in the best skills our great country's resources can provide.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. BAYH. I yield.

Mr. INOUYE. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana. I commend him for his most inspiring message about the youth of America. The junior Senator from Hawaii will be proud to support the amendments offered by the junior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for his willingness to join me in offering the amendment.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate has just listened to the maiden speech of the able new Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. Before I comment on his speech, I wish to apologize to him, first, for the number of times I was interrupted in my capacity of working on the bill on the floor; and second, because I was called to the cloakroom on a matter of policy. But I heard most of the Senator's speech. I congratulate him upon it.

If I were to make a maiden speech this year, I do not know of a better subject than a plea for more support for the youth of America. After all, the greatest resource we have is the potential brainpower of the youth of America.

We sorely need the authorization for the magnitude of appropriation that the Senator from Indiana asks for. I congratulate him on his speech. What he has said to the Senate is what the experts are saying, for the recommendation carried in his amendment is the recommendation of the Presidential panel of consultants on vocational education appointed by the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who is now our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

It would be pleasant if we were in an economic position to appropriate all the money for which the Senator asks. However, I am sure the Senator realizes the position of the Senator from Oregon.

Yesterday we heard a speech on the other side of the issue, a speech by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who sought to reduce the amount of the authorization drastically from that recommended by the committee by an overwhelming vote. Both the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Indiana, in my judgment, have proved by their eloquent pleas the soundness of the position of the overwhelming majority of the committee in presenting its recommendation, which will be most helpful and will be so much better than the situation is at present. It will get us on the way to an improved program of vocational education in the years to come.

The Senator from Indiana knows that I try to be a political realist in the Senate. When I take note of the fact that we are recommending substantially more than is provided in the House bill, but short of what the Senator from Indiana is recommending, the question before us is, Is this a reasonable, conscionable, compromise of the different points of view in the Senate? I respectfully submit that it is. Therefore, I find myself compelled to oppose the Senator's amendments. Nevertheless, he has made an eloquent, able record in support of the principle of the program.

I understand the position of the Senator from Indiana to be that he will not press his amendments, in view of the situation in which the committee finds itself. However, I thought he ought to know of the high regard in which I hold him, his speech, and his recommendation. I hope that in the years to come we may reach the figure that the Senator from Indiana has recommended.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield me 1 minute, to enable me to respond to his remarks?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the leadership the Senator from Oregon has exhibited in making what I have described in my remarks as a considerable step forward; and I share his concern with economic conditions and the condition of the budget.

The reason why I proposed this amendment in all seriousness was that it seemed to me that this is one area where, by investing more money in resources, we have better than a 50–50 chance to get more than our money back. As I pointed out, the State and local governments spend $4 for every $1 spent by the Federal Government; and of course the Senator from Oregon is aware of that.

I appreciate his counseling with me on this matter. I hope that, under his leadership, his subcommittee will consider my amendment. The Senator from Oregon will note that my amendment for this year called for the same allocation of funds that his illustrious subcommittee proposed; but I felt that if we could assimilate this large an increase the first year, we could assimilate with great ease additional increments, until finally, in a 4-year period, we reached what the President's advisers have said we could have and should have reached this year.

I do not intend to press now for action on my amendment; but I would ask the Senator from Oregon to use his great prestige in the interest of further consideration of this measure at a later date.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Indiana will withhold withdrawing his amendment for just a moment, in the interest of the time problem, I should like to use some time on the amendment and then yield similar time to other Senators, rather than yield time on the bill.

In reply to the remarks of the Senator from Indiana, let me say that I quite agree with him. Yesterday, I said that in the long run this expenditure is not going to cost the taxpayers 1 cent. In the long run we shall be supporting a program which will make people employable, whereas otherwise thousands of them might be unemployable. If we do not train them for employment in an age of automation, I fear they would be in danger of permanent unemployability.

The school dropouts of today—and there are thousands of them—who remain untrained will find themselves unable to be employed. Today they are unemployable, and cannot contribute to the support of the Nation. They will be a continuing drain on the resources of all levels of government. They will require social welfare benefits, unemployment compensation benefits, and add to the costs of our jails and prisons, because from this group of unemployables there will come a very large proportion of the dissident element of our society who run afoul of the law and thus place an additional tax burden upon the American people.

We must remember also the group of unemployed, for whom we shall have to find jobs. Many of the latter will need training for the upgrading of their skills. This bill seeks to provide for that.

I know of no better opportunity that the Senate will have this year to strike a body blow at the social problems which accompany automation, than the one offered by means of this bill.

However, I point out that this can be considered as a program of loans by the taxpayers, not an actual appropriation of their money without a return of the amount appropriated. Time will prove that these people, who otherwise would be unemployed or unemployable, will be able to get jobs as a result of the training provided by the vocational education and training program, and they will be earning salaries so much higher than any income they otherwise would earn that over the years they will return to the Treasury of the United States, in the form of taxes, many times the cost of this program. The program will enable them to pay large amounts of taxes which otherwise they would not be able to pay.

I have an unanswerable argument on that point, by way of proof which I have used in the previous debates on this subject, because it is undeniable that the educational provisions of the GI bill of rights have not cost the taxpayers 1 cent.

This is so because the earning capacity of a college graduate, over his lifetime, is shown statistically to be approximately $435,000, as compared to $257,557 or about half that amount for a high school graduate who enters the labor force. The differences among the taxpaying ability of the educated persons, the vocationally trained persons and that of those who lack such education or training will

represent so many more tax dollars in the Treasury of the United States that the cost of this program will be repaid many times over.

Yesterday, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] drew to our attention the results of studies made as to the value of vocational agricultural training. These studies were reported on page 99 of "Education for a Changing World of Work" the report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education.

They can stand repetition for they carry conviction. The panel said and I quote:

> High school graduates who have completed 3 or more years of vocational agriculture hold a significant economic advantage over farm-reared high school graduates who have not had such training. An Iowa study of 1943–54 graduates who were farming in 1955 showed that 89 percent of those with training in vocational agriculture were above hired-hand status, 57 percent farmed 161 acres or more, and vocational agriculture graduates realized in 1955 a mean of $7,720 in total gross sales from farming. Of the graduates who did not have vocational agriculture training, 79 percent were above hired-hand status, 48 percent farmed 161 acres or more, and all those with farms realized a mean of $5,788 in total gross products. Thus, vocational agriculture graduates realized an average of $1,932 more in 1955 than other graduates who worked on farms.
>
> A study of the effectiveness of vocational agriculture was conducted in Mississippi in 1959 to find out what effect vocational education had, over a period of 30 or more years, on farming and on other aspects of the lives of the people in the community. Of the 1,090 farmers surveyed, 21 percent (232) had taken vocational agriculture in high school, 48 percent had participated in adult farmer classes, and 16 percent had received all-day adult farmer instruction. Those who received organized instruction in vocational agriculture lived in better homes, achieved a higher rate of production, and participated in more community activities than others.

Both the GI bill studies and the vocational agricultural studies I have just referred to can be cited against my position. On the basis of these arguments the distinguished Senator from Indiana might well ask why I cannot support his amendment at this time. My answer is this: not only do we have a problem in the Senate and in the House, but we also have the greater problem of explaining this situation to the American people, who still do not understand the facts. We cannot go too far ahead of them. However, the fact that we are proposing this amount this year does not mean, I say to the Senator from Indiana, that next year—if public opinion demands it—we cannot amend the existing legislation so as to provide for increased amounts.

I wish to state that I am entirely convinced that once the people in the districts of America begin to understand the value of this program to their communities and to the employment problems in their communities, and the great social and economic benefits that will flow from it, public opinion will demand an enlargement of the program.

We are starting the new vocational program with this bill, if we succeed in our attempt to have the Senate pass it. I am satisfied that, with that start, we shall not need to worry about the future of the program, so far as further increase is concerned, because the people will realize its value and will demand its expansion.

So I believe this is the wisest course for us to follow this year. That is why—it is no secret to many Senators, and I explained it to the Senator from Indiana before we began in this colloquy, when he had not made up his mind about what he would do—it is my position that if he presses for adoption of his amendment, I shall urge its defeat, for the reasons just stated; and if he withdraws his amendment, as chairman of the subcommittee, I shall thank him from the bottom of my heart, and shall give him my assurance that year after year, so long as I serve in that capacity, I shall continue to press for an ever-expanding program to bring educational benefits to the youth of the country, because, as I said in debate yesterday, the potential brainpower of the rising generation in America is the greatest defense weapon we have, and we must develop it so that we constantly keep ahead of Russia in brainpower. That can be accomplished only by means of programs such as this one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota whatever time he desires to have on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for yielding to me, so that I can join other Senators in commending and congratulating the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] for this, his maiden address to the Senate, on a subject of very great importance, not only to the individual citizens, but to the whole Nation and, indeed, to the cause of freedom throughout the world.

I am very much pleased that the Senator from Indiana has become, as shown by his statement today, such a stanch ally of this program of Federal aid to education and, indeed, so strong a supporter of education itself.

I know that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, is indeed heartened by the message the Senator from Indiana has delivered, and is encouraged by the fact that he has in the Senate another powerful force to advance in Congress the cause of education.

The Senator from Indiana is to be commended for selecting this particular subject matter for his area of special interest and special concern, because it cannot be repeated too often that the nation that educates its youth is the nation that has a future; the nation that deals with the great force called brainpower is the nation that has the real power; and every time a boy or a girl is denied a full and equal opportunity for an education to the fullest extent of that individual's capacity to absorb and to learn, so often is the nation denied wealth, strength, morality, and progress.

If the Congress of the United States did not do one other thing than to provide the best schools humanly possible, the finest teachers and the best and most modern facilities for instruction, we would do more for the cause of freedom in our Republic than any other one thing that we have ever done.

Later in the debate it is my intention to place in the RECORD a rather concise history of the programs of Federal aid to education. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] and other Senators will be interested to note that the rise of the gross national product of our country can be traced by the amounts of money that have been invested in education at the Federal, State, local, and private levels. As sure as the sun rises in the east and sets in the west we can trace the rise of the prosperity of America, the growth of our economy, and the increase in our gross national product by looking at how much money we are putting into education. As the amounts of money in education are reduced or in any way inhibited, we see a drop in the gross national product or a leveling off of what we call our economic growth.

The Senator from Oregon has wisely and truly said that today we have thousands of people, young and old, who are inadequately educated either academically or in vocations. Therefore, those people are not permitted to make their real and full contribution to the wealth and strength of our country. They ought to be released and permitted to make their contribution. I can think of nothing that is more unkind and undemocratic than to deny to a person the opportunity to develop himself to the maximum of his capacity and ability. I can think of nothing that more depletes the resources of America than to deny the development of the greatest human resource; namely, the human mind and the human spirit. Today and in the future the real power of America will be the power of the intellect and the power of the mind—simply put, brainpower. That is the real resource. It is more important than our gold resources, our forests, our mines, or the land that we have. The real power, and the real secret to our power, is educational development—brainpower.

The Senator from Indiana ought to rejoice in the fact that by his good judgment he has selected this subject as the project to which he wishes to dedicate his energies, and, indeed, to give his life to during his career in the Senate and as a matter of public service.

I believe the history books of our Nation will have a special chapter for men and women who at an early time saw the importance of improvement in educational facilities, instruction, educational curriculum, and educational programs. The Senator is correct. No nation ever spent itself into bankruptcy by educating its people. The poorest nations are the most illiterate. Illiteracy and ignorance spell poverty and destitution. Education and enlightenment spell prosperity and strength.

Let it be crystal clear that when our Government starts to cut back on expenditures, it may well be cutting its own throat if it cuts in the field of education. Every time we reduce an educational budget, or every time we provide

an inadequate budget, we concede a victory to the forces of fear, tyranny, oppression, and poverty.

I commend the Senator from Indiana. I am delighted that he has spoken up as he has. Earlier today he told me that he would make his speech as his initial major address to the Senate. It is a compliment to him. What a refreshing experience it is to see a brilliant, able young man—a U.S. Senator—take that stand and advocate that course of action.

I salute the Senator from Indiana. I compliment him and commend him. I hope that he will continue to carry on the fight in the years to come, because if he does, he will make a greater contribution to our country than was ever dreamed humanly possible as a result of the fact that he dedicated his life to the education of our people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time remains to the opposition to the amendments of the Senator from Indiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The Senator from Oregon has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was about to yield to the Senator from Alaska. Did the Senator from Indiana wish me to yield to him?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I shall be glad to wait until the Senator from Alaska has concluded. I should like to respond to both the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Alaska desire?

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to have 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, when one of our colleagues makes a speech of unsurpassed eloquence and expresses far more ably than we ourselves can what we would say, we meet the situation by saying that we associate ourselves fully with the able and eloquent remarks—in this case—of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. He has said exactly what I wish I could have said as well as he said it.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] is to be warmly congratulated, not only for selecting his theme, but for presenting it so eloquently. I fully agree with the Senator that the greatest resource in the United States is our human resource. The way to develop that resource is through education. Yesterday in colloquy with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the education bill I said although there were many important priorities—national security, civil rights, taxation, resource development—none of them is equal in importance to education, because education is not merely an abstract objective but it is essential to the building of our economy to take care of the thousands of young people who are unable to obtain employment because they do not have adequate training. Through education we strike at unemployment which I consider our major domestic problem.

I should like to support the amendments of the Senator from Indiana. I have listened carefully to the objections raised by the able chairman of the subcommittee. I point out that there might be a way of raising the necessary money beneficially.

Yesterday in reporting to the Senate on the 10 countries in the Near East, I quoted from an interview given by Dr. Leona Baumgartner, Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and likewise Frank H. Bowles, president of the college entrance examination board. They pointed out the way unwarranted expenditures are being perpetrated under the foreign aid program as a result of our urging upon many foreign countries aid to create educational projects which are unsound or not needed.

The senior Senator from Oregon is well aware, as I am, of the numerous wastes in the foreign aid program. I should like to have him consider—perhaps not for immediate reply—whether we might transfer some of that money that is now wasted and which we are squandering abroad on worthless educational projects in areas where we should not be spending money at all to the benefit of our youth at home. That might be a way of finding some of the money which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] has said should be used for the education of our own youth to give them vocational training and to enable them to obtain employment.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield my remaining time on the amendment to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. I again thank the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] as well as the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] for their kind remarks. What the Senator from Oregon has said about the need for public opinion is true.

I feel also that in my State—and there are those who would say that the people of my State might not be quite as favorable to this proposal as the people of other States—the citizens are finally coming around to the conclusion that this problem must be solved. It has been multiplied time and again by the financial crises which confront all the States. There is hardly a State today that does not have to consider ways to increase taxes, to find new sources of revenue. Why? It is because of the mushrooming numbers of children and the need for increasing resources plowed into the area of education.

In my home community in the State of Indiana, the property tax rate—and the State makes a great effort to permit localities to handle this subject—has reached the point where it is almost confiscatory.

With the burdens resting upon the States and local communities as they do today, we who serve in the Congress must recognize that this great problem, of national interest, cannot longer be ignored.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for giving me his assurance that the committee will delve into the ramifications of my amendments. Since the amendments were designed to project a long-range image of additional emphasis in this area, perhaps with his assistance there will be a good possibility that the amendments can be considered and accepted the next time the Senate acts upon this type of legislation.

I thank the Senator for being so thoughtful and helpful in this regard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Senator does what I believe he is about to do, will the Senator from Oregon yield me 1 minute?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is in charge of consideration of the pending bill; the deputy majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; the distinguished Senator from the far northern State of Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]; and other Senators in extending congratulations and commendations to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], who has now made his first speech after serving 10 months in this body. The Senator has shown great patience and great tact.

I believe the speech was well worth waiting for. I hope, now that the ice has been broken, the Senator will not be so modest, but will contribute more and more to the effort being made in the Senate to pass various worthwhile pieces of proposed legislation. The Senator's record has been outstanding. His contribution today has been most magnificent. The assurances given by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon are encouraging. I congratulate the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader. Certainly, when a freshman Senator hears the remarks made concerning his interest in education which have been made by the stalwarts in the Senate who have complimented me, it is a great honor. I wish to tell all the Senators how thankful I am, and how much I appreciate their remarks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Indiana is withdrawing his amendments?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendments, because of the assurances given me in this regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to withdraw the amendments.

The committee amendment is open to amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 384. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest

grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes;

H.R. 491. An act vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands;

H.R. 3488. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana;

H.R. 3941. An act to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the offset against burial allowances paid by the Veterans' Administration for amounts paid by burial associations;

H.R. 5949. An act to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek compact;

H.R. 6756. An act to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes;

H.R. 7193. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the first union health center in the United States by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union;

H.R. 7235. An act to amend sections 671 and 672 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the Clerk and the Marshal of the Supreme Court;

H.R. 7400. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to authorize the transfer of unused funds from the administrative expense reserve to the contingency reserves of the several health plans under such act;

H.R. 7601. An act for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz.;

H.R. 8265. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Iowa Ordnance Plant Reservation, Iowa;

H.R. 8611. An act to facilitate the performance of medical research and development within the Veterans' Administration, by providing for the indemnification of contractors;

H.J. Res. 335. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December of each year as Wright Brothers Day; and

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 13. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.;

S. 453. An act to change the name of the Memphis lock and dam on the Tombigbee River near Aliceville, Ala.;

S. 743. An act to furnish to the Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Association medals in commemoration of this 250th anniversary of his birth;

S. 812. An act to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretobefore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America;

S. 814. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 1125. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood;

S. 1936. An act authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906; and

S. 1994. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of certain waterfowl feathers and down from the national stockpile.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 384. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8265. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Iowa Ordnance Plant Reservation, Iowa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 491. An act vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 3488. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana; and

H.R. 7193. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the first union health center in the United States by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3941. An act to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the offset against burial allowances paid by the Veterans' Administration for amounts paid by burial associations; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5949. An act to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek Compact; and

H.R. 6756. An act to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7235. An act to amend sections 671 and 672 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the clerk and the marshal of the Supreme Court;

H.R. 7601. An act for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz.;

H.J. Res. 335. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December of each year as "Wright Brothers Day"; and

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7400. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to authorize the transfer of unused funds from the administrative expense reserve to the contingency reserves of the several health plans under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8611. An act to facilitate the performance of medical research and development within the Veterans' Administration, by providing for the indemnification of contractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I support the vocational education bill, the extensions to the National Defense Education Act, and aid to schools in federally-impacted areas.

Since 1917 the Vocational Education Act has been one of the outstanding examples of Federal-State cooperation in a program designed to prepare young men for employment. In this era of rapid change in our economy and employment opportunities, and the increasing demand for specific skills, this legislation is more necessary than ever.

This bill is the positive, sensible approach to meeting the problems of unemployment and providing our industries with the skills they need to improve their competitive position.

In New Hampshire, one of the most industrialized States in the Nation, we have made excellent use of the vocational education program. And the New Hampshire Legislature has approved the construction of more vocational schools which will provide our youth with the opportunity to obtain skills and become employed. In 1962 alone, Federal vocational education funds were matched over 1½ times by the State of New Hampshire and local funds. Combined expenditures in the State amounted to over $739,100 and provided training for 7,600 persons.

Mr. President, let us remember that when the committee was considering the Youth Conservation Corps, testimony showed:

> There are 4 to 6 million people unemployed and at the same time there are 4 to 6 million job openings. The difference is lack of skills.

I voted against the Youth Conservation Corps as I saw no advantage in sending our youth into the woods and bringing them out still unskilled and untrained to take advantage of job opportunities. I do support this vocational education bill because it answers this very need.

Now, turning to the National Defense Education Act, which has proved through the years that it has merit and warrants extension.

Seven New Hampshire colleges and universities participated in the student loan program in 1963, and 2,047 students received loans in 1961 and 1962.

New Hampshire schools are strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction through the purchase of equipment and materials. Enrollments in language courses have steadily increased; all secondary schools will offer French during this school year and more secondary and junior high schools have added complete language laboratories.

In 1962, 18 guidance and counseling programs continued and 8 schools established new programs with full-time counselors.

This past summer, Dartmouth, St. Anselm's, and Rivier Colleges conducted modern foreign language institutes, enrolling a total of 145 teachers.

Finally, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to approve the full 3-year extension of aid to impacted areas.

This program is not only essential, it is just. Through the years we have put virtually every school district which receives this aid "through the wringer" in delaying extension of the act beyond a reasonable time and usually after the school districts have prepared their budgets for the year.

It is about time we extended this program for 3 years and gave the school boards, superintendents, and the taxpayers the benefit of being able to plan on receiving these funds.

Undoubtedly a complete study and review of this program is needed. But this is true of every Federal program, so why should we single out this particular program every year and demand a mere 1-year extension pending a full review? This review has been called for the last 3 years, but has never been conducted. I submit the review can be conducted while the program is in force, and any revisions found to be required can be made.

I am particularly pleased that the committee is recommending a 3-year extension. A bill which I introduced in this session called for a 2-year extension of this aid, but I am glad to vote for the additional year.

In New Hampshire, 40 school districts received $1½ million in impacted aid in the fiscal year just ended. These districts need to know the Congress supports the impacted aid program. I feel this is a good opportunity for us to demonstrate our support of a program that is needed and is right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I speak in support of H.R. 4955, a bill to expand and extend vocational education opportunities, to extend the National Defense Education Act, and to extend Public Laws 874 and 815. I will vote for this bill, and I have no doubt that it will be approved by the Senate, as it has been by the House.

This legislation continues programs which have been in operation for a number of years, and which have been of great importance in helping students secure higher education, in helping school districts in impacted areas, and in helping our Nation improve the quality of education.

Part A of H.R. 4955 authorizes four programs directed to the improvement of vocational education: one would provide continuing financial assistance to States to maintain and extend existing programs of vocational education; one would offer grants for research relating to vocational education and the financing of pilot demonstration projects; one would establish area residential vocational schools near urban areas having large numbers of unemployed young people or high school dropouts; and one would provide part-time employment in public agencies or institutions to needy youths of 15 through 20.

The bill reported by the Senate committee authorizes funds in the amount of $1.435 billion for the first 5 years of operation, as contrasted to the House bill authorization of $630 million for the first 5 years. The President originally requested $92 million for 1 year, and I believe that the House increase for 5 years is ample to meet the needs that have been pointed up in hearings.

Yesterday, Senator GOLDWATER offered an amendment substituting the money authorization of H.R. 4955—as passed by the House—for the amount provided in the Senate committee-approved bill. I voted for the amendment, as a supporter of vocational education, for I believe this is a great hope for our national problem of unemployment. But because the bill, as reported by the Senate committee, is costly, and because I do not believe the vast sums included in the Senate bill could be effectively used at this time, I voted for the amendment. I believe the House figure is sufficient, and if proven needs in vocational education develop there will be ample time for their consideration. I point out that in only 3 months a new session of Congress will begin, where these needs can be considered.

Further, there are other programs which have been approved by Congress from which the training results are only now beginning to be seen. Among these are the Manpower Development Act, and the retraining provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, which I supported. These two programs will have an impact on the problem. They provide funds, and will also reduce the need for the amount authorized by the Senate committee.

Part B of H.R. 4955 extends the National Defense Education Act student loan program for 3 years, and increases the present $90 million authorization to $125 million for this fiscal year, $135 million for fiscal year 1965, $145 million for fiscal year 1966, and $150 million for 1967. There is also a provision raising the institutional loan ceiling from $250,000 to $800,000, which does not affect the total cost of the program. NDEA, which I cosponsored when it was introduced and enacted upon the recommendation of President Eisenhower, provides loans and fellowships, and has been instrumental in helping many young people get through college who otherwise would have been denied the opportunity. Requests this year from colleges for loan funds for students have exceeded the $90 million presently available by $35 million, and this authorization will allow Congress to meet these requests for scholarships and fellowships by including the needed funds in a supplemental bill. When the original NDEA bill was before the Senate, I offered the amendment to provide loans rather than grants for college students, which is fair, and has resulted in savings, and I am pleased that the program has met with so much success in the 5 years since its enactment.

Part C of H.R. 4955 extends Public Law 815, relating to public school construction, and Public Law 874, relating to operation and maintenance costs of public schools in "impacted areas." Several amendments were proposed by the administration when this bill was sent to Congress, but the committee has recommended a straight 3-year extension of the act, and I support this extension.

As one who has supported educational programs since I have been in the Senate, and the particular programs contained in this bill, I am happy to vote for H.R. 4955 today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in support of H.R. 4955 as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

As one who testified before the Education Subcommittee last June, urging improvements in vocational education and extension of the National Defense Education Act and impacted areas laws and as a cosponsor of the vocational education amendments approved by committee, I am particularly pleased that this important measure has been promptly brought up for Senate action.

I have no doubt the bill will pass with overwhelming support, as indeed it should.

For it is an important and urgently needed step forward in strengthening the Nation's schools and educational opportunities.

I am pleased at the assurances offered by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that he will consider further improvements in vocational education. I am pleased also at his assurances that H.R. 4955 is but the first installment of educational measures to come before the Senate during this Congress.

In closing, I wish to commend members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee for their diligence and hard work in the field of education and their leadership in this field. I congratulate the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the committee, and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for persevering on education bills so that the Senate might have the opportunity to vote on this bill.

I strongly support the pending bill and trust the House will go along with the Senate amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes from the time on the bill to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

THE NEED FOR EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in this debate on a highly important public question I do not believe it would be entirely inappropriate for me to refer to the problem of education in the State from which I come.

Twelve years from now 659,000 students will be attending college and university classes in California. A faculty of 44,000 professors, instructors, and teachers will be required for those young students—twice the faculty in all our State colleges, public and private, today.

The annual budget of our great public institution, the University of California,

is now $450 million. Almost half of that comes from grants made by the Government of the United States.

There are three new college campuses preparing for construction or actually under construction at the moment in California. One is in my own county of Orange. One is at Santa Cruz, in the central coastal region. The other is in San Diego. Each new college campus will cost $400 million.

In 1975 the public educational systems of California on a collegiate level will cost $1 billion a year.

The people of California pay a 4-percent sales tax. They pay a State income tax which I believe is higher than that of most States which have personal income tax laws. In addition, the people of my State have approved overwhelmingly bond issues to finance higher educational facilities. Thus, California is attempting to deal with the problem of education. It always has. It always will.

As our population passes the 17 million mark and goes toward what is now conservatively estimated will be 42 million by the end of this century, education continues to be for California, as for the entire Nation, a basic, critical question which obviously must be solved, so that future generations will be able to utilize their brains for the good of this country and for the good of mankind.

But education is not a problem indigenous to your beautiful State of Hawaii, Mr. President [Mr. INOUYE in the chair] or to mine. It is indeed a matter of national concern.

But our concern cannot be alone with higher education. If the bricks and mortar and the talented teachers and administrators are not available at the elementary and secondary school levels throughout America there will be an inadequate reservoir of students with which to fill the junior colleges, State colleges, and private and public universities. The economic growth, continued well-being and defense of our way of life is directly related to the capacity of our country to educate its youth. Opportunity must be available to all who seek it regardless of their race and particular economic circumstance and regardless of whether they aspire to the highest level of graduate work in their chosen intellectual field or to the most skilled level of vocational training. America, and the world needs not only gifted natural scientists but also gifted technicians. Both are essential. Both are included in the bill now before the Senate.

H.R. 4955, as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

First, authorizes a permanent program of financial assistance to the States in order to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education; encourages the development of new vocational education programs through research grants and the financing of pilot and demonstration projects; permits the establishment of area residential vocational schools through grants to States, public educational institutions, and colleges and universities; as well as, through State grants, authorizes part-time employment in public agencies or institutions, to needy youths between 15 and 20 so that they might obtain vocational education training on a full-time basis; and

Second, extends for 3 years—from June 30, 1964—the National Defense Education Act of 1958, increasing the total amount available for student loans and raising the present restrictive institutional ceiling and providing flexibility so that fellowships might be more fully utilized; makes available to the seventh and eighth grades the guidance, counseling, and testing services now supplied to secondary schools; and

Third, extends for 3 years—from June 30, 1963—the impacted area program which has operated for well over a decade under Public Laws 815 and 874, modified only to include the District of Columbia under the program.

Mr. President, I have spoken many times in the Senate over the last decade in support of the impacted area programs. This program is of particular importance in my own State where thousands of people arrive each week from all over America to make their homes. Many of these people are sent to California to serve at a particular Federal installation. Without the impacted area program, the already overburdened property taxpayers would long ago have been overwhelmed by the influx of new defense-connected residents in what but a few years ago were relatively unpopulated areas. Even more important, young people would have gone uneducated. The extension of this program without crippling amendments is essential.

Education is not a partisan problem. Both the platform of the Democratic Party and the platform of the Republican Party recognize a responsibility to improve educational processes in America.

If, however, I may be permitted to be partisan for a moment, I recall with considerable pride that the late great Bob Taft, who was the leader of my party in the Senate, put through the Senate the first general Federal aid to education bill in modern American history.

But, as I say, this represents not merely the wave of the future. It represents the American way of life. Every young man and young woman should have an opportunity to be trained in the skill of his choice and to be intellectually equipped to face the challenges of the nuclear age in which we live.

That is the reason why I wished to make these comments. I thank my friend the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is in charge of consideration of the bill, for permitting me to do so. I ask unanimous consent that an intriguing article published in the July 1963 issue of Reader's Digest entitled "California Builds Big for Education" may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as well as a few of the hundreds of letters and telegrams I have received in support of this bill from business, education, and labor leaders in California.

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

CALIFORNIA BUILDS BIG FOR EDUCATION

(By Ben Hibbs)

On the eastern approaches to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, a flashing signboard ticks off California's moment-by-moment population growth, in figures that grow larger as you watch—like the meter on a gasoline pump.

The signboard is worth noting. Since 1950, California's population has rocketed from about 10,600,000 to something over 17 million. The State's soothsayers forecast 42 million by the year 2000. Any eastern State with industry and population surging in at this rate would view the phenomenon with consternation. Californians, however, who describe their State as "dynamic," seem undismayed. They are ceaselessly making studies of the problems—and opportunities—ahead, planning, building, getting ready.

The foresight and exuberance being poured into this planning can best be seen in the area of public higher education, where the State faces a staggering problem. By 1975—just 12 years hence—it is expected that 588,000 students will be streaming to State and junior college and university campuses. Add the estimated enrollment in California's numerous private institutions and you get the fantastic total of 659,000 students. For all these institutions a faculty of 44,000 will be required, as compared with 20,000 today. To prepare for this dizzy growth, California in the spring of 1960 passed into law its master plan for higher education, which has since come to be regarded as a model throughout the Nation.

Under this plan, California is now building, simultaneously, three huge new branches of its State university. One campus is near Santa Cruz, 80 miles south of San Francisco; another is in Orange County, some 50 miles southeast of Los Angeles. The third, rising a few miles north of San Diego, will be integrated with a small nearby branch of the university which consists of a graduate science school and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

Each campus is being laid out to accommodate an eventual student body of 27,500, the maximum set by the board of regents. Each will become a fullfledged university, with professional schools, graduate training and research facilities. San Diego will be ready for its first undergraduates in autumn 1964, the other two a year later.

Even without its new campuses, the University of California is the largest in the Nation. UC's enrollment of full-time students last fall was 58,616, and its faculty now numbers close to 5,000. Wisely, California does not try to pack all these students onto one campus. When the new branches open their doors, the university will be operating on nine campuses.

Berkeley, the parent campus, and the Los Angeles branch (UCLA) are already huge, with 25,000 and 20,000 students, respectively. The other campuses now operative—at Davis, Santa Barbara, Riverside, San Diego, and the medical school at San Francisco—are smaller but ticketed for immediate expansion in varying degrees. Davis, for example, once an agricultural college, is becoming a full-range university. Among other far-flung facilities, UC operates 70 research and extension stations, 50 farm advisory offices, adult education courses in 175 communities, and 2 atomic research installations.

In addition, California has a fast-growing system of 17 State colleges—several with enrollments over 10,000. The State also gives substantial support to 69 2-year community junior colleges. In sheer numbers, both these systems are larger than the university.

Giantism in education, as in any other area of life, brings its problems. In the mid-1950's the State's higher education complex seemed headed for chaos. Each of the three systems was vocally jealous of its rights, and demanding expansion in line with its own ambitions: Junior colleges wanted to become 4-year institutions, State colleges wanted to achieve university status. There was no strong central planning body to iron out the differences.

Finally, in 1959, a team of eight top-flight California educators was appointed to study the problem. President Arthur G. Coons, of Occidental College, a private institution, was named chairman. A year later, the team turned in a far reaching and decisive report. Adopted almost in full by the legislature, this master plan became law.

The plan lays down clear lines of authority and coordination, states the duties of each system, suggests orderly programs of expansion. Under its provisions, the university will become more and more for juniors, seniors, and graduate students, with a gradually diminishing ratio of freshmen and sophomores. The State colleges will continue to be colleges, but will give graduate work through the various master's degrees and will take part in selected doctoral programs jointly with the university. The community colleges will remain 2-year institutions, giving (1) instruction leading to further college work, (2) academic courses for those who plan to go no further, and (3) strong vocational training to teach the skills for which California's highly technical industrial complex is clamoring.

Perhaps the most important provision of the plan is its firm ukase on the division of students. The university now draws its young people from the top eighth of the State's high school graduates, the State colleges from the top third. The junior colleges must accept any boy or girl with a diploma from an accredited California high school. Students, however, can move freely from one system to another—when they have raised their academic performance to the necessary levels. (Actually, many students eligible for the university attend State and junior colleges from choice.)

Where will California find the horde of additional college teachers needed by 1975? UC has long prided itself on the quality of its teaching and research staff—which includes 11 Nobel Prize winners, more than any other institution in the country. Will quality suffer in the search for quantity? Not in the opinion of Dr. Clark Kerr, president of the statewide university complex. "We'll get the people," he says, "and the quality will be just as good as it is now, maybe better."

The UC chancellors are trying to make college teaching a more attractive career for young people. They are combing lists of retired faculty for still vigorous men, and they are looking hopefully to retired military, diplomatic, and business personnel. But, above all, UC frankly expects to raid other institutions, particularly the big universities of the East and Midwest.

"The East is sending great segments of its population to California," said Dr. Kerr, "and we must have some of its faculty."

The building of the new campuses offers an exciting challenge. The one in Orange County is a good example. This county is among the fastest growing areas in the world. Space-age factories and research installations, flanked by vast housing developments, spread across the landscape. In the middle of this seething activity is historic 93,000-acre Irvine Ranch, an immensely valuable landmass only now beginning to move toward urbanization. Here, on 1,000 choice acres given to the State by the Irvine Co., will rise the University of California, Irvine. Ground will be broken for the first classroom building this fall.

Around the perimeter the Irvine Co. has set aside 10,000 acres for the development of a university-oriented town and residential communities. On the drawing boards are industrial parks, subdivisions, shopping centers, highways, and water reservoirs.

"Just as the land-grant colleges were founded a century ago to serve the rural nation of that era," says Chancellor Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., "so we are building Irvine to serve the urban world today. We expect to develop the closest kind of cooperation with southern California's industrial complex, but this doesn't mean that Irvine will become just another big technological school. Here, technology and culture will not be mutually exclusive."

The plan for the Santa Cruz campus is the bold brainchild of Chancellor D. E. McHenry, formerly dean of academic planning for the statewide university system. On a 2,000-acre site a complex of 15 to 20 residential colleges will be built, each to have its own faculty, classrooms, housing, and eating facilities for perhaps 600 students. Each college will lean toward one branch of learning: history, modern languages, literature, the natural sciences. Typically, the student will get at least half of his instruction in his own college, but will cross the campus to other colleges for courses not offered in his own unit. A university library and other general facilities will be centrally located, and graduate and professional schools will be added as needed. As at Irvine, closed circuit TV cables will connect all buildings.

"We think we have a concept here," said Chancellor McHenry, "that will combine the advantages of the small college and the big university."

At the new San Diego campus, a modified plan of smaller units will be used. Three clusters of four colleges each will be built, and each cluster will operate as a unit. Heading this development is Chancellor Herbert F. York, one of the country's leading physicists.

A real conundrum is whether California's taxpayers can and will support all this panoply of higher education. The annual budget of the university alone is about $450 million. About half of this, however, is Federal money—chiefly for research work which the Government hires UC to do. Thus the university's actual operating budget is about $225 million, and of this about $158 million comes from State funds. The rest is derived from student fees, gifts, and endowment. In addition, UC is currently spending from $50 to $75 million a year on new buildings and facilities. The estimated tab for constructing the three new branches is about $400 million each. By 1975, the operating budgets for California's three systems of higher education are expected to add up to more than a billion dollars annually, about two-thirds of which will come from State funds.

California is a wealthy State with a relatively high level of personal income. With a skyrocketing population and burgeoning industries, perhaps it can continue to foot the bill. The team of master planners say flatly that it can. Despite a 4-percent sales tax and a State income tax already in the middle ranges, Californians last autumn voted 2 to 1 for a large bond issue, chiefly to finance new plants for higher education.

Will California's higher education cosmos become a ponderous learning factory in which the average student loses contact with his teachers, loses his own identity? Chancellor Franklin D. Murphy, of UCLA, an outspoken defender of the big university says, "In recent decades there has been an explosion of knowledge as well as of population. Consequently it is almost impossible these days for the smaller school to offer the enormous range of subject matter that young people need to prepare for useful lives in this complex world.

"The day of spoonfeeding in higher education is past. We must encourage independent study, put the student more on his own responsibility and treat him like an adult, as European universities do."

Since its earliest days, California seems to have been more passionately committed to public education than most States. Ever since it was founded in 1869, Californians have particularly loved and cherished UC. The State constitution gives the university autonomy, there is no political meddling with its management and the university's board of regents is a hardworking, nonpartisan body. Under the warming sun of such boons, the university has flourished. Not surprisingly, it feels equal to the challenge—as do the State colleges and junior colleges, and the Californians themselves.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *Oct. 4, 1963.*

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your active support of H.R. 4955. This legislation concerns programs of critical importance to education in California—extension of the National Defense Education Act, passage of new Vocational Education Act, and continuation of Federal aid for "impacted areas." We are hopeful that you will resist any crippling amendments to this legislation.

MAX RAFFERTY,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *October 4, 1963.*

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your support for companion bill to H.R. 4955 involving funds for vocation education and impact area education funds.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY CHAPTER, NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION.

SAN BERNARDINO., CALIF., *October 4, 1963.*

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request support of H.R. 495, regarding extension of Public Law 815, 864 and 874. Funds are urgently needed to maintain present educational standards in federally impacted areas of this county.

ROY C. HILL,
County Superintendent, MF Schools,
San Bernardino County.

LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS,
July 8, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUCHEL: There is now pending before the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress a bill on vocational education known as H.R. 4955, which was introduced by Representative CARL PERKINS, Democrat, of Kentucky. This legislation was introduced as a separate vocational education bill and states that its purpose is to maintain, extend, and improve vocational education programs. It does not, however, replace, repeal, amend, or change in any form the existing vocational education acts; nor are the funds authorized under the Perkins bill earmarked for any particular phase of vocational education, but, rather, funds can be used for any and all phases as determined by State boards of education responsible for vocational education.

H.R. 4955 is endorsed and fully supported by the American Vocational Association and has the support of State and local vocational educators in California.

Mr. KUCHEL, I am convinced that this is an urgent piece of legislation. The need for vocational education was never greater. With the population influx experienced in California, especially southern California, education in general and specifically vocational education must be supported by Federal funds. Quality vocational education is expensive, far more than the local taxpayer can adequately support. Yet, the need exists as evidenced by our industrial growth and the report of the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education that vividly indicated the need to train youth and adults in gainful occupational skills. For 80 percent of the 26 million youth who will enter the labor force in the next decade without a college degree, the public schools must assume the responsibility and be given financial support to offer these young people adequate vocational training. This can be accomplished by the passage of H.R. 4955.

I would respectfully urge your support for H.R. 4955, the vocational education bill, when it reaches the floor of the Senate.

Yours very truly,

DONALD F. REYNOLDS,
Supervisor, Trade and Technical Education.

LOS ANGELES
TRADE-TECHNICAL COLLEGE,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 5, 1963.

The Honorable THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. KUCHEL: Over the years I have tried to keep you informed regarding proposed legislation that affected the welfare at this school (more than 10,000 students annually), as well as directly affecting vocation education in this Los Angeles area. I hope you realize that Los Angeles city schools do employ Federal funds to an appreciable amount.

Recently, I again studied the content of the proposed Perkins (H.R. 4955) enactment. I believe that it embodies those essentials necessary to put vocational education "on its feet" for the good of our local citizenry and future industrial expansion.

Unfortunately, in the past, the Congress has passed limited educational legislation that neither visualized a complete vocational program nor provided funds enough to more than establish token efforts.

The Swanson report clearly indicates the vocational education needs of our Nation, and, in my belief, we should embody as much of the conservatively stated Swanson report into legislation as the wisdom of the Congress finds practical. The general need for establishing more emphasis upon vocational education at all levels is so apparent that I do not believe it is necessary to labor this point. Continued automation developments, among other trends, will accelerate the need for more opportunity for vocational retraining, skill training and new levels of broad technical training for new occupations that are appearing on the economic horizon.

I do hope you will again review the Swanson report and personally support the Perkins (H.R. 4955) legislation, which I do recommend to be for the long-term good of California and our Nation.

Respectfully,

F. PARKER WILBER,
President.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
October 4, 1963.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your support of H.R. 4955 appropriation for vocational training. The additional funds are needed in this area.

W. J. DE BRUNNER,
San Diego Building and Trades Council.

BROTHERHOOD OF PAINTERS, DECORATORS AND PAPERHANGERS OF AMERICA,
San Diego, Calif., October 4, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS E. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As spokesman for the Union Glaziers and Glassworkers of San Diego and Imperial Counties I would like to request that you support the passage of H.R. 4955 without amendments.

We feel it would benefit our area to have this bill passed.

Truly yours,

FRANCIS J. O'CONNOR,
Business Representative.

MILLS COLLEGE,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Oakland, Calif., September 26, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: The National Defense Education Act is presently scheduled to expire on June 30, 1964, unless it is further extended. I understand that the extension is provided for as a part of H.R. 4955 now being considered by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. I hope you will urge your colleagues on the committee to support the extension of the NDEA and that when the matter comes up for vote on the floor, you will vote in its favor.

With my best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

C. EASTON ROTHWELL.

LAWNDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT,
DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION OFFICES,
Lawndale, Calif., September 30, 1963.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: The financial condition of the Lawndale school district is such that, as a result of defeat of two tax issues within the last 2 years, we face additional cutbacks in services that will result in inferior educational presentation to the children of this district. We are intensely concerned with the status of the Federal aid to education bill which was voted out of the Senate Education Subcommittee on Wednesday, September 11. In light of our present financial condition, we urge you to use your influence with the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to report this bill and we ask that you support the provisions of this bill when it reaches the Senate floor. We are aware of the desirable provisions in all four portions of this bill, particularly, of course, concerning part "C" involving the extension of the impact area legislation of Public Laws 815 and 874. * * *

The amount of money involved for the Lawndale school district has averaged $30,000 per year. In a district where the total budget is less than $3 million, this represents a serious threat to our financial stability particularly when we have a built-in deficit of approximately $50,000 per year, causing us to live off reserves—reserves which have now come to an end.

Sincerely,

MORRIS E. LUSK.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I announce that I cannot yield more time on the bill. I have only 15 minutes remaining.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 69, between lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

(b) (1) Section 10 of such Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 10." and by inserting at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(b) In any case in which the Commissioner makes such arrangements for constructing or otherwise providing minimum school facilities, he may also make arrangements for constructing or otherwise providing minimum school facilities for children residing in any area adjacent to Federal property on which such minimum school facilities have been provided or otherwise constructed, with a parent who, during some portion of the fiscal year in which such education is provided, was employed on Federal property, but only if the Commissioner determines after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency (1) that the provision of such minimum school facilities is appropriate to carry out the purposes of this chapter, and (2) that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children."

(2) The second sentence of such section 10 is amended by striking out "authority and" and inserting in lieu thereof "authority, or".

On page 69, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 69, between lines 12 and 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

(b) (1) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 6 of such Act is amended by striking out "authority and" and inserting in lieu thereof "authority, or".

(2) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 6 of such Act is amended by striking out "employed on such property" and inserting in lieu thereof "employed on Federal property".

On page 69, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the amendment, when read, is very technical; when explained, it is quite simple, when its import is understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. It is my understanding that I have a half hour on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 15 minutes.

Simply stated, the amendment seeks to give the Commissioner of Education, who administers the impacted areas statutes, Public Laws 815 and 874, the same authority in respect to attendance at school of children whose parents work on a U.S. base or post, but live off that base or post, which he now has with respect to the children whose parents work or serve on the post and also live on the post.

Let me restate that, because it is a very simple proposition. The principle of this amendment is to give the same authority to the Commissioner of Education with respect to paying, under the impacted areas program, for the schooling of children who live off the base with their parents, but whose parents work on the base, as he now has with respect to children of parents who both live and work on the base.

The Commissioner says, with respect to the children whose parents work and live on the base, that if they cannot find in the area a suitable or nonsegregated public school, he will build a school on the base for them. But he says he has no such power with regard to the children of parents who work on the base, but live off the base.

Therefore, I am trying to bring both practices into harmony.

The practical point is that only 10 percent of the children in 15 Southern States are involved in the HEW antidiscrimination policy. According to our information, of the 564,000 chidren who go to school there and are the children of U.S. personnel, either civilian or military, only 10 percent, or roughly 56,000, reside with their parents on a base. Hence, the Commissioner says that if he cannot find a nonsegregated school for them, he can build one or provide them with suitable or nonsegregated facilities. But he says he cannot do the same as to the other half million children, and therefore those children are compelled, in many, many instances, to attend segregated schools, which are then aided by Federal tax moneys.

I have offered a number of amendments such as this one, and I assure the Senate that I am just as weary of the process as is any other Senator. The same motion will probably be made to table the amendment as is usually made. Perhaps it will be; perhaps it will not be. Heretofore motions have been made to table such amendments. Perhaps it will be done in this instance. The question is, Why go through this process time and again? In the first place, I have set a ground rule for myself. I am not doing it except for new programs. This proposal is an extension of the impacted areas program for 3 years. We are now proposing to put this same plan into effect until 1966, as it expires in 1963.

It is inconceivable that, with literally a civil rights revolution raging in the country, the United States, with the taxpayers' money, is aiding segregated programs in Southern States—not old programs, or incidents that have happened in the past, but new programs, or extensions of old programs, which thereby become new programs. This is a salient instance of it.

The anomalies involved are fantastic. Let us take this particular case. The Commissioner of Education says he has no authority to find or build nonsegregated schools for those 500,000 children. He says, "I must pay, under the impacted areas program, to segregated schools." He says it specifically. I asked him this question, and I have it in writing, so there is no question about it:

Question. Are Public Law 874 and Public Law 850—

That is, maintenance and construction—

payments now being made to local school districts which practice segregation in their public schools?

That is clear enough, is it not, Mr. President?

Answer. Payments are being made to such school districts. Public Law 874, as presently written, does not contain any provision authorizing the Commissioner to withhold payments otherwise due and payable to local school districts on the ground that they practice segregation.

Mr. President, it is inconceivable to me that this is so and the President cannot stop it. I say he has power under the Constitution to stop it this afternoon. It is a sticky question only in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is tragic, sad, and a shocking disgrace, so far as the United States is concerned, that it is allowed to continue. So, knowing of these instances and seeing them as they come from my own committee, I have voted to report such programs. It would be a distinct abnegation of my duty as a Senator if I did not draw the situation, as best I could, to the attention of the Senate and the Nation.

Hearings were held some months ago on just this issue; an entire day of expert testimony was taken by the Education Subcommittee on May 17. The President has been thoroughly alerted to the facts, and the testimony is clear that he has the power to remedy them. Yet the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has not hesitated to put the same facts—and its contrary policy—in writing.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to me from the Department, dated October 4, 1963, be made a part of my remarks.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., October 4, 1963.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: During the executive session of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on September 25 for consideration of H.R. 4955 you asked certain questions of Mr. Conley, assistant general counsel of this Department, and requested that we furnish you our replies in writing. This we are glad to do, and I am setting forth below the questions as reported by Mr. Conley and our answers.

Question. Does section 6(b) of Public Law 874 authorize the Commissioner of Education to provide education in on-base schools operated by the Federal Government on a desegregated basis to off-base federally connected children (i.e., children whose parents are employed on, but do not live on, Federal property) who now must attend local public schools operated on a segregated basis?

Answer. Section 6(b), in pertinent part, reads as follows:

"(b) In any case in which the Commissioner makes such arrangements for the provision of free public education in facilities situated on Federal property, he may also make arrangements for providing free public education in such facilities for children residing in any area adjacent to such property with a parent who, during some portion of the fiscal year in which such education is provided, was employed on such property, but only if the Commissioner determines after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency (1) that the provision of such education is appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, (2) that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children, and (3) in any case where in the judgment of the Commissioner the need for the provision of such education will not be temporary in duration, that the local educational agency of the school district in which such children reside, or the State educational agency, or both, will make reasonable tuition payments to the Commissioner for the education of such children."

Our interpretation of the word "suitable," as used in section 6(a) of Public Law 874, to exclude segregated education, would apply equally to the use of that term in clause (2) of the above-quoted subsection. However, clause (3) of the above-quoted subsection precludes (except in Puerto Rico, and outlying islands) the on-base education of off-base children for other than temporary periods, unless the State or local educational agency agrees to make appropriate tuition payments. There is, moreover, no authority to construct such facilities for the education of off-base children. Hence, the use of the authority in this subsection without tuition charge has, in actual practice, been limited to situations where the education of off-base children would be of a temporary character; e.g., where a child's parent is moved to a new station in the middle of a school year and cannot immediately be provided quarters on the military base.

Question. Are Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 payments now being made to local school districts which practice segregation in their public schools?

Answer. Payments are being made to such school districts. Public Law 874, as presently written, does not contain any provision authorizing the Commissioner to withhold payments otherwise due and payable to local school districts on the ground that they practice segregation. In the case of Public Law 815, the Department is cooperating with the Attorney General in the litigation of several cases involving such school districts which, if successful, would establish the right of the Government to obtain a court order requiring such school districts, or at least those that have received construction grants, to provide desegregated education to federally connected children, and might permit withholding of construction funds if this obligation were not carried out.

Question. Do the vocational education provisions of H.R. 4955 authorize the Commissioner to withhold grants from State or local educational agencies which practice segregation in the provision of vocational education?

Answer. These provisions clearly require that the benefits of the program be made available to all qualified persons without regard to race, but they contain no specific grant of authority to withhold funds from grantees which practice segregation. The circumstances under which discriminatory practices of one kind or another would warrant a withholding of funds may depend upon legislative history developed in the course of congressional consideration and action on the bill, and upon any judicial precedents which may be pertinent when the question arises in the course of the bill's administration.

Question. Has the Library Services Act been interpreted by the Department as precluding grants for library services which are provided on a segregated basis?

Answer. The definition of "public library" at section 9(c) of the Library Services Act (i.e., a "library that serves free all residents of a community, district, or region * * *") has been interpreted by the Commissioner as excluding any library which discriminates in the provision of library services on the basis of race, creed, or color.

Sincerely yours,

ALANSON W. WILLCOX,
General Counsel.

Mr. JAVITS. Still, the situation persists. I cannot see how a Senator like myself, with all this information at hand, can fail to ask the Senate to act on it if the President does not—and he will not. I say he has the power to do so immediately. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not agree with me as to the power which that Department has. The Department of Defense, the Department of Labor, the Post Office Department, and other departments have acted entirely equivalent to what I am proposing. Why must this Department be an exception?

The former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare [Mr. RIBICOFF], who is now in the Chamber, is the author of the policy about on-base children. He himself offered such a proposal, but he himself, as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, felt bound by the opinions of lawyers in his Department. I cannot quarrel with him about that, but I can and do quarrel with the President who appoints the Secretaries and who has the authority to act.

This whole problem has not been swept under the rug. A few days ago we received the 1963 report from the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. I call the attention of the Senate to page 196 of that report, headed "Discrimination in Education." I want the Senate to know what is happening under the cover of this situation. The Commission reports the following experience, on page 197:

> This has been an embittering experience for many Negroes. For some Negro families, assignments to southern installations require them to expose their children for the first time to segregated schools. In some cases, children must travel up to 40 miles each day to and from the nearest Negro school. They frequently find rundown buildings with obsolete textbooks and equipment, and overcrowded classrooms maintained by inadequately trained teachers. In States such as Mississippi, where 357 of 642 Negro elementary schools do not meet minimal State—

Not National, but State; State of Mississippi—

> accreditation standards, the quality of the education may be so inferior as to jeopardize the student's chances of acceptance when he seeks to enroll at another institution. Segregation has an added impact on both white and Negro families living on military installations. They see their children, who live and play together on base, line up by race to await the arrival of segregated school buses to take them to their segregated schools.

I now read from page 199 of the report:

> The result has been that there are schools adjacent to military installations which are built, maintained, and operated almost entirely with Federal funds and attended almost exclusively by the children of military families, which exclude Negro children.
>
> At one Air Force base in Alabama, Negro children bypass such a school every day on their way to the more distant Negro school. Not only is the school operated with Federal funds; it was built upon property deeded by the Federal Government to the school district in 1955 soon after the Defense Department's policy of integration of on-base educational facilities went into effect. The deed did not require that the school be operated for the benefit of all children.

One further anomaly it seems to me indicates the ridiculousness of everything we are doing. We are extending the impacted areas program; we are authorizing the appropriation. And at one and the same time we are suing in court to desegregate some of the schools to which we are giving money under the impacted areas program and to which we are agreeing that the Deartment of Health, Education, and Welfare is compelled to send children, notwithstanding that they are segregated.

How silly can we be? Suppose I owed somebody $100 and he owed me $200. Would I pay him the $100 and sue him for the $200? I would have to be insane to do so. But that is exactly what the United States is doing. The United States is paying Federal funds to these segregated schools, and then is suing them in court to restrain them from being segregated. It was bad enough when that plan was in effect, up to June 30, 1963. However, that plan has expired. We are now renewing it. We are apparently going to renew it on precisely the same basis. That is what we shall be doing if we renew the plan without my amendment being added to the bill.

Mr. President, it is not only an assault on commonsense and reason, but also an insult to intelligence. That is precisely what the Senate is proposing to do today.

The excuse is given, "Perhaps the suits will yield rulings in our favor." Such suits have been dismissed in Federal courts in Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi. It was held that the Government had no status or standing to bring such suits.

Mr. President, we are living in a topsy-turvy world. The Government, it is said, has no status to sue, but, nonetheless, it does have status to pay money to support such schools. In one case in Virginia the court sustained the suit, and it is now on appeal.

The argument is made, "Let us wait until the main civil rights bill is under consideration. Then we will give the President discretionary authority to withhold money from such school districts." I say that the President has discretionary authority now. He does not need any new authority. He does not need a statute to give it to him; almost every Department has so stated, except HEW. He is not doing anything about HEW's contrary position.

Some Members may wonder why Negroes demonstrate. Mr. President, they can read. They have a few pretty good lawyers; certainly as good as I am. They understand what it is all about. They can read the Constitution.

When Members of the Senate talk about the danger to domestic tranquility in the civil rights revolution, I hope they will think of cases like this. Blatant to the point of stupidity, yet we hide our heads in the sand.

I close upon this note. We are sometimes told that if one of these amendments were to carry, we would kill the bill, and therefore it is bad to offer it.

I am in favor of Federal aid to medical schools, to graduate schools, to dental schools, and to education generally. Therefore, as a liberal—and I am proud of the designation—I am told that I should not offer an amendment which would kill the bill. However, we are engaged in a struggle for the very soul of America, and I believe that struggle is more important than any bills, not merely the bills I have named and which I support. This is an ideal case for doing precisely what I have been advocating. Most of this money goes to Southern States. They get millions of dollars. We do not get very much of this money in my State, or in many other parts of the country. This money will very heavily subsidize southern schools.

That is where it would hurt. Let our southern friends filibuster. That would be fine. Let them be the ones responsible for their not getting the money. This is the ideal bill on which to add such an amendment. If they kill the bill, they kill something they dearly want. I doubt very much that they would do that, although I am not privy to their plans.

For just about every reason one can think of, and not only for the sake of justice under the Constitution, but for commonsense, let us adopt the amendment. I would like to change the policy of the Department, which in my opinion is only tying its own hands by its own interpretation of what the law says. Nonetheless, we face a reality, not a theory. Let us untie the Department's hands, so that they can proceed to do justice to children of parents who live off the base, just as we do for children of parents who live on the base.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

This is really not a civil rights amendment, even though it would have that thrust. It would enable the Department to get out of the entanglement in which it finds itself, and thus be able to do justice to the children who find themselves subjected to this embarrassment, so demeaning to them, in areas where the public school systems are segregated and where the parents have no choice, as left to them by the United States, but to send children to segregated schools. If there ever was an amendment which should be adopted, it is this one.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I wish to say to my friend from New York that I know he would not deliberately put me on the spot. That would be furthest from his intentions, I am sure, because we are too fond of each other. He is a brilliant lawyer, as he has just demonstrated. He has stated the opposition's arguments, which is good legal pleading strategy. However, stating the arguments does not answer them. Therefore I shall have to repeat a few of the arguments that he stated but which, in my judgment, he did not answer.

I plead with him not to press the amendment. I take the same position here as I did in committee. I opposed the Senator's amendment in committee. His amendment was defeated in committee. In due course in the debate I shall do exactly what the Senator from New York said probably would be done; I shall move to lay his amendment on the table. I shall move to lay it on the table

for what I consider to be good and sufficient reasons.

The Senator is a great libertarian. I believe I have demonstrated time and time again that my objectives are the same as his. The Senator from New York and I are coauthors of a general amendment to the civil rights laws of this country which would end all Federal aid to any Federal program in which segregation exists.

I believe that is the sound way to proceed. It is a sound amendment, and it ought to be adopted as an amendment to the civil rights laws. I believe that in the not too distant future such an amendment will be adopted in the great civil rights debate that will be before the Senate.

I opposed an amendment 2 years ago, in connection with S. 1021, the general Federal aid bill, which would have had the same practical effect as the Senator's amendment today. I have opposed similar amendments since about 1947 or 1949 when a public housing bill was before the Senate. I sat on the Senator's side of the aisle at that time, and some of my distinguished Republican colleagues offered an amendment to the public housing law. It was known as a civil rights rider. The proponents of that amendment were different in one respect from the proponent of the pending amendment. They were really opposed to the public housing bill. I asked them whether, if the amendment were adopted, they would vote for the bill.

Of course, they are honest men, and they admitted that they would not do so.

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

Mr. MORSE. In this instance the Senator was not in that same position; but the principle, I respectfully say, is the same, because, in spite of his statement, it is true that his amendment would kill the bill. The bill would never be passed by the Senate with such an amendment added to it. I am going to be a realist. In my capacity as leader of the proponents of the bill, I owe a responsibility to the undertrained in this country, to the boys and girls in this country who need the benefits of the pending bill; and we should not penalize them in connection with what amounts to a civil rights rider on the bill, when the real responsibility of Congress is to measure up to its overall obligation to pass an adequate civil rights law.

I believe we have a duty to enact the needed legislation, to get it on the books, and to reserve our civil rights fight for the major battle that is about to take place. I wish to quote from a statement made by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Celebrezze, which appears on page 228 of the hearings. Secretary Celebrezze was testifying, and was interrogated by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]:

Senator PROUTY. Would you object if a provision were included in the bill which would be applicable to all times which would forbid funds authorized to be appropriated under this act to be sent into a State where racial discrimination existed?

Secretary CELEBREZZE. Senator, I would give you the same answer as we gave you on the youth employment bill, and as I stated in my opening statement, I don't believe that education should be depended on to solve all the sins of the world, and that we should attack that by a frontal bill, and we should leave that to a civil rights bill such as has been introduced by Senator CLARK, because I am convinced that if such a provision goes in a bill we will get no bill. That has been our experience.

So through the action that the administration has taken, through the lawsuits that it has filed in four or five cases, through the fact that there is pending before this distinguished body bills which deal directly with the problem, I would suggest that it be omitted from this bill.

A majority of the committee voted accordingly. I do not need to tell my friend the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] what I suffered in disagreeing with him on a matter of procedure in the handling of a civil rights subject; but that is the real difference. This is basically a procedural difference. Is this the time and place to conduct a major civil rights debate in the Senate, to the sacrifice of educational benefits for tens of thousands of young people all over the country who will benefit from the bill if we succeed in passing it, but whose benefits would be lost if the bill failed of passage? I think not.

I also point out that this is a wide, encompassing bill. The bill includes impacted area legislation; but it includes also national defense education amendments; and it includes vocational education. I do not reflect upon the good senses of the Senator from New York; I merely disagree with him in this instance. I say that good commonsense dictates the course of action I have suggested.

I shall not move to table the Senator's amendment until the Senator from New York has had full opportunity to make his argument. He knows that we have tried to persuade each other, but that it is hopeless. We are nonpersuadable, so far as the changing of our positions is concerned. We are going to have to count it out in the Senate on the motion to lay the Senator's amendment on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. First, there is a distinction between what I am trying to do with respect to this bill and what I have tried to do in connection with other programs, such as the youth employment and mental health programs, and others. It is necessary to offer this amendment, and I have so drawn it in this particular instance, in order to give authority to the HEW to do what it is doing for children who live on the base, namely, build schools and otherwise provide for their schooling. This is affirmative action, not merely the negative action of withholding the funds; although I believe the withholding of funds could just as effectively accomplish the purpose. I do not believe schools are going to persist in their practices if important elements of support are withheld from them. Nonetheless, if this amendment should be adopted in this case, it would allow the HEW to do what it is actually doing for the children on base. This amendment would correct a very serious discrimination within the Federal Establishment.

Children who live on base fare differently from children who live off base. Some—10 percent of them—are going to nonsegregated schools because they have to live on a base; some go to segregated schools—90 percent of them, because they are unfortunate enough to live off base.

The fundamental argument against the amendment is that the program will go down the drain. Is not that the very reason why it has been possible to frustrate and kill civil rights legislation on the floor of the Senate? It is always considered by itself, not in relation to things which are of vital interest. Hence, Senators who oppose civil rights bills with a filibuster—and they are a minority—can always have an edge over the rest of us, because we are fighting the battle. Yet they are ahead; they lose nothing. If they defeat the legislation, they defeat it. If they do not, they do not. They do not lose anything in the substantive program; whereas in this program, they do lose something. This is one case where they can lose something by defeating the bill. Yet we always shy away.

For how long are we going to submit to the tyranny of a minority? That is exactly what it is. There is just as much tyranny, as history has shown for a century, in a minority as there can be in a majority.

The final and very important point of difference is this: It is beyond me to understand why one of the President's departments, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has to follow a policy of dissent, for that is what it comes down to. In the Department of Agriculture there is some dissent, but the consequences are not so great. In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare it is very great.

The situation does not exist in the Department of Defense, in the Post Office Department, or any other Government department. The Department of Defense is the most salient example. Consider the attack mounted against the Department of Defense because of Secretary McNamara's directive with respect to off-base facilities. That Department has not budged an inch. That Department is right. I hope it does not budge an inch and will stick to its guns.

But HEW is a Department that runs a government within a government. The President cannot avoid responsibility for it. The members of his party cannot avoid responsibility for it.

The President was not afraid to make a housing order, not so comprehensive as it should have been, but quite a sweeping order. He made it. Why do we have to bridle at a proposal which affects children and would direct the payment of taxpayers' money into totally new programs? Why must the President be looking over his shoulder to see what is happening in the Southern States on this matter? Why did he, after a time, issue the housing order? In a sense, equality in this instance is even more crucial, because it involves direct payments by the Federal Government to State agencies which are segregated. Under the housing order, Federal credit or Federal insurance was generally involved, which is pretty potent, but it is not getting money on the barrelhead.

For all these reasons, and with great regret, I feel that this battle has to be fought. The minority party has a duty. I am a member of the minority party. The minority has a duty to expose, and a duty to propose constructive alternatives. The minority would not be doing its duty otherwise. It could go down to defeat 50 times. It could go down to defeat but could ultimately prevail. In my judgment, the minority would not be doing its duty unless it exposed this situation, which is what I am doing today. I am trying to point out where the duty lies, where the responsibility lies, and what must be done, particularly in light of the dangerous situation which exists in the country today.

We are not living in the 1940's or the 1950's; we are living in 1963, when bombings, raids, and disorders are occurring, with great fear of more to come. Thus it is our duty to do whatever we can to make certain that justice is done, in order to avoid dread consequences. That is my argument.

If the Senator from Oregon is ready to move to table my amendment, I should like to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Am I entitled to a quorum call?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall ask that there be a quorum call, the time for the quorum call to be charged to neither side.

If I ever committed murder—God forbid—the attorney I would like to have would be the Senator from New York; but he would be defending a guilty party.

I feel, somewhat, that that is the best answer I can make to his argument, which I consider to be the wrong side of this case. The Senator pointed out that the Southern States receive a great benefit under the impacted-area legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the table that appears on page 22 of the committee report, entitled "Public Law 874; Appropriations, fiscal year 1962."

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

Public Law 874: Appropriations, fiscal year 1962

Category and State:	*1962* [1]
Appropriations	$247,000,000
Total entitlements	[1] 246,633,498
Net entitlements:	
Alabama	5,349,576
Alaska	6,808,231
Arizona	5,189,876
Arkansas	1,428,031
California	42,033,957
Colorado	7,163,724
Connecticut	2,457,392
Delaware	259,832
Florida	6,215,166
Georgia	5,592,672
Hawaii	4,938,280
Idaho	1,918,609
Illinois	4,352,845
Indiana	1,282,105

[1] May be changed on basis of additional information.

Public Law 874: Appropriations, fiscal year 1962—Continued

Category and State—Continued	
Net entitlements—Continued	
Iowa	$832,826
Kansas	5,838,375
Kentucky	1,472,530
Louisiana	964,454
Maine	2,062,810
Maryland	9,461,446
Massachusetts	7,131,493
Michigan	1,918,719
Minnesota	501,835
Mississippi	1,840,855
Missouri	2,724,784
Montana	2,186,652
Nebraska	2,757,568
Nevada	1,569,402
New Hampshire	1,320,536
New Jersey	5,974,390
New Mexico	5,172,539
New York	6,058,625
North Carolina	2,781,324
North Dakota	916,227
Ohio	5,615,602
Oklahoma	7,490,344
Oregon	1,176,678
Pennsylvania	5,096,775
Rhode Island	2,218,765
South Carolina	3,809,630
South Dakota	2,425,471
Tennessee	2,511,403
Texas	13,981,061
Utah	2,257,324
Vermont	57,533
Virginia	15,559,386
Washington	9,911,802
West Virginia	141,120
Wisconsin	702,584
Wyoming	931,349
Guam	188,432
Virgin Islands	71,150
Payments to Federal agencies	13,379,770

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first I call attention to the amounts of money that States which are not Southern States receive:

Alaska, $7 million; California, $42 million; Colorado, $7 million; Connecticut, $2 million; Oklahoma, $7 million; New York, $6 million; Oregon, $1½ million.

Mr. President, these are substantial sums that go to States that are not Southern States.

Last of all, let me point out that it is a mistake to believe that a school district that gets impacted area money does not make a contribution in return. In fact, the impacted area money, school district by school district, is only a small proportion of the total amount of taxes paid in each district.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I repeat what I have said many times—namely, that as a matter of legislative policy and sound procedure, I am opposed—and have been opposed for years—to all civil rights riders to substantive legislation. In my judgment, that is not the way to handle civil rights legislation. The way to handle it is to enact a civil rights law, not to proceed by way of this piecemeal approach, because the latter will only result in the death of the legislation that is sorely needed for the benefit of people from coast to coast, and from north to south. Surely that would be the result.

Mr. President, I have been requested by a number of Senators who wish to be called to the Chamber—and I wish to enable them to use whatever time remains—to request a quorum call at this time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time required for the quorum call not be charged to the time available to either side.

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

Mr. MORSE. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] desires 2 minutes. I yield 2 minutes to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the efforts of the Federal Government to enforce school desegregation are handicapped by the contradictory policies and practices of various Government departments. In practical terms, the Department of Justice is bringing lawsuits to enjoin practices financed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In moral terms, the commitment of the Federal Government to the principle of nondiscrimination in publicly supported programs is undermined by continued Federal subsidization of segregation in just such programs.

Strong speeches and eloquent appeals to Governors, mayors, and even operators of private businesses are all to the good. Statements that desegregation is morally as well as legally wrong have my complete approval. But these pronouncements would have much more impact if the Federal Government practiced more faithfully what it preaches so vigorously.

The standard set by the Federal Government has been far from satisfactory. The impacted areas program is only one example, but it is typical of the reluctant, confusing, and contradictory approach of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other agencies to this problem.

There are at this very moment schools adjacent to military installations which are built, maintained, and operated almost entirely with Federal funds which wholly exclude Negro children. The Commission on Civil Rights in its recent report cites one case in which the children of Negro servicemen at an Air Force base near Montgomery, Ala., are excluded from a nearby school which not only is operated with Federal funds, but which was built on property deeded by the Federal Government to the school district.

It is disgraceful to subject an American serviceman to such humiliating treatment. Negro servicemen do not choose their posts, and they certainly have nothing to do with the Defense Department's decision to station more than 46 percent of all Armed Forces personnel in the United States in 17 States which

maintain segregated school facilities. The use of Federal tax funds to support discrimination against the dependents of men who may be asked to risk their lives for their country, is indefensible by any standard of right and wrong.

It is said that some progress has been made since the Secretary of HEW announced in March 1962, that segregated schools would not be considered suitable for children who reside on Federal property. But only a small percentage of dependents live on Government property, and as of last month, the policy announced by the Secretary of HEW more than a year ago has affected only 26 of the 242 segregated school districts where children reside on Federal property and attend schools in the community.

The amendment which is now pending would extend this requirement of nondiscrimination to all schools in impacted areas constructed or maintained with Federal funds. Actually, there should be no need for such an amendment, since the President already has ample authority to require a policy of nondiscrimination in the expenditure of all Federal tax funds. The Commission on Civil Rights has recommended specifically that the President use this power in the impacted school program, and I strongly endorse this recommendation.

The requirement of nondiscrimination in tax-supported schools will not be affected by our action on this amendment. This obligation stems directly from the Constitution, and neither the refusal of Congress to give it legislative expression or the President to give it practical application can alter the situation.

But we do have an opportunity today to reaffirm our commitment to constitutional principles and to compel a reluctant department to carry out the command of equal protection. An affirmtutional principles and to compel a rejection of any attempt to table it will evidence our determination to face up to the civil rights crisis facing our Nation. Billions already have been spent on this form of aid to education. This investment in education is an investment in the future of our country. By adopting this amendment, we can make certain that all the children of America, regardless of their race, enjoy the benefits of this program, due them as a matter of right and justice.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds to thank my colleague from New York for his support, which is typical of the fight which he has been making in the Senate in the monumental struggle for civil rights. If the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] wishes to make a motion, I shall yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the reasons I have already stated in the debate in answer to my friend from New York in opposition to his amendment, for the reasons set forth in the committee hearings, and in the light of the overwhelming majority vote in our committee against the Javits amendment, I move that the amendment of the Senator from New York be laid on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to the committee amendment.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], 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 Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 35, as follows:

[No. 185 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Anderson	Ellender	Jackson
Bartlett	Ervin	Jordan, N.C.
Bayh	Fulbright	Kennedy
Bible	Gore	Long, Mo.
Brewster	Gruening	Long, La.
Burdick	Hartke	Magnuson
Byrd, Va.	Hayden	Mansfield
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	McCarthy
Cannon	Holland	McClellan
Church	Humphrey	McGee
Edmondson	Inouye	McGovern
McNamara	Pastore	Symington
Monroney	Pell	Talmadge
Morse	Robertson	Thurmond
Moss	Russell	Walters
Mundt	Smathers	Williams, Del.
Muskie	Sparkman	Yarborough
Neuberger	Stennis	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—35

Aiken	Douglas	Pearson
Allott	Fong	Prouty
Beall	Hart	Proxmire
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Boggs	Hruska	Ribicoff
Carlson	Javits	Saltonstall
Clark	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Cooper	Keating	Simpson
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith
Dirksen	Lausche	Williams, N.J.
Dodd	McIntyre	Young, Ohio
Dominick	Mechem	

NOT VOTING—11

Case	Goldwater	Morton
Curtis	Johnston	Nelson
Eastland	Metcalf	Tower
Engle	Miller	

So Mr. MORSE's motion to lay on the table Mr. JAVITS' amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion to lay on the table was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I offer amendments to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 69, between lines 5 and 6, to insert the following:

(b) (1) Paragraph (1) of section 15 of such Act is amended in the third sentence by striking out "and (B)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(B) for one year beyond the end of the fiscal year in which occurred the sale or transfer thereof by the United States, any property considered prior to such sale or transfer to be Federal property for the purposes of this Act, and (C)".

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall be effective on and after July 1, 1962.

On page 69, line 6, to strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 69, between lines 12 and 13, to insert the following:

(b) (1) Paragraph (1) of section 9 of such Act is amended by striking out "housing" in clause (B) of the third sentence.

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall be effective on and after July 1, 1962.

On page 69, line 13, to strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 69, line 17, after "shall" to insert a comma and the following: "except as otherwise provided,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Connecticut yield to himself?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time would the Senator like?

Mr. DODD. About 5 or 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is in control of the time in favor of his amendment. How much time does he yield himself?

Mr. DODD. Seven minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the amendment would lessen the impact on school districts of the sale of Government-owned property to private interests.

My amendment would redefine the meaning of "real property" under Public Law 874 which presently offers relief to school districts 1 year beyond the sale of Government-owned housing property to private buyers. I feel this provision should apply to the sale of Government-owned industrial and nonhousing property as well.

The problem which this amendment remedies was originally brought to my attention by the sale, consummated last December, of a number of Government-owned buildings in the Electric Boat Co. compound in Groton, Conn.

The sale of this property had an immediate and devastating effect on the city of Groton and 20 other Connecticut towns where Federal impacted aid was based, in part, on this Government-owned property now in the hands of private owners.

The economic crisis was felt immediately, as anticipated Federal aid was based on the attendance of schoolchildren of federally connected workers as of October 1962. The sale took place after many delays, changes, and modifications, and resulted in an immediate reduction in aid to be received.

Mr. President, it is readily apparent that this property now in the hands of the Electric Boat Co. will be taxed by the city of Groton. However, the tax assessed is not computed until the next tax year, and will not approximate the Federal school aid formerly received when these buildings were Government-owned. Of course, the other towns affected will receive no relief from this property tax revenue.

I feel that the present law discriminates in its definition of "real property" and in the extent of its aid coverage following the sale of such property.

In many instances where there was a sale or disposal of Federal property, the program which caused the increase in workers and their families continues on and the burden on the schools and their facilities is in no way lessened by the sale.

This is certainly true in this case.

The amount of Federal aid, moreover, is markedly reduced without a corresponding increase in taxes assessed against the property sold.

In 1956 an amendment was inserted in Public Law 874 which stated that the provision of the law applied:

> For 1 year beyond the end of the fiscal year in which occurred the sale or transfer thereof by the United States, any housing property considered prior to such sale or transfer to be Federal property for the purposes of the act.

This clause offers partial protection to school districts with a preponderance of "housing property," but offers no relief when the Government property sold is nonhousing. This is precisely what has happened in the sale of this property to the Electric Boat Co., in Groton.

As I have said, this sale has had an immediate and serious economic effect on the school budget of Groton and 20 surrounding towns. These towns and cities, dependent to a large extent on Federal aid to impacted areas, had no way of planning because the sale of these buildings took over a year to consummate.

Mr. President, situations of this type are, of course, not restricted to the State of Connecticut and they can and will occur in many towns and cities throughout the United States as the Federal Government is called upon to dispose of Federal nonhousing property at its installations.

Some might say that relief can be sought under subsection (f) of Public Law 874, "Adjustment for Certain Decreases in Federal Activities." A measure of relief may be possible to some of the towns affected but not to all of them. At the present time, even though the sale of this property took place almost a year ago, eligibility for aid under this subsection has not been determined as yet and the various school districts are suffering because of this further delay and uncertainty.

Of course there is no such relief provision under Public Law 815 and school construction plans for several towns have had to be curtailed because of reduced Federal school aid brought about by the sale of the property.

I feel that striking out the word "housing" and thus making all property eligible for relief extension and permitting the payment of aid benefits "for 1 year beyond the end of the fiscal year in which the sale or transfer occurs" is only simple justice and wise economics in that it provides for intelligent planning and lessens the overall impact of the property sale on the towns concerned.

I submit this amendment at this time and request and solicit the support of my colleagues for an affirmative vote on it.

I think it is an equitable and fair solution to this problem, and I earnestly hope that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon will look favorably on my amendment and accept it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I reply to the Senator from Connecticut, I wish to do two things. First, I should like to make brief comment on the procedural situation confronting us. Many of our colleagues have asked me what the schedule of amendments for the rest of the afternoon is. Some Senators have a very important engagement downtown at 4 o'clock. I have assured them that I will do all I can to protect their interests. I should like to ask now what amendments will be offered. I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] intends to offer an amendment. Does any Senator know whether the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] will press an amendment?

So far as I know at the present moment, the only amendment that remains is the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. Therefore I should say that we shall probably be through by 4 o'clock. Of course, no one can predict what will happen, but I hope we may get through in time so that our colleagues can keep their downtown appointment.

Second, I promised to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. I yield 12 minutes to him.

THE PROBLEM OF CUBA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the problem of Cuba is urgent. Ignoring it will not make it go away. It lies at the heart of U.S. and hemispheric security.

Communist Cuba is no mere nuisance beneath the notice of a great power like the United States. It is a menace, a privileged base for the systematic subversion of every free government in the Americas. It symbolizes our weak and vacillating foreign policy everywhere. It is the anvil on which is being shattered our image as a great and responsible nation dedicated to freedom.

I know that nothing bores so much as yesterday's crises, nor captures our full attention like today's new sensation. But Cuba is not just yesterday's crisis; it is today's crisis and unless we do something about it, it will be tomorrow's crisis—a crisis which we may not then be able to overcome.

Make no mistake about it, the situation is continuing and dangerous, and the hard facts are not being adequately presented to the American public.

We hear, for example, a great deal these days about Soviet fishing trawlers. There has been considerable discussion of their encroachments on nearby fishing grounds, but very little of the fact that many of them operate in and out of Cuba.

A recently issued report of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the House Armed Services Committee states: "More than a dozen seagoing Russian trawlers of the *Okean* class make regular round trips between the North Atlantic fishing banks and Cuba." The report further states that naval and Coast Guard witnesses had agreed in testimony before the committee that these ships "could be landing or picking up spies or saboteurs or smuggling military items and that this could be done with little chance of detection in the landing or picking up operations."

There are also reports of a Soviet subsidized Cuban "fishing fleet"—a fleet which grows larger as the supplies of fish available in Cuban markets grow smaller. Can this be a red herring fleet?

This past May 11, the Cuban Consolidated Naval Construction Enterprise reportedly announced that it had budgeted $15 million to build 88 ships, 70 of which were to be of the Lamba 75 type. The Lamba 75, with a 29.5-ton cargo capacity and a 250-horsepower engine is an ideal vehicle for subversive operations.

Then there are reports of paratroopers being trained at sea, of a Russian tanker based at Georgetown, British Guiana, to supply fuel for Soviet and Cuban vessels in that area, of arms being transshipped through British Guiana, of Castro-inspired violence in Venezuela and Colombia, of Castroite guerrillas attempting to enter Bolivia, of training

schools for subversion and revolution being set up all over Cuba.

On July 26 in a speech which received little notice in the United States, Castro proclaimed:

> The duty of the revolutionaries, of the Latin American revolutionaries, is not to wait for the change in the balance of power to produce the miracle of social revolution in Latin America, but to take the fullest advantage of everything favoring the revolutionary movement and make revolutions.

Then this Soviet puppet practically pinpointed some of the targets, when he said:

> And what are the political situations in these countries—Peru, Colombia, Argentina, Paraguay, Venezuela, Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador? Complete lack of stability, where the governing classes no longer control. We know by experience, and by conviction, that every people that does what the Cuban people has done will have the decided support of the Soviet Union and all the Socialist camp.

Soviet and Cuban fishing fleets are obviously trafficking in a good deal more than fish in the Western Hemisphere's troubled waters.

Let us raise the curtain of silence, face the hard facts of Cuba, and the intrinsic relation of these facts to our whole sagging foreign policy.

Last October the Soviet presence in Cuba was branded as "unacceptable"; to this day, the Soviet occupation forces remain.

Last October, the continued existence in this hemisphere of an advance base of Communist imperialism was labeled "unthinkable"; today, the administration flatly refuses to disavow eventual coexistence with a Red-dominated Cuba.

Last October the President pledged the solemn commitment of U.S. honor, U.S. will, and U.S. policy to the goal of Cuba's liberation; yet Castro's Communist tyranny becomes more deeply entrenched with every passing day.

History may well record our time as one characterized by brave words and timid deeds unless we once again shoulder our responsibilities and go about the not always comfortable business of world leadership.

Ratification of the partial nuclear test ban treaty does not sweep away grievous problems such as Soviet Cuba.

Administration spokesmen answer public and congressional concern over Cuba with one stock debate stopper. What would you have us do, they ask, go to war? Discussion is then shrouded in a mushroom cloud of self-righteous horror. Yet there are alternatives, constructive alternatives short of war to our present course. Since mid-June my distinguished colleagues, Mr. MORTON, of Kentucky; Mr. ALLOTT, of Colorado; Mr. CURTIS, of Nebraska; Mr. MUNDT, of South Dakota; Mr. DOMINICK, of Colorado; Mr. HRUSKA, of Nebraska; Mr. BENNETT, of Utah; Mr. PEARSON, of Kansas; and Mr. SIMPSON, of Wyoming, have all offered on this floor not only specific criticisms of present policy but specific proposals for effective action short of war, action calculated to launch the process of Cuba's liberation from Castro and Soviet military occupation.

They include a proposal for formation of a provisional government around which all the forces of a free Cuba might rally; proposals for a leakproof pacific blockade against all strategic traffic; for a quarantine to isolate Cuba as a base for Communist subversion; for the imposition of tough penalties against all blockade runners; for preparations for the rehabilitation of Cuba after Castro and Soviet occupation; and for a no-quarter political and psychological offensive against Castroism and world Communist aggression—all reinforced by the unequivocal demand for an immediate end to the Soviet occupation of Cuba and, thus, of the Western Hemisphere.

The response to these proposals has been almost total silence. As far as the administration and its apologists are concerned, our discussion of alternatives to inaction have been entirely ignored.

How can we account for this silence—rationally, within the bounds of substantial evidence, and beyond the confines of sheer partisan advantage?

One explanation might run in terms of electoral politics—but its implications are almost too shocking to contemplate.

It is true though that despite weeks and months of prior warning, missile sites were "discovered" in Cuba only in late September 1962. This was followed by the hastily devised "quarantine" which was successfully mounted in October. The Soviets, eyeball to eyeball, blinked first—or was it a knowing wink—just in time for the 1962 congressional elections.

An administration bent on electioneering the promise of Cuban liberation next year might well be impatient with solid proposals for Cuba's liberation and rehabilitation made this year and a damper on all serious debate and discussion would be its logical reaction. Are they being advised:

> Let us put Cuba in the deep freeze until we can come up with big fireworks, with startling promises of 1965 action, to be unveiled in the fall of 1964?

I do not believe that this temptation will be implemented, since it would be so contrary to our continuing security. But what then is the explanation? Could it be that the administration is in truth as timid, indecisive, and vacillating as it seems to be? Cuba would not be the only case in point, it would simply be the most serious in a long list—a list including Laos, Berlin, the decline of the Atlantic Alliance, India's seizure of Goa, and the United Arab Republic's aggression in Yemen.

But the anvil on which our prestige and position are being shattered is Cuba.

For a great Nation such as ours to tolerate the armed intrusion of an expansionist power so close to its own shores cannot help weakening our position throughout the world.

Those who question our intentions in Latin America are certainly not reassured by our appeasement of Castro.

Those who question our resolution over Berlin cannot be reassured by our lack of resolution over Cuba.

Those who question our staying power in southeast Asia are not reassured by Cuba.

Those who question our intentions in the Middle East are not reassured by our accommodation with tyranny in Cuba.

We must recast our Cuban policy into the encompassing frame of the worldwide struggle with communism before we can fairly come to grips with all the issues which daily bedevil us. We must not be taken in by the mounting chorus of the experts, the so-called Kremlinologists, that because of the partial test ban treaty and Soviet troubles with Red China, Khrushchev is so affably ready to do business with us, that U.S. concessions are in order.

I have heard no offer from Khrushchev to tear down the Berlin wall.

I have heard no offer from Khrushchev to remove his occupation troops from Cuba.

I have heard no offer from Khrushchev for real and meaningful disarmament.

I have heard no renunciation by Khrushchev of the Communist goal of world domination.

Instead we hear talk of U.S. troop withdrawals which would weaken our position in Europe, of nonaggression pacts which would legitimize the Soviet's World War II conquests, and of some new-found respectability on the part of the butchers of Budapest.

Mr. Khrushchev's hand controls the cold war thermostat, and all he seems to have to do is tap it up a degree or so and we glow as if bathed in the sunlight of a new era. Personally, I do not believe this sun will burn so warmly as to give us a lasting tan.

It is true that there have been changes in Soviet tactics, postures, and images. The time and mode of our "burial" has possibly been altered. But who can soberly conclude that the grave has been filled in? The Soviet Communist Party declared in its reply to Chinese Communist criticism published in Izvestia this past July 14: "We fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible."

Is there more than one explanation of this declaration of policy?

Yet, so many of our officials and opinionmakers walk and talk amidst the delusions of their own inflated hopes, apparently assuming that our roadmaps for the future and Khrushchev's are interchangeable.

Though some of the milestones, such as Cuba, seem to be all too similar and all too dangerous for the United States, our desired destinations are still poles apart. The clash of basic principles, whether we wish to recognize it or not, is still very real and this fact must be reinserted into our strategic calculations before we relax ourselves into Mr. Khrushchev's burial ground.

We cannot make the hard decisions required of U.S. foreign policy on the basis of talk of a "good atmosphere" or a "new climate." One observer has termed this the science of "meteorological diplomacy." Aristophanes depicted similar political follies as "Cloudcoocooland."

I have always been intrigued by the mysteries of the universe, but when it

comes to the diplomacy of the United States, I believe that the basis should be eternal principle and national interest—not stargazing—and certainly not Red stargazing.

To wait is to suffer later. To plan—and to act upon a plan—should be the order of the day.

Let us delay no longer on the menace of Cuba, 90 miles near. Let us give serious consideration to the proposals which have been offered here in the Senate, and let us hope sincerely that our foreign policymakers will stop ignoring serious proposals for our security and will formulate now a course of real and meaningful action in the national interest.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I compliment the Senator from Pennsylvania upon his speech with respect to the Cuban question and for calling the situation to the attention of the Senate again. There is no question, as shown by events, that the Cuban question is still foremost in the minds of the American people. Until the administration has spelled out a policy for the Nation and gives indication that it has such a policy and will pursue it, the people will be left in a quandary concerning our purposes and aims in Latin America.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his remarks.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to add my commendation of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I commend him particularly for raising the question of fishing boats, which the Russians obviously are using, in my opinion, for the sole purpose of mapping the underwater territories off our coasts, for military use at a later date.

I have spoken on two occasions about the military buildup in Cuba. To me, it is extremely serious. Information is reaching us constantly, from a variety of sources, concerning this problem. One of the better articles I have read is contained in a column entitled "Huge Soviet Missile Complex in Cuba," written by Daniel James, and published in the Denver Post of September 17, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HUGE SOVIET MISSILE COMPLEX IN CUBA

(By Daniel James)

WASHINGTON.—Russian guided missiles are still in Cuba some of them secreted in tunnels located in the Province nearest the United States, Pinar del Rio, according to sources inside Cuba.

The Russians are said to have dug five big tunnels at La Gobernadora Hills, near the main Cuban base at Mariel, in Pinar del Rio. It was at Mariel, just down the coast from Havana, that Khrushchev landed most of the missiles that precipitated the crisis last October.

The La Gobernadora tunnels are 105 feet wide—wide enough for two-way traffic—and have reinforced ceilings 30 feet high. A Castro army lieutenant who has defected, and who personally toured the tunnels during their construction, reports that at least two of them penetrate La Gobernadora for a distance of 6 miles.

One tunnel has been air-conditioned for the storage of nuclear warheads, and another equipped with refrigerating equipment for storing liquid oxygen used for ballistic missiles, according to sources inside Cuba.

Furthermore, add those sources, electrical systems have been installed at the nearby base of Meseta de Anafe, and those systems are in turn connected with the guided-missile centers at La Gobernadora as well as the big horseshoe-shaped military complex around Havana.

Pinar del Rio, it should be kept in mind, commands the Florida Straits. It has become the site of a great new Soviet military complex, say informants recently out of Cuba, with Russian Army GHQ located at La Gobernadora.

Another part of western Cuba where missiles are reportedly being stored is the Isle of Pines, just across the Gulf of Batabano from Pinar del Rio.

Fresh information indicates that the main Soviet installation on the Isle of Pines is at the Bay of Siguanea, and is manned by an estimated 2,000 Soviet soldiers and technicians armed with the following:

SAM air-to-ground missiles, land-to-sea missiles, underground strategic missiles, Komar rocket-launching vessels, plus such conventional weapons as tanks and artillery.

Also at Siguanea, according to underground sources, is a large submarine base under construction. It is said to consist of sub pens, still in construction, similar to those built by the Germans at their famous Kiel naval base during World War II.

The Soviet military complex in Pinar del Rio is, literally, so complex that the Russians had to build an intricate communications system to maintain contact with all their forces there. The system was built underground, it is said, and connects La Gobernadora with these other bases: San Julian airbase (MIG 21's), San Diego de los Banos, Soroa, Villanueva, Gramma, Finca Suset, and Meseta de Anafe.

"Pinar del Rio has been converted into one immense Soviet military camp," claim resistance leaders in Cuba.

A Russian military construction-supply center near Mariel alone extends for almost 3 miles, says a freedom fighter now in the United States, Gustavo Pernas Calva. "It is visible to any traveler from Havana to Pinar del Rio."

Mariel itself is wholly under Soviet military control, according to a man who formerly belonged to the office of the Chief of Staff of the Cuban Navy, Juan Guerra Fernandez. He reports that about 1,200 Cuban Navy personnel were discharged from Mariel recently and replaced by Russians—a move that completed Soviet control of the base.

One purpose for that control is that the Soviets are intent on protecting their great construction-supply center nearby, which consists of foundries, a cement plant, and a thermoelectric plant in the final stages of construction.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expend the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by my distinguished senior colleague from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. He has presented to the Senate a real problem, which affects not only the Groton and New London area of Connecticut, but other areas, as well, which might be similarly situated. The amendment is worthy of the support of all Members of this body. I hope the amendment will prevail.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7179) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, and 27 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to the bill, and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 2436) to amend section 101 (18) of title 38, United States Code, to permit the furnishing of benefits to certain individuals conditionally discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 2436) to amend section 101(18) of title 38, United States Code, to permit the furnishing of benefits to certain individuals conditionally discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Georgia desires to call up a conference report. I yield to him, with the understanding that the time will not be charged to the bill.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7179) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the committee of conference agreed on appropriations totaling $47,220,010,000 for the various military programs and activities of the Department of Defense, exclusive of military construction, family housing, civil defense, and military assistance. This total is $119,697,000 under the Senate bill, which totaled $47,339,707,000; and $138,001,000 over the House bill, which totaled $47,082,009,000.

The Conference Committee total of $47,220,010,000 is $1,794,227,000 under the budget estimates of $49,014,237,000, and $1,130,072,500 under appropriations totaling $48,350,082,500 for fiscal year 1963. However, when the 1963 appropriation is adjusted to exclude $467,300,000 provided for the support of military family housing, which is not included in the pending bill, the decrease under appropriations for fiscal year 1963 is $662,772,500.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at conclusion of my remarks a tabulation giving the amount of the 1963 appropriation, 1964 budget estimate, House allowance, Senate allowance, and conference allowance for each appropriation in the bill, and a tabulation giving the same information by titles of the bill and organizational component.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, with respect to title I, Personnel, the committee of conference agreed on transfers from various working capital funds to the military personnel appropriations totaling $325 million. The House bill provided for transfers totaling $547 million, and the Senate bill included $300 million from these sources.

The conferees on the part of both Houses were in complete agreement that the programed end strengths of 975,000 for the Army, 670,000 for the Navy, 190,000 for the Marine Corps, and 860,000 for the Air Force were to be maintained. The Department of Defense has assured me, by letter of October 4, 1963, that these programed strengths will be maintained. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., October 4, 1963.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Department of Defense Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of Defense appropriation bill as passed by the Senate recommended, in connection with the military personnel appropriations of the services, that the additional funds in the amount of $247 million, made available for transfer by the House to the military personnel appropriations from revolving funds, be retained in the revolving funds. The Department of Defense considers this action to be prudent and necessary. We fully concur in the statement in the Senate committee report, "* * * any transfers from the revolving funds in addition to those indicated in the budget estimates would jeopardize the programed actions of the revolving funds in fiscal year 1964." This was expanded upon in my presentation made to your committee on August 20, 1963.

In response to your request, if the military personnel appropriations of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force are passed in the amounts contained in the Senate bill, I assure you that the Department of Defense will, as we understand it to be the intent of the Congress, carry out the military personnel program of the active forces and in the programed strengths as presented by the Department of Defense and the services in the course of the hearings on this bill, and as indicated in the justifications submitted to the committees of the House and the Senate. It would be our intent to carry out this program without a change in program, but at the same time, to practice every available economy in doing so.

In the event that the funds appropriated are subsequently determined to be inadequate to defray the minimum costs of the previously stated programs, it would then be our intent to submit in the usual manner a request for supplemental appropriations, supported by detailed information indicating the added requirement. This we believe to be the intent of both the House and the Senate with which we fully concur and recommend as the course of action to be subscribed to by the conferees on the Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1964.

Sincerely,

ROSWELL GILPATRIC.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the other action in title I, the House conferees agreed to the appropriation of an additional $2,500,000 provided by the Senate for needed National Guard training and schooling. The conferees also agreed to the Senate language providing that the Army Reserve and Army National Guard will be programed to attain an end strength of 300,000 and 400,000, respectively.

In title II, operation and maintenance, the conference agreed insofar as "Operation and maintenance, Army" is concerned, to restore $1,750,000 of the House reduction for the maintenance of noncombat vehicles; the full budget request for field exercises; and $4,821,000 of the unspecified reductions made by the House.

For "Operation and maintenance, Navy" the conference agreed to provide the full amount for necessary surface missile and equipment rework and $5,600,000 of the unspecified reductions made by the House. Partial restoration of $325,000 was made for "Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps."

For "Operation and maintenance, Air Force" it was agreed to restore $2,500,000 of the House reduction for maintenance of noncombat vehicles and $12 million in unspecified reductions.

An additional $4,200,000 provided by the Senate for Army National Guard technicians and repair parts was approved.

In title III, procurement, for "Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army," the conferees agreed to the Senate action restoring $3,900,000 for instrument training helicopters and to the Senate reduction of $31,700,000 in the aircraft program.

For the Navy, the conferees agreed to restore the House reduction of $11,700,000 for the T-2B trainer aircraft but disallowed the Senate restorations for the EA6A Intruder aircraft and the TC-4B Gulfstream trainer. With respect to the disallowance of funds for the procurement of the EA6A electronic reconnaissance aircraft, the committee of conference made it clear that the program recently submitted to the Congress for the modification of existing A6A aircraft to perform this mission shall proceed with available funds. The Senate conferees agreed to accept the House action in regard to a reduction in labor and material cost increases in "Shipbuilding and conversion" for which the Senate had restored $8,500,000. The Senate reduction of $20,500,000 for the proposed roll on/roll off cargo vessel was agreed to.

For the procurement programs of the Air Force, the conferees agreed to the Senate action restoring $25 million for the RF-4C reconnaissance aircraft; $16,175,000 for the HC-130E aircraft program; $10 million for funds in lieu of recoupments and so-called free assets in two appropriations; and $9,500,000 for programs, previously deferred, but now approved. For the C-141 aircraft program, the conferees approved restoration of $15,500,000 of the House reduction of $25 million. The reduction is to be applied to the spare parts program and not to the procurement of aircraft.

In title IV, "Research, development, test, and evaluation," for the Army, the conferees approved Senate restorations for the defense communications satellite program and the Lance program, but stipulated that the latter restoration be offset by a reduction in an aircraft development program.

For the Air Force, the conferees approved a restoration of $7,230,000 for a classified project, and $30 million of the Senate increase of $60 million for the development of the mobile medium range ballistic missile.

With regard to general provisions, the House agreed to the Senate limitation of 20 percent on indirect expenses of research grants and to the Senate language in connection with ship repair, alteration, and conversion.

There were a couple of items on which the committee yielded most reluctantly and only after considerable discussion, but, generally speaking, I believe that that the conference report before the Senate represents the thinking of the Senate as previously discussed on the floor. In many areas of appropriations,

I believe that it will require a belt-tightening consonant with the desire to provide the most defense for every dollar expended. On the other hand, however, I am certain that the defenses of our country will be strengthened during fiscal year 1964 and thereafter by the proper application of the funds provided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is one amendment in disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7179, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S., *October 8, 1963.*

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, and 27 to the bill (H.R. 7179) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes," and concur therein;

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$2,059,589,000".

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

EXHIBIT 1.—*Appropriations for the Department of Defense, fiscal year 1964*

SUMMARY

Title	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with— Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I—Military personnel	$13,235,200,000	$12,848,200,000	$12,850,700,000	$12,850,700,000	−$384,500,000	+$2,500,000	
Title II—Operation and maintenance	11,792,237,000	11,678,337,000	11,741,030,000	11,714,033,000	−78,204,000	+35,696,000	−$26,997,000
Title III—Procurement	16,724,800,000	15,666,472,000	15,763,747,000	15,706,047,000	−1,018,753,000	+39,575,000	−57,700,000
Title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	7,262,000,000	6,889,000,000	6,984,230,000	6,949,230,000	−312,770,000	+60,230,000	−35,000,000
Total, titles I, II, III, and IV	49,014,237,000	47,082,009,000	47,339,707,000	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000	+138,001,000	−119,697,000
Distribution of appropriations by organizational component:							
Army	12,579,628,000	12,095,563,000	12,117,106,000	12,105,534,000	−474,094,000	+9,971,000	−11,572,000
Navy	14,966,300,000	14,369,838,000	14,424,088,000	14,369,963,000	−596,337,000	+125,000	−54,125,000
Air Force	19,178,400,000	18,365,935,000	18,547,840,000	18,493,840,000	−684,560,000	+127,905,000	−54,000,000
Defense agencies	2,289,909,000	2,250,673,000	2,250,673,000	2,250,673,000	−39,236,000		
Total, Department of Defense	49,014,237,000	47,082,009,000	47,339,707,000	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000	+138,001,000	−119,697,000

TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with— Budget estimates	House	Senate
Military personnel, Army	[1] $3,885,000,000	[2] $3,785,000,000	[1] $3,785,000,000	[1] $3,785,000,000	−$100,000,000		
Military personnel, Navy	[3] 2,676,000,000	[4] 2,614,000,000	[2] 2,614,000,000	[3] 2,614,000,000	−62,000,000		
Military personnel, Marine Corps	678,600,000	678,600,000	678,600,000	678,600,000			
Military personnel, Air Force	[5] 4,148,000,000	[6] 3,943,000,000	[5] 3,943,000,000	[7] 3,943,000,000	−250,000,000		
Reserve personnel, Army	210,100,000	210,100,000	210,100,000	210,100,000			
Reserve personnel, Navy	92,300,000	92,300,000	92,300,000	92,300,000			
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	28,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000			
Reserve personnel, Air Force	55,100,000	55,100,000	55,100,000	55,100,000			
National Guard personnel, Army	240,300,000	240,300,000	242,800,000	242,800,000	+2,500,000	+$2,500,000	
National Guard personnel, Air Force	58,300,000	58,300,000	58,300,000	58,300,000			
Retired pay, Defense	1,163,000,000	1,143,000,000	1,143,000,000	1,143,000,000	−20,000,000		
Total, title I—Military personnel	[8] 13,235,200,000	[9] 12,848,200,000	[8] 12,850,700,000	[10] 12,850,700,000	−384,500,000	+2,500,000	

[1] In addition, $150,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[2] In addition, $190,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[3] In addition, $120,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[4] In addition, $147,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[5] In addition, $30,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[6] In addition, $210,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[7] In addition, $55,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[8] In addition, $300,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[9] In addition, $547,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[10] In addition, $325,000,000 to be derived by transfer.

TITLE II—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with— Budget estimates	House	Senate
Operation and maintenance, Army	$3,395,200,000	$3,361,000,000	$3,375,643,000	$3,369,071,000	−$26,129,000	+$8,071,000	−$6,572,000
Operation and maintenance, Navy	2,934,000,000	2,905,000,000	2,919,200,000	2,913,600,000	−20,400,000	+8,600,000	−5,600,000
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	192,300,000	191,000,000	191,650,000	191,325,000	−975,000	+325,000	−325,000
Operation and maintenance, Air Force	4,385,000,000	4,341,000,000	4,370,000,000	4,355,500,000	−29,500,000	+14,500,000	−14,500,000
Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies	451,400,000	446,000,000	446,000,000	446,000,000	−5,400,000		
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard	176,600,000	176,600,000	180,800,000	180,800,000	+4,200,000	+4,200,000	
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard	222,700,000	222,700,000	222,700,000	222,700,000			
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army	528,000	528,000	528,000	528,000			
Claims, Defense	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000			
Contingencies, Defense	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000			
Court of Military Appeals, Defense	509,000	509,000	509,000	509,000			
Total, title II—Operation and maintenance	11,792,237,000	11,678,337,000	11,741,030,000	11,714,033,000	−78,204,000	+35,696,000	−26,997,000

EXHIBIT 1.—*Appropriations for the Department of Defense, fiscal year 1964*—Continued

TITLE III—PROCUREMENT

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimates	House	Senate
Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army	$3,202,000,000	$2,958,894,000	$2,931,094,000	$2,931,094,000	−$270,906,000	−$27,800,000	
Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy	3,066,000,000	2,877,445,000	2,928,845,000	2,889,145,000	−176,855,000	+11,700,000	−$39,700,000
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	2,310,000,000	2,080,089,000	2,068,089,000	2,059,589,000	−250,411,000	−20,500,000	−8,500,000
Other procurement, Navy	1,208,000,000	1,175,231,000	1,175,231,000	1,175,231,000	−32,769,000		
Procurement, Marine Corps	207,700,000	201,960,000	201,960,000	201,960,000	−5,740,000		
Aircraft procurement, Air Force	3,559,000,000	3,328,900,000	3,395,075,000	3,385,575,000	−173,425,000	+56,675,000	−9,500,000
Missile procurement, Air Force	2,177,000,000	2,129,490,000	2,141,990,000	2,141,990,000	−35,010,000	+12,500,000	
Other procurement, Air Force	951,500,000	871,299,000	878,299,000	878,299,000	−73,201,000	+7,000,000	
Procurement, Defense agencies	43,600,000	43,164,000	43,164,000	43,164,000	−436,000		
Total, title III—procurement	16,724,800,000	15,666,472,000	15,763,747,000	15,706,047,000	−1,018,753,000	+39,575,000	−57,700,000

TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimates	House	Senate
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army	$1,469,900,000	$1,363,141,000	$1,391,141,000	$1,386,141,000	−$83,759,000	+$23,000,000	−$5,000,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy	1,572,900,000	1,525,713,000	1,525,713,000	1,525,713,000	−47,187,000		
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force	3,621,800,000	3,416,146,000	3,483,376,000	3,453,376,000	−168,424,000	+37,230,000	−30,000,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense agencies	447,400,000	434,000,000	434,000,000	434,000,000	−13,400,000		
Emergency fund, Defense	[11] 150,000,000	[11] 150,000,000	[11] 150,000,000	[11] 150,000,000			
Total, title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	7,262,000,000	6,889,000,000	6,984,230,000	6,949,230,000	−312,770,000	+60,230,000	−35,000,000
Total, titles I, II, III, and IV	49,014,237,000	47,082,009,000	47,339,707,000	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000	+138,001,000	−119,697,000

[11] In addition, $150,000,000 to be derived by transfer from other appropriations.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill to strengthen and approve the vocational education program is one of the most important measures to come before the Senate in recent years. If it is approved by the Congress in the form reported by the Senate committee, I am confident that it will go down in history as one of the most significant achievements of this session. The need to update the Federal vocational education assistance program has been obvious for many years. I am pleased that the Congress is at last facing up to the problem of providing a system geared to the realities of our modern economy.

I have never been able to understand why the House of Representatives founders on a general aid to education bill and then gives overwhelming approval to specialized Federal aid measures. Every Member of the Congress knows that we have had Federal aid to education since the founding of the Republic—and we have it now in many shapes, forms, and fashions. But the House still refuses to approve the kind of bill that would enable the States to take care of educational problems peculiar to their systems. In the last fiscal year it is estimated that nearly $2 billion in Federal funds were expended for the support of education—ranging all the way from education of Indians to donations of surplus property to the States. In the 1962 fiscal year Arkansas' educational system benefited from nearly $20½ million in Federal aid. It is interesting to note that if the word "vocational" were struck from the title and the declaration of purpose of this bill it would not be far from being a general Federal aid bill.

If we had a strong program of Federal aid to education this bill would not be necessary. But it appears that this is the closest we will get anytime in the foreseeable future to providing meaningful Federal support for education, and I hope that it will pass the Senate by an overwhelming margin.

Edward T. Chase wrote in the April issue of Harpers:

> The biggest failure of American education is not its inability to produce more scientists than Russia. It is the way in which it is turning millons of young people into unemployables.

This is what this bill is designed to prevent. Any system that concentrates on training youth for work in agriculture when the experts say only 1 in 10 can hope to make an adequate living farming is badly in need of revision. We are wasting the Nation's most precious asset—its youth—by failing to recognize that the vocational demands of today are a far cry from those of 1917 when the Smith-Hughes Act was passed. In 1920 each farmworker fed himself and 7 others—today he feeds 25. It took 276 hours to produce a bale of cotton in 1910—it takes about 55 today. As late as 1950 only 1 percent of the Arkansas cotton crop was harvested by machine; about 60 percent of this year's crops will be machine picked. Statistics leave little doubt that the job picture is changing constantly and we must make drastic revisions in our approach to vocational education if workers are to be available to fit the needs of tomorrow's economy. We will be doing a grave disservice to American youth by training them for no more than filling a reserved spot on the unemployment roles.

Technology has revolutionized every facet of our economy. The President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education pointed out in their recent report, as examples of changing job demands, that automatic elevators have displaced 40,000 operators in New York City and the Bureau of the Census used 50 statisticians in 1960 for tabulations that required 4,100 in 1950. Although automation and technological change hit both skilled and unskilled workers it is the unskilled, less educated worker who suffers the most. Ten percent of those who failed to finish elementary school are unemployed compared with a 2 percent rate for college graduates. In March 1962 64 percent of those unemployed failed to finish high school.

Anyone who doubts the seriousness of the youth employment problem which, of course, stems in large measure from a faulty educational system, should read the report of the President's Committee on Youth Employment. The Committee pointed out that 40 percent more young people will be seeking jobs during the 1960's than in the 1950's and if the current rate of unemployment persists we

will have close to 1½ million unemployed young people by 1970. Of the young people who will enter the labor force between 1960 and 1970 nearly 30 percent will not have a high school education, 9 percent will have only a grade school education or less. These are sobering statistics and loaded with political dynamite unless we do a better job in preparing these young people to assume a useful place in society.

A look at the daily want ads shows that countless jobs remain unfilled while we have millions drawing relief or unemployment compensation. We do not have enough skilled workers to go around and the unskilled, uneducated worker is a drug on the market—and a burden on the economy. This is intolerable in a capitalistic society. The loss to our economy from those who fail to get an adequate education is subject to much guesswork. Dr. Walter Heller has estimated that $100 million is lost in lifetime earnings for each 1,000 young people who have the ability to graduate from college, but stop at high school. We cannot afford to let this kind of loss to the economy continue. Dr. Ginzberg of Columbia University said recently:

> Our economic system is misnamed. Capitalism suggests that the key factor in development is capital; actually it is the values, aspirations, and skills of people.

Unfortunately, there is little general appreciation of the investment character of education. If our society looked upon an investment in education in the same way we look upon an investment in physical capital I am sure there would be a sudden, dramatic increase in funds spent for education. Development of human capital, the key to the success of our form of government and any capitalistic economy, is relegated to a very low place on our national priorities totem pole.

Much attention has been focused recently on the school dropout problem and its relationship to the civil rights issue. There is little doubt that many of the grievances asserted by Negroes spring from educational and economic roots, not from deprivation of constitutional rights. Little can be done to improve the lot of the Negro—or the white—who has little education or no skill. In an economy where it has become cheaper to dig ditches by machine than manpower the ditchdigger faces a bleak future. Statistics exploring the composition of underprivileged America, white and black, always point to educational shortcomings.

It is only if we attack the underprivileged problem at its source in the schools, and in the training classes, that we will ever be able to make net gains in improving the lot of these unfortunates. Bigger jails, increased welfare payments, and higher unemployment compensation offers no permanent solution. The training programs that will be possible under this will equip our youth with skills fitted to the needs of society. It is much more economical to educate our youth for a meaningful role in society than to neglect them now and pay the unavoidable costs of social dereliction later.

As Walter Lippmann said on a recent television appearance you can always wait a few years to rebuild a slum or build a highway, but you cannot wait with education of children. He said:

> If you don't educate them, they'll be uneducated when they grow up, and they'll be the parents, uneducated parents, of the children who will be still less educated. So you get a thing that is a * * * vicious spiral downward.

This bill may not stop the spiral downward but it should at least slow it down.

The change made in the Senate bill to take into account the income level of the States in distribution of the grant funds improved the bill considerably. In the case of Arkansas it means about a one-third increase in grant funds based on the $108 million authorization for the first year—$1,288,920 as opposed to $951,145 under the formula of the House bill. As a Senator from a poor State I naturally have a somewhat selfish interest in insuring that our economic situation is taken into consideration in the formula. There are few Members of this body who would dispute the fact that the need is greater in underdeveloped States than is the case with the more industrialized States.

It is easy to understand one of the great difficulties in building Arkansas' economy when we consider the fact that, according to the 1960 census, 15 percent of her adults over 25 had less than 5 years of schooling compared to the Nation's average of 6.7 percent. More than 36 percent of the Negroes over 25 in Arkansas had less than 5 years of schooling, compared with the national average of 23.5 percent. Only 29 percent had a high school education. These educationally underprivileged are also economically underprivileged and offer little in helping to build a progressive economy. Many are—or will be—a burden on their skilled and more fortunate fellowmen. These unfortunates have found, or will find in the years ahead, that the world has passed them by—that a person with only his labor to sell has little, if anything, to sell. A substantial program of vocational education will go a long way toward insuring that Arkansas' young people, and those coming behind them, do not enter the working world with the same two strikes against them.

The committee action in adding the NEA and the impacted areas amendments is commendable. There is no question about the success of the programs authorized under the National Defense Education Act. The student loan program has been so well received that it has in a short period of a few years become an essential program in financing college training. There is a demonstrated need for expanding the loan authorization limit. The demands in my State for loan funds was so critical this year, for example, that only 53 percent of the amounts requested by the colleges could be approved. The increase in the authorization to $125 million will go a long way toward meeting the greatly increased demands for student loans.

I suppose there is no Federal aid to education program as popular with the Congress as the one for federally impacted areas. It is unfortunate that we cannot stir up this kind of congressional support for a general Federal aid bill. I always have more communications from school officials in Arkansas about bills to extend this program than I do on any other educational measure. But I am pleased that the committee added the amendment to extend these two aid programs which are so important to many districts in my State.

There has been some objection to this bill on the basis of cost. It authorizes a total of $173 million for the vocational educational features in the next fiscal year. This is far less than the amounts that are being spent for the impacted areas program. When we consider the size of the space and defense programs the new authorizations being asked here become chicken feed in comparison. It should be remembered that it will avail us very little to put a man on the moon if we cannot handle our problems here on earth. Such an accomplishment would divert attention from our difficulties for a while, but the realities of preparing our young people for this complex, ever-changing society will still be there after we come back to earth. If we cannot afford to pay for a good educational system we cannot afford to live in a democratic society.

In closing, I wish to pay tribute to the senior Senator from Alabama for his longstanding, unfailing concern with educational problems. If the whole Congress had followed his leadership on aid to education legislation many years ago the current educational crisis might not be facing the country now. American youth have no stronger champion than Senator HILL.

I also want to congratulate and thank the senior Senator from Oregon and the members of the Education Subcommittee who have devoted so much time to educational problems this session. The hearings held by the subcommittee have made a strong case proving the need for greater support for education at all levels, Federal, State, and local. The seven volumes of testimony comprise a massive documentation of problems—and opportunities—facing our educational system. The senior Senator from Oregon has done an able job in focusing public attention on this most critical problem and I congratulate him for his work on this bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. How much time have I left on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 7 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio, inasmuch as I have to reply to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] before my time runs out.

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. I have consulted with as many members of my committee as I

have been able to consult, while at the same time doing my work in the Chamber. They agree with me that I should offer to take to conference the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, with the understanding that there will be no commitment that it will come out of conference.

I wish the RECORD to show that the Senator from Connecticut wrote me a letter; and I believe the Senator has presented a case in behalf of the communities in Connecticut that deserve the very careful attention of the conferees. We have not had an opportunity, as members of the subcommittee, to study it, but I wish the Senator to know, and I wish the RECORD to show, that there are some legal problems involved in the amendment that the Senator offers. There are some definitive problems in relation to the whole impacted area legislation that we must examine from the standpoint of precedential import.

The question has also been raised by counsel as to whether it might have any effect on the lifespan of the legislation itself. The Senator from Connecticut is a very distinguished lawyer, and he knows that when those legal matters are raised they must be considered by the committee. That is the responsibility of the committee. But on the other hand, it would not be fair to the two Senators from Connecticut for me to seek and urge the defeat of the amendment, when I myself cannot say in all honesty that I believe the amendment should be defeated. But it is my job not to have added to the bill any amendment that I cannot endorse, but I can endorse this amendment sufficiently to agree to take it to conference; and then between now and the conference I should like to have the Senator from Connecticut sit down with me and the other members of the committee, so that we can go into these matters, and so that the Senator can make further arguments in support of his amendment.

If I could not have the amendment taken to conference with that understanding, I would have to urge the Senate to oppose the Senator's amendment, because I am not sure of all of its implications. If what I have said is satisfactory to the Senator, with the approval of my colleagues—and I have talked with them, so I am sure that they would approve the restrictions that I have placed on taking the amendment to conference—and with the understanding which I have offered to the Senator from Connecticut, I would be willing to take his amendment to conference.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DODD. That is typical of the most generous and fair way in which the Senator from Oregon has treated all questions that have arisen. I am perfectly satisfied to have the amendment so considered and accepted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be adopted on that basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do both Senators yield back their remaining time?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] wishes to offer an amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 68, line 28, in the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out "1966" and insert in lieu thereof "1964".

On page 69, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "1966" and insert in lieu thereof "1964."

On page 69, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "1963–1964" and insert in lieu thereof "1961–1962".

On page 69, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "1966" and insert in lieu thereof "1964".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The purpose of the amendment is to cut back to 1 year the 3-year extension of the impacted area program set forth in Public Laws 815 and 874.

My reasons for proposing the amendment are that the impacted area program as presently administered is, in my judgment—and I believe in the judgment of almost everyone who has looked into it—grossly inequitable. There are school districts that are receiving money under those two statutes to which they are not entitled. There are school districts receiving more money than they are entitled to. There are some school districts which are not getting as much money as they should. The Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has wrestled with that difficult problem for several years. Senators will recall that on September 9, 1961, the President of the United States wrote a letter to the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. The letter appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 14, page 19058. In that letter the President said:

> Therefore in my judgment a 1-year extension of school aid for impacted areas and the National Defense Education Act provide the best assurance that reevaluation of legislation affecting education will take place early next year.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the President's letter may be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

SEPTEMBER 9, 1961.

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

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: You have asked my views concerning legislation to extend aid for schools in federally impacted areas and to extend the National Defense Education Act.

As you know, my recommendations to the Congress for legislation to help achieve educational excellence in this country included continuation of the federally impacted area program and extension and strengthening of the National Defense Education Act. I still believe that both of these steps are urgently needed.

An extension of these programs should make it possible for the Congress to make a careful review of their content and costs next year. School aid to federally impacted areas could then be reexamined to update its operation and effect possible economies. Also, the increased demands which are being thrust upon this Nation make it especially important that we give consideration next year to strengthening those provisions of the National Defense Education Act which improve the quality of education in this country.

Therefore in my judgment a 1-year extension of school aid for impacted areas and the National Defense Education Act provide the best assurance that reevaluation of legislation affecting education will take place early next year.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. CLARK. At that time there was great resistance in the House of Representatives to the passage of a general omnibus Federal aid to education bill as advocated by the President. The Senate in general, under the brilliant leadership of the senior Senator from Oregon, took the President's view. We passed a good Federal aid to education bill in 1961. It festered in the House for over a year. The House Rules Committee was opposed to Federal aid to education. The racial and religious issue became involved in the problem. The House did nothing for a good long while. The only whip we had over the House to make them come around to talk about the merits of a general Federal aid to education bill was the impacted areas provision which we in the Senate had held back very carefully and with a good many restrictions. If the House had ever been able to get away with passing impacted area legislation for 3 or 4 years, that would have been the end to a Federal aid to education bill. Today the impacted areas bill is Federal aid to education on a grossly inequitable basis. It gives generous Federal aid to education for certain school districts while denying it to other school districts that are even more entitled to it.

Back in 1961, on the recommendation of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, we wrote into our general aid to education bill in the Senate section 204 of S. 1021, which reads as follows:

> The Commissioner shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before January 1, 1963, a full report of the operation of Public Laws 815 and 874 as extended by this act, including an analysis of

the relation between Federal payments under those laws and Federal payments under title I of this Act, and its recommendations to what the future relations between these two laws on that title should they be further extended.

That section never became law because we were never able to pass a general Federal aid to education law. We finally arrived at a conference report after the House had acted in a quite different way from the way we acted. But the conference report was killed in the House. So the study has never been made.

At the time of which I speak, in 1961, it was the view of the majority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—and I was in that majority—

It is the considered judgment of the majority of the committee that only a 1-year extension of the program at this time is advisable.

The 1-year extension was provided so that we would not be cutting off the aid which many meritorious school districts needed while we were making the study. That action gave them one more year during which time we could make the study. But the study has never been made. And now the same committee which came out with a recommendation for a 1-year extension 2 years ago has come out with a recommendation for a 3-year extension this year. The President of the United States, who asked us to make a careful study, did so in order that recommendations might be made which would eliminate the inequities in the program, asked for a 4-year extension, which would be tapered off in the last few years to deal with some of the inequities that are supposed to exist in the absence of a comprehensive study.

The Comptroller General has been most critical of these two federally impacted area bits of legislation, Public Law 815, and Public Law 874. I say in all good humor to the Senator from Oregon, whose position I fully understand, that if I were in his shoes I would do just what he is doing now. Having strongly advocated with me and other Senators on the floor of the Senate 2 years ago that we should hold the extension down to 1 year, he finds himself committed for reasons for which I have great sympathy to push for a 3-year extension. Mr. President, I should like to take my friend from Oregon off the embarrassing spot on which he finds himself. Therefore my amendment would cut down impacted area legislation to 1 year so that a study can be made to continue to hold some kind of whip over the House in support of a better education bill than we could otherwise get them to go gack to when we were on sound ground in 1961.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I shall answer the Senator in greater detail later. I see that the great Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is about to speak on the subject. I have not the slightest idea where he stands on the issue, but I wish to quote a great citizen of Illinois in the glorious past history of America—Abraham Lincoln. He said:

It is a very dumb man who has not more sense this year than he had last.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has used 8 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if it is not true that the 3-year extension of aid to impacted areas is put in as a bait in order to induce certain Members of the Senate to vote for Federal aid to higher education and, if we get the bill through the Senate, to persuade certain Members of the House to vote for Federal aid to higher education who otherwise would not vote for it.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is well aware how reluctant I am to pass on the motivations of any Member of the House or of the Senate. Without dealing with motivations, perhaps that would be the effect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not probable that the Senator from Oregon foresaw the possible effect, and therefore included the provision for 3 years as a bait to gain votes which otherwise he would not be able to obtain?

Mr. CLARK. I would not wish to take eloquent words out of the mouth of my friend from Oregon, who, I am sure, will be able to express his own views as to why he thought it desirable to change his position this year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not extraordinary that some Members of Congress will vote for Federal aid to impacted areas, which is the least desirable and least defensible form of Federal aid to education, and yet oppose a general measure?

Mr. CLARK. I have found that quite impossible to reconcile in my own mind, but I know that each of my colleagues is eminently sincere in the position he takes. To me the situation is fantastic.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall vote in favor of the amendment, because there are undoubtedly in existence what are called impacted areas which are rich and completely unjustified in asking relief from this source.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first I wish to make a reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Florida and to the Senator from Oklahoma.

I very much appreciate the help that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has been to me and to the committee on education legislation. He is performing a very valuable service in pointing up areas of our legislative consideration of impacted areas which should be brought before the Senate.

In this instance, however, I am constrained reluctantly to oppose the adoption of his amendment. I base this on the following grounds:

First, if it were to be adopted then we should be faced in February or March of 1964 with the same problem we are now laboring to resolve. As I said yesterday in my speech, we have an obligation, in my judgment, to permit school administrators a reasonable leadtime in order to make the decisions which they must make in the expenditure of school dollars. If the Senator's amendment is adopted—and I trust it will not be—we will but continue to complicate unnecessarily the program operations of the school districts which educate one-third of America's boys and girls.

We face a parliamentary situation to which I should like my good friends from Pennsylvania and Illinois to give heed. The House committee reported a 1-year program. If the Senate adopts a 1-year program there will be nothing to discuss on that point in conference; and it is important that we go into conference on this matter, for reasons I shall shortly point out. If we go into conference on a 3-year Senate proposal, I know it is not necessary to tell my friends what the usual conference procedure is. When one is in any bargaining position at all, one at least has an opportunity to obtain a 2-year provision. I shall fight for the 3 years, for the reasons I am about to state. I always put my cards on the table. I have a problem of conference leadership in this regard.

I should like to have Senators hear me through on what I believe would be a great injustice to many school districts in this country if the Senate should adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania. Adoption of the committee 3-year extension would not mean we would lose any opportunity during the 3 years to bring about reforms in the administration of the aid to impacted areas program.

The Senator has pointed out quite clearly that 2 years ago a study was proposed in the general aid bill. We passed S. 1021 in the Senate, but we lost it, as the Senator knows elsewhere in the Congress.

I pledge to the Senator now, as chairman of the subcommittee, that with his valiant help—I am sure we can have the unanimous support of the committee—I shall officially call upon the various officers of the administration to proceed with the kind of study we have been seeking, and I shall ask them to work in close cooperation with the Comptroller General of the United States, who has placed on file some instances where the law has required administration of this program in a manner which I think must be corrected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. It is important that we have some time for the preparation of that study. The Senator well knows that it cannot be done in less than a year. That is what it adds up to, as I shall show in a moment. We cannot have it done in less than a year and put into effect any recommendations which may result from the study.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. CLARK. Why should we not write the study provision into the bill, as was done in 1961?

Mr. MORSE. That is a thought which has not been proposed before.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest to the Senator that many Members of the Senate would support him if he were willing to offer an amendment to the pending bill to incorporate in the bill the provisions of section 204 of S. 1021 of the 87th Congress, so that when the Senate goes to conference there will be a study on the line in the Senate bill. I believe that would cause no difficulty.

Mr. MORSE. I am perfectly willing to put my head on the block right now as chairman of the subcommittee. We can agree upon an amendment. I am willing to take to conference a proposal for a study, as an amendment to the bill. I have no objection to doing that. We shall need a few minutes to decide on the phraseology of the amendment. I hope the Senator will write it out and submit it to me. Perhaps he can do so while I am concluding my argument. Then I shall be glad to consider it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. May I modify my amendment by proposing an amendment in the nature of a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Since the yeas and nays have not been ordered on the amendment, the Senator may modify his amendment in any way he desires.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while the Senator is working on his amendment, I should like to finish stating my reasons for my position. I am willing to put the reasons into the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS rose.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator wish to hear them?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon a question. Is not the inclusion of the impacted areas provision the green trading stamp with which the Senator from Oregon hopes to induce others to buy the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Not at all. I do not engage in that kind of bartering. I am presenting this proposal on its merits. My goods sell themselves, they are so meritorious. I do not need any bonus. I am presenting a sound proposal. I want the Senate to hear me through. It will take only a few minutes.

Mr. President, my second ground is that there is much merit in many of the substantive revisions which could be made to the law. The Senate should permit us to do this thorough job free from the pressure of extending the acts. A 3-year extension as in the committee proposal will provide us this time.

Third, if the Senator's amendment is adopted, then other Senators, all of whom have very worthwhile suggestions, would press for the adoption of their proposals which would make a hodgepodge out of the bill.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] would extend these provisions of the impacted area program which expired June 30, 1963, for 1 year only until June 30, 1964—and it is October now—instead of for a 3-year period as recommended by the subcommittee and by the full committee. It is understood that the 1-year extension is proposed in order that needed changes can be made in these provisions to be effective for the period after the 1-year extension.

I agree that some changes are needed in this legislation. In fact, I have stated to this body a number of times in the past, when these programs were before this body for further extension, that the payments authorized by the legislation should be brought more in line with actual burdens caused by Federal activities which they are intended to meet.

My objection to restricting the extension to 1 year instead of 3 years as the subcommittee proposed is based on a number of considerations.

Some of the provisions in each of these laws are permanent, such as the provisions which authorize payments for those schoolchildren who live on Federal property. Those provisions authorizing payments to all other categories of Federal impact ended June 30, 1963. We are well into the 1963–64 school year and the 4,000 school districts throughout the country that are dependent on these payments to help finance their school programs do not know what to count on for the current year because this Congress has not acted on the legislation. They are in a most difficult position, because they have established their tax rates and set their budgets expecting the Federal assistance.

If we extend this program for only 1 year, we will then be faced with the necessity for detailed review of the temporary provisions in order to make the changes determined to be necessary. This legislation even with a 1-year extension probably will not be completed for a month or two. Shortly after the first of the year these school officials will be faced with developing budgets again for the 1964–65 school year. It would be extremely difficult for the Congress to act on these changes at the next session of Congress in time for the school board members to know what the changes are and how they would affect each district in order to take proper recognition if the reduction in Federal payments in preparing their next year's budgets.

Even if the changes could be worked out and enacted into law at a reasonably early period next year, the school officials in these impacted districts would find it extremely difficult to make the budget adjustment without a period of transition during which they could find additional sources of revenue to help finance their school operation. It takes time to make this kind of transition.

During the 13 years of this program a number of changes have been proposed, and some have been incorporated into the legislation. Invariably the Congress has taken the position that restrictive amendments should be enacted and the school superintendent should be given time to know what they are and how they would affect the local tax rate and income for schools before they are put into effect.

The history of these programs shows that opponents of any change or restriction in the amount of the Federal payments have an effective argument against the changes, when they are proposed to be put into effect without an adequate transition period. This was the position taken by the administration in its recommendations to the Congress on the program this year. The administration recommended that the legislation be extended for 4 years, with no change the first year and gradual changes during the next 2 years.

In addition, the subcommittees that handle this legislation need ample time to have studies conducted and obtain the necessary information on which to base the restrictive amendments.

A 3-year extension without change, except for the inclusion of the District of Columbia, would give time for obtaining the facts and information on which the changes would be based, to enact the changes into law, and give the local school officials time to make the necessary transition. It is also to be pointed out that, if agreement can be reached on the changes that are needed sooner than appears practicable at the present time, amendments can be made effective prior to the expiration of the present 3-year extension proposed by the committee. In other words, the 3-year extension should be considered as the outside limit during which the changes can be made in an orderly manner, but should not preclude the making of desirable amendments prior to the expiration of the 3-year extension should that be found desirable by the Congress. The administration recommendations now before the Congress might well be the basis for amendments which could be made effective prior to the end of the 3-year extension now being recommended. Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent that there be printed from the 12th annual report on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815 an excerpt setting forth the highlights of these programs.

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

HIGHLIGHTS

PUBLIC LAW 874—MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

The sum of $1,426,512,788 has been appropriated for this program from its beginning in 1950 through fiscal year 1962. For the 12th consecutive year the number of school districts and the total amount of their entitlements increased; $247 million was appropriated for fiscal year 1962, as compared with $217.3 million for fiscal year 1961.

The number of eligible school districts increased from $3,965 in fiscal year 1961 to 4,065 in fiscal year 1962. Increases were chiefly attributable to growth in school population and new or expanded Federal activities.

The total number of pupils in the 4,065 eligible districts approximated 11 million, or about one-third of all pupils attending public elementary and secondary schools in the

Nation. Federally connected pupils totaled more than 1.75 million, representing approximately 15.2 percent of the total attendance in eligible districts.

Over 255 million acres in federally owned property were claimed as a basis for entitlement in fiscal year 1962. The number of different Federal properties claimed as a basis for payment totaled 5,288, an increase of 106 over 1961.

Entitlements of over $230 million resulted from pupils who resided on Federal property or resided with a parent employed on Federal property, or both. Entitlements of approximately $233 million constituted about 5.2 percent of current operating costs of eligible districts. Payments of over $13 million were made for pupils residing on 48 Federal installations, chiefly military bases.

PUBLIC LAW 815—CONSTRUCTION

The sum of $1,087,919,000 has been appropriated from the beginning of the program in 1950 through fiscal year 1962.

The sum of $946.9 million in Federal funds has been reserved for 4,961 construction projects submitted by approximately 1,840 different local school districts. Of these projects, 1,326 are new elementary schools and 1,963 are additions to elementary schools, 461 are new secondary schools and 846 are additions to secondary schools, and 365 are for improvements to existing facilities, such as equipment and heating plants; 4,469 of these projects are completed, 407 are under construction, and 85 are in the preconstruction stage.

To the Federal funds, school districts have added an estimated $670 million (exclusive of site, off-site improvements, and other costs) for a total of over $1.6 billion used to construct 53,345 classrooms and related facilities for 1,546,777 pupils.

Of the total granted to local school districts, almost $42 million has been allocated under section 14 (formery title IV) to 250 projects to provide 1,428 public school classrooms for 40,889 pupils (primarily children living on Indian reservations), and funds for 40 projects costing over $7.5 million have been reserved for construction of temporary school facilities housing 13,928 pupils.

In addition to the funds granted to local school districts approximately $123 million has been allocated for Federal construction of 310 projects on Federal property, comprising 3,241 classrooms and related facilities for 98,447 pupils living on Federal property.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I make my plea in the interest of helping the school districts operate efficiently by enabling the school districts to have the leadtime we provide. We can bring forward, discuss, and correct, in that leadtime, any disjointures in the program which need to be corrected.

I have already assured the Senator from Pennsylvania that he can count on me to stand shoulder to shoulder with him in that respect.

I have also indicated to him that, if he will give me the language, calling upon the proper officials in the Government to direct that an appropriate study be made of the impacted area program, I will be willing to take it to conference in order to let the conference consider it on its merits.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to be recognized on my own time.

Mr. MORSE. Very well.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that his speech would be more pertinent after I modify my amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I doubt if it will be more pertinent, because I am going to oppose the amendment completely. I agree with the position taken by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. How much time does the Senator want?

Mr. HOLLAND. About 7 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Not only do I oppose completely the amendment the Senator from Pennsylvania has offered, but also I oppose it in the form in which he has indicated he would like to amend it further.

Here is the situation confronting us: There are Senators who think the impacted areas bill is some kind of gracious gift, some boon from the Federal Government to the districts that maintain public schools in the very swollen population areas where great defense projects are located.

I want to tell them in the first place that they could not be more wrong; that there has never been any attempt to repay those districts for the full cost of educating the extra children added to their school programs by reason of defense establishments. On the average less than half of the added expense is paid to those districts for the cost of the attendance in their schools of children brought into those areas by uninformed personnel or civilian personnel at such great bases, for example, as the area around Cape Canaveral, where the public schools have been doubled in size by reason of children coming from Patrick Air Force Base and from the NASA organization in that area.

If the impacted area program is not continued and if, as a result, those children are not permitted to attend public schools, but, instead, the Federal Government is required to build and operate schools of its own to take care of those children, it will cost the Federal Government a good deal more than twice as much as it provides to pay a part of the debt which it owes to these districts.

Is it a debt, Mr. President? I say it is because not only are these large numbers of added children brought into impacted areas to go to public schools, but at the same time great areas are taken off the tax rolls of the particular counties where the impacted areas exist.

It seems to me that here is something the Federal Government should do as a matter of fairness, apart from its paying for a just proportion of the cost these additional children add to the public school burdens in impacted areas.

This program is not to be compared with the ordinary Federal aid program, because in this instance the Federal Government itself brings in large numbers of children to add to the school burden. The local people are required to pay half or more of the load of the added number of children, and the Federal Government pays half, or less than half, of that load. It seems to me from any standpoint this is just legislation.

Let me discuss for a moment the approach which has been taken by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. Yesterday, he twice used the term "sweeten" in remarks in which he said this provision was put in the bill in order to sweeten the other provisions in it. I think that was hardly complimentary of the other members of the committee who reported the bill to the Senate. I think it was hardly complimentary of Senators who think here is a just debt that we owe to the school districts where the heavy population of children exists because of the presence of defense facilities.

I notice today that the Senator has changed his approach. Instead of having sugar, he is going to have a whip, because twice today in his speech he said this is a whip we are going to hold over the head of the House. How is that going to look in the record of the debate—that the Senate feels it has some prestige which permits it to hold a whip over the head of our coordinate body at the other end of the Capitol which must consider this legislation? It is wrong, and it is not justified by the equities of the situation.

I point out one other thing. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania read into the RECORD a request from the President asking for a 1-year approach to the extension of this particular program and the national defense education program 2 years ago. In this bill the national defense education program is extended for 3 years and is enlarged sizably. Yet the Senator from Pennsylvania says it is wrong to have an extension of the federally impacted areas program for 3 years. However, it is not proposed to be enlarged——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I have more time?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I am glad the Senator from Florida is taking the time. I agree with everything he says.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to be standing shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Oregon on this proposal or on any other proposal in which we find this situation existing.

The national defense education program is extended by the same bill for 3 years and sizably enlarged, and the committee in its wisdom gave equal treatment to the impacted areas part of the education program. Yet the Senator from Pennsylvania, using a whip today, but some sweetening or sugar yesterday, says this part of the program should be reduced from 3 years to 1 year.

The vocational education part of the program, which is, of course, in the same bill—there are three large parts to it—is expanded for 5 years and greatly increased in size. But it is only the impacted areas provision which affects so vitally so many counties where defense bases or establishments of one kind or another are located that the Senator thinks should be cut down to 1 year.

I want to stand back of the Senator from Oregon in his statement that, from the standpoint of fiscal responsibility in the impacted areas affected, it is highly important that the extension be for 3 years instead of 1.

My file is full of letters from school boards all the way from Cape Canaveral

to Key West, the submarine base, and Boca Chica Naval Air Station, to Jacksonville, where the Naval Air Station is, and Escambia County, where Pensacola Naval Air Station is, which have had to start the school year without knowing how much to provide for the operations of the schools because of the long delay in this matter.

This is October. They were supposed to have fixed their programs last summer. The schools must open in late August or early September. As a result, there is confusion and frustration in those areas because Congress has not told the school boards what they can depend upon in this regard.

A 1-year extension would be 1 year of frustration, and nothing more. A 2-year extension, would take care of next year when we will not be in session as late as October, because we will be out in the hustings in the presidential and congressional election. A 3-year extension—and I commend the committee for its good judgment in this respect—would give time for the matter to be handled in a normal way both by the school districts affected and by the committees of Congress, and in that way enable Congress to decide what it wishes to do by way of further extending all or part of the program.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is making a brilliant argument against an amendment which I do not intend to press. He knows very well that I said 10 minutes ago I would take a 3-year extension if the study could be included. The Senator is speaking against something that no one is proposing.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator is withdrawing both the sweetening and the whip, because I do not believe either reflects any great credit on any of us.

In order to be fair to people in many counties across the Nation—and my State happens to have 10 or 12 of those counties—and in fairness to the school authorities, the proposed legislation should be passed as reported by the committee.

I commend the committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, for having recognized that only the 3-year extension would give fair treatment both to the school districts and the local officials, and also give time for Congress and the administrative agencies to consider any changes needed in this program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield me 7 minutes?

Mr. MORSE. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had not intended to enter into the discussion. Perhaps I should not, since the Senator from Pennsylvania does not intend to press his amendment.

However, I believe that we need to consider the whole impacted area problem a little more fundamentally than my good friend from Florida has done.

The impacted area problem began in the early days of the Korean war. It was started at the instance of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who realized that, with the Armed Forces being enlarged from something less than 1 million to more than 3 million, with the defense budget increasing from about $14 billion to approximately $42 billion, large numbers of servicemen would be congregated in areas which were not prepared to receive the children of servicemen who needed schooling, when housing had not yet been built to provide the basis for general property to support the local tax rolls.

This was also true, of course, in connection with the starting of new industries, such as the Atomic Energy Commission's plants in South Carolina and Kentucky, and the development of war industries elsewhere.

In other words, large numbers of persons would be dumped upon localities without the local tax base growing at the same time.

I voted for the impacted areas bill. I not only voted for it, but, since I was then a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I worked very hard for it.

However, I point out that that was 12 or 13 years ago. In most instances the communities have grown up. Housing has been built to provide for servicemen and defense workers, and this has furnished a local tax base, which did not exist 12 years ago.

It may be true that certain communities, such as Cape Canaveral and communities like Cocoa in Florida do not have sufficient general property to support schools. In those instances I can well believe that Federal funds are appropriate. However, in many cases the so-called impacted areas have long since adjusted to the flush of warwork and defense installations. They have grown up. We find prosperous suburbs, prosperous communities, well able to support the schools, nevertheless receiving Federal grants; and, once receiving Federal grants, holding on to them with great insistence. We find Representatives and Senators who would fight to the death against any general program of Federal aid to education designed to help needy communities defending the claims of prosperous communities to continue to receive unnecessary subsidies.

It is this type of thing which, frankly, I find somewhat repellent. This has caused me to enter the intellectual dispute. It is no longer a parliamentary dispute. I hope that sometime people will practice consistency. It is anomalous to have people attack Federal aid for education for needed communities and yet demand it for communities which have long since outgrown any need if, indeed, there was any need in the first place.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I modify my amendment, and ask that the clerk read the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 69, after line 7, it is proposed to insert:

(D) The Commissioner of Education shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before January 1, 1965, a full report of the operation of Public Laws 815 and 874, as extended by this Act, and his recommendations as to what amendments to these laws should be made if they are further extended.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand from the reworded amendment that the Senator is not now insisting upon reducing the 3-year extension to 1 year, but is insisting upon a study being made before the end of 1964?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under those conditions, of course, I withdraw my opposition, and I commend the Senator for making the change.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. How much time have I remaining? Do I get an additional 15 minutes, or do I still have available only 15 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not get any additional time.

Mr. CLARK. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I believe the amendment is self-explanatory, although I agree thoroughly with what to my way of thinking was the brilliant argument made by my friend from Illinois in answer to the argument made by my friend the Senator from Florida, which has now become largely irrelevant in view of my modification, which modification I now ask my friend from Oregon to accept.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator state briefly what the modification does to his amendment?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. I have withdrawn the amendment which would have confined the impacted area extension to 1 year.

Mr. KUCHEL. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Not because I thought I was wrong, because I do not think I was; but because it was completely obvious that I was not going to get anywhere. Therefore, it was necessary to sweeten the amendment a little to make it applicable to the present situation.

I am agreeing to a 3-year extension of the impacted area provision, albeit reluctantly, and am writing into the bill the same provision which was in the general Federal Aid to Education Act which was passed in 1961, calling on the Commissioner of Education to make a study of the operations under Public Laws 815 and 874, and to report to Congress and the President by January 1, 1965, as to what amendments, if any, he

recommends should be made to the legislation.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Does the modified amendment which the clerk has read embody the full text of the Senator's amendment as it is now at the desk?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. There is nothing "under the rug." I have concealed nothing from my dear friend from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I wanted to be sure there was nothing to impair the operation of the act for the next 3 years.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I congratulate the Senator upon modifying the amendment. I have joined with the Senator many times in trying to correct inequities by having a uniform general aid to education bill. I still support that principle.

However, I cannot overlook the fact that we could do a great injustice while awaiting the passage of such a law. Although the Senate has passed such a bill many times, it has been defeated or delayed by the other body for various reasons, often outside the scope of general Federal aid.

Therefore, I am delighted that the Senator from Pennsylvania has agreed to a study rather than a 1-year extension. I believe such a study would result in providing continued opportunities for defense-impacted areas, which in my State have the highest scale of taxes within the State. Such aid supplies the only possibility for providing adequate education in many outlying Army and Air Force bases and defense production areas within the larger centers.

I feel that the 3-year extension which the Senate bill provides would first make possible a good study, while we hope we can get together with the other House on a general Federal aid to education bill.

School executives will be able to know 6 or 8 months ahead that they can sign contracts with teachers—it is hard to find good teachers these days—and make certain of tenure of office and plan for a more effective school system.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has made a worthwhile improvement.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator. As a matter of legislative history, I felt it was more important, indeed, that we should not give up the increased need to look analytically and carefully into the impacted area legislation. In my opinion, it still contains glaring inequities. It needs a careful going over. Under the bill as originally proposed, it would not have received such a study.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator obviously has a right to his opinion that there are inequities in the law. That is an opinion which is not shared by some of the rest of us.

Mr. CLARK. In California.

Mr. KUCHEL. It is not the intention of the Senator from Pennsylvania, is it, to indicate that the legislative intent expresses any dissatisfaction with the present law?

Mr. CLARK. I cannot make legislative history any better than the Senator from California can. I should like to indicate my opinion, my legislative feeling, that there is a substantial inequity. I cannot speak for the Senate—I hardly ever do.

As a result of the great expansion of defense industries in that great State, which was the subject of some comment on the floor of the Senate yesterday by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the State of the Senator from California has been able to get such an overwhelming proportion of defense industries into his State that that State does not need any Federal aid to education bill. It has already received such aid.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is not correct. I said earlier in the debate that in 12 years there will be almost 700,000 college students in my State. California will be required to pay for 44,000 professors and instructors.

However, in the interest of time, and because the Senator from Oregon has other labors to perform in the public interest, I am glad to see that the Senator from Pennsylvania, while not having changed his mind, has changed his amendment. I salute him.

Mr. CLARK. I am the first to admit that the State educational system of California is the best in the country. There is no doubt about it. If all States had as good an educational system as California, perhaps we would not need any Federal aid to education. I commend the Senator from California, because he has always supported general Federal aid to education legislation in the most unselfish way. His State really does not need it, because it has the best State system. It is generous of him to support those of us who represent other States which are not so fortunate.

Mr. KUCHEL. That legislative history is comforting to one who is growing old in the public service.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is it correct to say that the Senator from Pennsylvania is really not concerned with taking away any of the inequities which California now enjoys, but, rather, proposes to make those inequities universal among the States?

Mr. CLARK. That is my own view. I favor comity among the States.

I hope the Senator from Oregon will accept my amendment.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Pennsylvania has demonstrated again the wonderful cooperation he always extends to me as one of my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Education. The only other member of my subcommittee who is presently in the Chamber is the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is also chairman of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have consulted with the Senator from Alabama. I said on the floor yesterday that we owe much to him for the progress made in recent years in the whole field of education. We owe him a debt of thanks for the aid he has given us in the vocational education bill. I have consulted with him, and he agrees with me that I should go out on the end of a limb, so to speak, and assume responsibility for the subcommittee and the full committee by agreeing to take the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania to conference. I shall take it to conference and do everything I can to try to obtain favorable consideration for it in conference, because the proposed study is needed. We supported it last year. We took it through the Senate 2 years ago. The Senate is already on record in support of this proposal.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for his argument in support of expanding Federal aid to school districts educating the other two-thirds of American boys and girls, because the impacted area program now provides such aid to school districts involving only one-third of the schoolchildren of the Nation. I think he has made an eloquent argument in support of a universal Federal aid to education program.

Another result of the study that will be made will be that we shall discover that the study itself will be another monumental volume that can be used in support of a general Federal aid to education bill. Once that study has been made, it will be possible to do equity to the plea that has been made for years for universality of Federal aid to education.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is it not true that in almost every case in which a Federal installation has been constructed, the actual tax base in the general area has been improved?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. Federal installations are usually made after chambers of commerce have come forward and stressed the need and urged that a Federal installation be made, and all the benefits that will be made available to the Federal Government if the installations are made.

Chambers of commerce know the value of installations to the economy of their areas and States. In almost all instances such installations have raised the tax base.

Mr. President, I accept the amendment. I urge the Senate to adopt it. I will take it to conference.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the committee amendment.

The modified amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask unanimous consent that it not be read but, rather, that I may state the purport of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself as much time as I may require.

The amendment which I send to the desk would substitute for the committee bill, the President's omnibus bill, which is S. 580. My purpose in proposing this substitute is to bring before the Senate the critical nature of the educational crisis in this country. My fear is that the pending bill and the other bills which have been reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare do not adequately deal with that crisis.

Yesterday, I had occasion to speak at some length in the Senate on the very close connection between the failures in our educational system and the continuing chronic and persistent unemployment which afflicts our country in most areas, and so seriously affects our country in many areas, in my own State and elsewhere, where unemployment is chronic and persistent, and has been for a very long time.

The Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has been holding comprehensive hearings since early May in dealing with the paradox of continuing unemployment in areas where our educational system has fallen down in not giving an adequate basic education to members of the labor force in areas where men and women have lost jobs because the industry in which they had earned their livelihood has become obsolete and they have no employable skills to enable them to get additional employment.

This testimony has highlighted the continuing heavy rate of school dropouts, which every year is turning hundreds of thousands of young people out on the streets, with no employable skills. We have seen the drastically heavy unemployment rate among minority groups, particularly Negroes, largely because of lack of skills.

So with the coming—at an increasing pace, in my opinion—of automation and with the relatively recent marriage of the computer to the assembly line, we find a situation in which unemployment at the lower levels of skills is constantly growing.

Last week, one competent witness, Mr. John I. Snyder, Jr., a manufacturer of automation equipment, told our subcommittee that, in his opinion, the progress of automation—using that word in its broadest sense—was destroying 40,000 jobs a week, so that there is a continual increase in the number of people who are being put out of work each week, each month, and each year, because they have no employable skills and their jobs have been taken away from them by machines.

At the same time, the size of our labor force is increasing at the rate of approximately 1 million a year; so the market is being flooded with new entrants into the labor force at the same time that the processes of automation are decreasing the job opportunities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this point, will the Senator yield, so that I may present one statistic?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. This is a statistic with which I am quite sure the Senator from Pennsylvania is familiar. He will recall that it came up in our hearings—that testimony was given, and was verified by several expert witnesses—that if we could just stop automation right now at its present level, with no more automation, it would take, for many years to come, 35,000 new jobs per week to meet the job loss that the present level of automation is causing. If that statistic does not cause the Members of this body to take a hard and long look at the objectives the Senator from Pennsylvania and I and our committee have in mind in regard to coming to the assistance of education, I do not know what statistics they need.

When the Senator from Pennsylvania finishes his remarks, I shall have more to say as to why I do not support his amendment; but I am in complete agreement with him as to the crisis that faces the American people—not the educational system, but the American people—in connection with this matter, and as to the necessity to provide the support that is needed in order to train people so they can be employed in the new era of automation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I agree wholeheartedly with the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and I am happy that he brought that basic statistic to the attention of the Senate.

It is well established that there are fewer jobs in manufacturing today than there were a few years ago; and there is no really practical possibility, according to most of the economists whom we have called before our subcommittee, of expanding markets in the area of manufacturing, thus producing new opportunities for the sale of manufactured goods in sufficient quantities to create new employment opportunities in manufacturing.

Even in many of the service areas, job opportunities are shrinking, as banks and retail establishments turn more to the use of computers and to various modifications of business machines which enable them to do the same amount of work with fewer employees.

While this condition is going on with respect to the blue-collar and the white-collar workers in the lower salary grades, a paradox exists with respect to the highly skilled occupations—engineers, chemists, biologists, physicists, and particularly in the more erudite branches of those professions; and the result is that we are in short supply for many occupations which are badly needed in the interests of our national security and our national well-being.

In fact, the other day we were informed that normally conservative looking ahead establishes the fact that by the year 1970 we will need 690,000 new engineers, but we are preparing to turn out only 270,000 engineers from the engineering schools presently in existence.

The relevance of all this, Mr. President, to our present educational dilemma is that expert after expert—starting with the Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, and including the Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, and also including the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion E. Folsom, who gave us some splendid testimony, and Senators will recall that he is still a high executive in the Eastman Kodak Co.—and witness after witness have testified that the best single weapon—not the only weapon, but the best single weapon—with which to deal with the unemployment situation, both at the level where there are so many unemployed at the moment, and with the problem of manpower utilization at the top of the pyramid, where skills are in short supply, is to upgrade our educational system.

Mr. President, on that basis my thesis is that the bill before the Senate and the bills which have also been reported to the calendar which deal with the expansion of library services and with some aid to higher education are both too little and too late. The least that we should be prepared to do is to accept the President's omnibus bill, send it over to the House, and hope that adequate popular support could be marshaled behind it and that the administration would really fight for it. Parenthetically, I must say that the administration, in my opinion, ran away from its own bill before a shot had been fired. I deplore that. I suspect that the advice that they received was unsound. Of course, they think that they know best. But I believe that if the President would fight for his bill, we could pass it. I think we ought to give him an opportunity to fight for it. For that reason I have offered the amendment in the nature of a substitute to put the President's bill before the Senate in order that the country may see that there are at least a few Senators who believe that the bill which has come from the committee is not good enough to meet the crisis which confronts the country.

The best material in support of what I am saying is contained in the message of the President himself on the subject of education, which he sent to Congress under date of January 29, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's message on education in support of his omnibus bill may be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress. Nothing has contributed more to the enlargement of this Nation's strength and opportunities than our traditional system of free, universal elementary and secondary education, coupled with widespread availability of college education.

For the individual, the doors to the schoolhouse, to the library and to the college lead to the richest treasures of our open society: to the power of knowledge—to the training and skills necessary for productive employment—to the wisdom, the ideals, and the culture which enrich life—and to the creative, self-disciplined understanding of society needed for good citizenship in today's changing and challenging world.

For the Nation, increasing the quality and availability of education is vital to both our national security and our domestic well-being. A free nation can rise no higher than

the standard of excellence set in its schools and colleges. Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers and school dropouts—these and other failures of our educational system breed failures in our social and economic system: delinquency, unemployment, chronic dependence, a waste of human resources, a loss of productive power and purchasing power and an increase in tax-supported benefits. The loss of only 1 year's income due to unemployment is more than the total cost of 12 years of education through high school. Failure to improve educational performance is thus not only poor social policy, it is poor economics.

At the turn of the century, only 10 percent of our adults had a high school or college education. Today such an education has become a requirement for an increasing number of jobs. Yet nearly 40 percent of our youths are dropping out before graduating from high school; only 43 percent of our adults have completed high school; only 8 percent of our adults have completed college; and only 16 percent of our young people are presently completing college. As my science advisory committee has reported, one of our most serious manpower shortages is the lack of Ph. D.'s in engineering, science, and mathematics; only about one-half of 1 percent of our school age generation is achieving Ph. D. degrees in all fields.

This Nation is committed to greater investment in economic growth; and recent research has shown that one of the most beneficial of all such investments is education, accounting for some 40 percent of the Nation's growth and productivity in recent years. It is an investment which yields a substantial return in the higher wages and purchasing power of trained workers, in the new products and techniques which come from skilled minds and in the constant expansion of this Nation's storehouse of useful knowledge.

In the new age of science and space, improved education is essential to give new meaning to our national purpose and power. In the last 20 years, mankind has acquired more scientific information than in all of previous history. Ninety percent of all the scientists that ever lived are alive and working today. Vast stretches of the unknown are being explored every day for military, medical, commercial, and other reasons. And finally, the twisting course of the cold war requires a citizenry that understands our principles and problems. It requires skilled manpower and brainpower to match the power of totalitarian discipline. It requires a scientific effort which demonstrates the superiority of freedom. And it requires an electorate in every State with sufficiently broad horizons and sufficient maturity of judgment to guide this Nation safely through whatever lies ahead.

In short, from every point of view, education is of paramount concern to the national interest as well as to each individual. Today we need a new standard of excellence in education, matched by the fullest possible access to educational opportunities, enabling each citizen to develop his talents to the maximum possible extent.

Our concern as a Nation for the future of our children—and the growing demands of modern education which Federal financing is better able to assist—make it necessary to expand Federal aid to education beyond the existing limited number of special programs. We can no longer afford the luxury of endless debate over all the complicated and sensitive questions raised by each new proposal on Federal participation in education. To be sure, these are all hard problems—but this Nation has not come to its present position of leadership by avoiding hard problems. We are at a point in history when we must face and resolve these problems.

State and local governments and private institutions, responsive to individual and local circumstances, have admirably served larger national purposes as well. They have written a remarkable record of freedom of thought and independence of judgment; and they have, in recent years, devoted sharply increased resources to education. Total national outlays for education nearly trebled during the 1940's and more than doubled during the 1950's, reaching a level of nearly $25 billion in 1960. As a proportion of national income, this represented a rise from little more than 4 percent in 1940 to nearly 6 percent in 1960, an increase of over 40 percent in total effort.

But all this has not been enough. And the Federal Government—despite increasing recognition of education as a nationwide challenge, and despite the increased financial difficulties encountered by States, communities, and private institutions in carrying this burden—has clearly not met its responsibilities in education. It has not offered sufficient help to our present educational system to meet its inadequacies and overcome its obstacles.

I do not say that the Federal Government should take over responsibility for education. That is neither desirable nor feasible. Instead its participation should be selective, stimulative and, where possible, transitional.

A century of experience with land-grant colleges has demonstrated that Federal financial participation can assist educational progress and growth without Federal control. In the last decade, experience with the National Science Foundation, with the National Defense Education Act, and with programs for assisting federally affected school districts has demonstrated that Federal support can benefit education without leading to Federal control. The proper Federal role is to identify national education goals and to help local, State, and private authorities build the necessary roads to reach those goals. Federal aid will enable our schools, colleges and universities to be more stable financially and therefore more independent.

These goals include the following:

First, we must improve the quality of instruction provided in all of our schools and colleges. We must stimulate interest in learning in order to reduce the alarming number of students who now drop out of school or who do not continue into higher levels of education. This requires more and better teachers—teachers who can be attracted to and retained in schools and colleges only if pay levels reflect more adequately the value of the services they render. It also requires that our teachers and instructors be equipped with the best possible teaching materials and curriculums. They must have at their command methods of instruction proven by thorough scientific research into the learning process and by careful experimentation.

Second, our educational system faces a major problem of quantity—of coping with the needs of our expanding population and of the rising educational expectations for our children which all of us share as parents. Nearly 50 million people were enrolled in our schools and colleges in 1962—an increase of more than 50 percent since 1950. By 1970, college enrollment will nearly double, and secondary schools will increase enrollment by 50 percent—categories in which the cost of education, including facilities, is several times higher than in elementary schools.

Third, we must give special attention to increasing the opportunities and incentives for all Americans to develop their talents to the utmost—to compete their education and to continue their self-development throughout life. This means preventing school dropouts, improving and expanding special educational services, and providing better education in slum, distressed, and rural areas where the educational attainment of students is far below par. It means increased opportunities for those students both willing and intellectually able to advance their education at the college and graduate levels. It means increased attention to vocational and technical education, which have long been underdeveloped in both effectiveness and scope, to the detriment of our workers and our technological progress.

In support of these three basic goals, I am proposing today a comprehensive, balanced program to enlarge the Federal Government's investment in the education of its citizens—a program aimed at increasing the educational opportunities of potentially every American citizen, regardless of age, race, religion, income, and educational achievement.

This program has been shaped to meet our goals on the basis of three fundamental guidelines:

A. An appraisal of the entire range of educational problems, viewing educational opportunity as a continuous lifelong process, starting with preschool training and extending through elementary and secondary schools, college, graduate education, vocational education, job training and retraining adult education, and such general community educational resources as the public library;

B. A selective application of Federal aid—aimed at strengthening, not weakening, the independence of existing school systems and aimed at meeting our most urgent education problems and objectives, including quality improvement; teacher training; special problems of slum, depressed, and rural areas; needy students; manpower shortage areas such as science and engineering; and shortages of educational facilities; and

C. More effective implementation of existing laws, as reflected in my recent budget recommendations.

To enable the full range of educational needs to be considered as a whole, I am transmitting to the Congress with this message a single, comprehensive education bill—the National Education Improvement Act of 1963. For education cannot easily or wisely be divided into separate parts. Each part is linked to the other. The colleges depend on the work of the schools; the schools depend on the colleges for teachers; vocational and technical education is not separate from general education. This bill recalls the posture of Jefferson: "Nobody can doubt my zeal for the general instruction of the people. I never have proposed a sacrifice of the primary to the ultimate grade of instruction. Let us keep our eye steadily on the whole system."

In order that its full relation to economic growth, to the new age of science, to the national security, and to human and institutional freedom may be analyzed in proper perspective, this bill should be considered as a whole, as a combination of elements designed to solve problems that have no single solution.

This is not a partisan measure—and it neither includes nor rejects all of the features which have long been sought by the various educational groups and organizations. It is instead an attempt to launch a prudent and balanced program drawing upon the efforts of many past Congresses and the proposals of many Members of both Houses and both political parties. It is solely an educational program, without trying to solve all other difficult domestic problems. It is clearly realistic in terms of its cost—and it is clearly essential to the growth and security of this country.

I. THE EXPANSION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIVIDUALS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Our present American educational system was founded on the principle that opportunity for education in this country should

be available to all—not merely to those who have the ability to pay. In the past, this has meant free public elementary and secondary schools in every community—thereafter, land-grant, State, and municipal colleges, and vocational education—and more recently, job retraining and specialized teachers for students with special educational problems.

Now a veritable tidal wave of students is advancing inexorably on our institutions of higher education, where the annual costs per student are several times as high as the cost of a high school education, and where these costs must be borne in large part by the student or his parents. Five years ago the graduating class of the secondary schools was 1.5 million; 5 years from now it will be 2.5 million. The future of these young people and the Nation rests in large part on their access to college and graduate education. For this country reserves its highest honors for only one kind of aristocracy—that which the Founding Fathers called "an aristocracy of achievement arising out of a democracy of opportunity."

Well over half of all parents with school-age children expect them to attend college. But only one-third do so. Some 40 percent of those who enter college do not graduate, and only a small number continue into graduate and professional study. The lack of adequate aid to students plays a large part in this disturbing record.

Federal aid to college students is not new. More than 3 million World War II and Korean conflict veterans have received $6 billion in Federal funds since 1944 to assist them to attend college.

Additionally, the National Defense Education Act college student loan program has aided more than 300,000 students in more than 1,500 institutions who have borrowed nearly $220 million. In 4 years of operations, defaults have totaled only $700 while repayment rates are more than twice that required by law.

But as effective as this program has been, it has not fulfilled its original objective of assuring that "no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need." The institutional ceiling of $250,000 per year on the Federal contribution limits loan funds in at least 98 of the presently participating institutions. The annual statutory ceiling of $90 million on Federal appropriations restricts the size of the program. As a result, only about 5 percent of the students enrolled in participating colleges are assisted. Additionally, the forgiveness feature for teachers is rendered less attractive as well as less meaningful by excluding those who go on to teach in colleges, private schools or on oversea military posts. This proven program must be enlarged and strengthened.

Other types of assistance are needed. For students who cannot meet the financial criteria under the National Defense Education Act loan program, a loan insurance program—drawing on techniques well established by the FHA and other Federal programs—would encourage banks and other institutions to loan more money for educational purposes.

Moreover, many students from families with limited incomes cannot and should not carry a heavy burden of debt. They must rely largely on income from employment while in college. For these students, the Federal Government should—as it did in the days of the National Youth Administration—help colleges provide additional student work opportunities of an educational character.

A serious barrier to increased graduate study is the lack of adequate financial aid for graduate students. Only 1,500 fellowships are permitted annually under the National Defense Education Act program, upon which we are dependent for urgently needed increases in the number of college teachers and the number of graduate students pursuing other courses essential to the Nation's advancement and security. The National Science Foundation has broad authority for fellowships and training grants, but its program, too, has been restricted by limited appropriations. The President's Science Advisory Committee has predicted that the dramatically increasing demand for engineers, mathematicians, and physical scientists, will require that the output of Ph. D.'s in these fields alone be increased 2½ times, to a total of 7,500 annually by 1970, and that the number of master's degrees awarded annually be substantially increased. In all fields the need exceeds the supply of doctoral recipients. The shortage is particularly acute in college teaching, where at present rates the Nation will lack 90,000 doctoral degree holders by 1970. It is clearly contrary to the national interest to have the number of graduate students limited by the financial ability of those able and interested in pursuing advanced degrees. Fellowship programs can ease much of the financial burden and, most importantly, encourage and stimulate a fuller realization and utilization of our human resources.

The welfare and security of the Nation require that we increase our investment in financial assistance for college students both at undergraduate and graduate levels. In keeping with present needs and our traditions of maximum self-help, I recommend that the Congress enact legislation to—

1. Extend the National Defense Education Act student loan program, liberalize the repayment forgiveness for teachers, raise the ceiling on total appropriations and eliminate the limitation on amounts available to individual institutions.

2. Authorize a supplementary new program of Federal insurance for commercial loans made by banks and other institutions to college students for educational purposes.

3. Establish a new work-study program for needy college students unable to carry too heavy a loan burden, providing up to half the pay for students employed by the colleges in work of an educational character—as, for example, laboratory, library, or research assistants.

4. Increase the number of National Defense Education Act fellowships to be awarded by the Office of Education from 1,500 to 12,000, including summer session awards.

5. Authorize a thorough survey and evaluation of the need for scholarships or additional financial assistance to undergraduate students so that any further action needed in this area can be considered by the next Congress.

6. In addition, as part of this program to increase financial assistance to students, the 1964 budget recommendations for the National Science Foundation, which are already before the Congress, include a proposed increase of $35 million to expand the number of fellowships and new teaching grants for graduate study from 2,800 in 1963 to 8,700 in fiscal 1964.

II. EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Aid to college students will be to no avail if there are insufficient college classrooms. The long-predicted crisis in higher education facilities is now at hand. For the next 15 years, even without additional student aid, enrollment increases in colleges will average 340,000 each year. If we are to accommodate the projected enrollment of more than 7 million college students by 1970—a doubling during the decade—$23 billion of new facilities will be needed, more than 3 times the quantity built during the preceding decade. This means that, unless we are to deny higher education opportunities to our youth, American colleges and universities must expand their academic facilities at a rate much faster than their present resources will permit.

In many colleges, students with adequate modern dormitories and living quarters—thanks to the College Housing Act—are crammed in outmoded, overcrowded classrooms, laboratories and libraries. Even now it is too late to provide these facilities to meet the sharp increases in college enrollment expected during the next 2 years. Further delay will aggravate an already critical situation.

I recommend, therefore, the prompt enactment of a program to provide loans to public and nonprofit private institutions of higher education for construction of urgently neded academic facilities.

The opportunity for a college education is severely limited for hundreds of thousands of young people because there is no college in their own community. Studies indicate that the likelihood of going to college on the part of a high school graduate who lives within 20–25 miles of a college is 50 percent greater than it is for the student who lives beyond commuting distance. This absence of college facilities in many communities causes an unfortunate waste of some of our most promising youthful talent. A demonstrated method of meeting this particular problem effectively is the creation of 2-year community colleges—a program that should be undertaken without delay and which will require Federal assistance for the construction of adequate facilities.

I recommend, therefore, a program of grants to States for construction of public community junior colleges.

There is an especially urgent need for college level training of technicians to assist scientists, engineers, and doctors. Although ideally one scientist or engineer should have the backing of two or three technicians, our institutions today are not producing even one technician for each three science and engineering graduates. This shortage results in an inefficient use of professional manpower—the occupation of critically needed time and talent to perform tasks which could be performed by others—an extravagance which cannot be tolerated when the Nation's demand for scientists, engineers, and doctors continues to grow. Failure to give attention to this matter will impede the objectives of the graduate and post-graduate training programs mentioned below.

I recommend, therefore, a program of grants to aid public and private nonprofit institutions in the training of scientific, engineering and medical technicians in 2-year college-level programs, covering up to 50 percent of the cost of constructing and equipping as well as operating the necessary academic facilities.

Special urgency exists for expanding the capacity for the graduate training of engineers, scientists and mathematicians. The President's Science Advisory Committee has recently reported that an unprecedented acceleration in the production of advanced degrees is immediately necessary to increase our national capability in these fields. Added facilities, larger faculties, and new institutions are needed. I have recommended, therefore, in the proposed 1964 budget already before the Congress, a strengthening of the National Science Foundation matching grant program for institutions of higher education to expand and improve graduate and undergraduate science facilities.

Because today's trend in colleges and universities is toward less lecturing and more independent study, the college and university library becomes even more essential in the life of our students. Today, as reported by the American Library Association, nearly all college libraries are urgently in need of additional books, periodicals, scientific reports

and similar materials to accommodate the growing number of students and faculty. Additionally, they need buildings, equipment and publications to serve their academic communities, whether public or private.

I recommend the authorization of Federal grants to public and private institutions of higher education for library materials and construction, on a broad geographic basis, with priority to those most urgently requiring expansion and improvement.

Expansion of high quality graduate education and research in all fields is essential to national security and economic growth. Means of increasing our supply of highly trained professional personnel to match the rapidly growing demands of teaching, industry, government, and research warrants our interest and support.

We need many more graduate centers, and they should be better distributed geographically. Three-quarters of all doctoral degrees are granted by a handful of universities located in 12 States. The remaining States with half our population produce only one-fourth of the Ph. D.'s.

New industries increasingly gravitate to or are innovated by strong centers of learning and research. The distressed area of the future may well be one which lacks centers of graduate education and research. It is in the national interest to encourage establishment of these critically needed centers of advanced learning, especially in parts of the Nation now lacking them.

I recommend enactment of a Federal grant program administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the development and expansion of new graduate centers. I also urge appropriation of the increased funds requested in my 1964 budget for expansion of the National Science Foundation program of science development grants, which will also contribute to strengthening of graduate education.

Our experience under the National Defense Education Act with respect to modern language and area centers has demonstrated that Federal aid can spur development of intellectual talent. They deserve our continuing support, with assurance that resources will be available for orderly expansion in keeping with availability of teaching talent.

I recommend that the current modern foreign language program aiding public and private institutions of higher learning be extended and expanded.

III. IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY

A basic source of knowledge is research. Industry has long realized this truth. Health and agriculture have established the worth of systematic research and development. But research in education has been astonishingly meager and frequently ignored. A fraction of 1 percent of this Nation's total expenditures for education is now devoted to such research. It is appalling that so little is known about the level of performance, comparative value of alternative investments and specialized problems of our educational system—and that it lags behind, sometimes by as much as 20 or even 50 years, in utilizing the results of research and keeping abreast of man's knowledge in all fields, including education itself.

Highest priority must be given to strengthening our educational research efforts, including a substantial expansion of the course content improvement programs which the Government has supported, particularly through the National Science Foundation. Two interrelated actions are necessary:

1. I have recommended appropriations in the 1964 budget for substantially expanding the National Science Foundation science and mathematics course materials program and the Office of Education educational research program.

2. I recommend legislation to broaden the Cooperative Research Act to authorize support of centers for multipurpose educational research, and for development and demonstration programs; and to broaden the types of educational agencies eligible to conduct research.

The second step to improvement of educational quality is teacher training. The quality of education is determined primarily by the quality of the teacher. Yet one out of every five teachers in the United States has either not been certified by his State as qualified to teach or failed to complete 4 years of college study. In the field of English, between 40 and 60 percent of the secondary school teachers lack even the minimum requirement of a college major in that subject. Thus it is not surprising that, largely because of unsatisfactory elementary and secondary school instruction, our colleges and universities are now required to spend over $10 million annually on remedial English courses.

The lack of teacher quality and preparation in other fields is equally disturbing. More than two-thirds of our 1.6 million teachers completed their degree work more than 5 years ago. Yet, within the past 5 years, major advances have been made—not only in the physical, biological, engineering, and mathematical sciences, but also in specialized branches of the social sciences, the arts and humanities, and in the art of teaching itself.

In addition, we lack sufficient trained teachers for 6 million handicapped children and youth, including 1.5 million mentally retarded and another 1.5 million with very serious social and emotional problems. Only through special classes, taught by specially trained teachers, can these children prepare for rehabilitation, employment, and community participation. Yet less than one-fourth of these children now have access to the special education they require, primarily because of the lack of qualified special teachers, college instructors, research personnel, and supervisors. It is estimated that 75,000 special teachers—55,000 more than presently available—are needed for the mentally retarded alone.

The teacher training support programs of the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education have demonstrated their value.

I recommend, therefore:

That the National Science Foundation program for training institutes for teachers in the natural sciences, mathematics, engineering and social sciences be expanded to provide for upgrading the knowledge and skills of 46,000 teachers, as provided in my 1964 budget recommendations;

That new legislation be enacted to (a) broaden authority for teacher institutes financed by the Office of Education, now restricted to school guidance counselors and language teachers, to other academic fields; (b) authorize a program of project grants to help colleges and universities improve their teacher preparation programs by upgrading academic courses and staff, by encouraging the selection and retention of their most talented prospective teachers, and by attracting and training teachers from new sources such as retired military personnel or women whose family responsibilities permit them to teach; and (c) authorize training grants through colleges and universities for teachers and other education personnel requiring specialized training, with particular emphasis on the training of teachers of the mentally retarded and other handicapped children, teachers of gifted or culturally deprived children, teachers of adult literacy, librarians, and educational researchers.

IV. STRENGTHENING PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Improved research and teacher training are not enough, if good teachers do not choose to teach. Yet present salary schedules in some cases are too low at the start to compete against other positions available to college graduates. In almost all cases, they are too low at the top to retain our ablest young teachers. Without sufficient incentive to make teaching a lifetime career, teachers with valuable training and experience but heavy family responsibilities too often become frustrated and drop out of the profession. Their children may never try to enter. Although teachers' salaries have generally improved in the Nation in recent years, there are still districts which have starting salaries below $3,000.

Good teachers, moreover, need good schools. Last year, over 1,500,000 children were in overcrowded classrooms and an estimated 2 million others were studying amid grossly substandard health and safety conditions. In many areas school dropouts, or the education of the economically disadvantaged, the culturally deprived, the physically or mentally handicapped, and the gifted require specially designed programs which simply are not available.

I am not the first, but I hope to be the last President to be compelled to call these needless shortcomings to the Nation's attention. These are national problems crossing State boundaries, and deserving of national attention. In our mobile population—where every year one out of five families moves, sometimes across the street, but often across State lines—every family has reason to make teaching in every State a more rewarding and productive profession, and to help every State strengthen its public elementary and secondary education, particularly in those school districts that are financially unable to keep up.

Yet let us face the fact that the Federal Government cannot provide all the financial assistance needed to solve all of the problems mentioned. Instead of a general aid approach that could at best create a small wave in a huge ocean, our efforts should be selective and stimulative, encouraging the States to redouble their efforts under a plan that would phase out Federal aid over a 4-year period.

I recommend, therefore, a 4-year program to provide $1.5 billion to assist States in undertaking under their own State plans selective and urgent improvements in public elementary and secondary education including (1) increasing starting and maximum teacher salaries, and increasing average teacher salaries in economically disadvantaged areas; (2) constructing classrooms in areas of critical and dangerous shortage; and (3) initiating pilot, experimental, or demonstration projects to meet special educational problems, particularly in slums and depressed rural and urban areas.

I also recommend extension of the National Defense Education Act programs which contribute to improving the quality of elementary and secondary education. Grants for testing, guidance, and counseling programs should be expanded and continued beyond the 1964 expiration date. This program has great relevance for the detection of incipient problems which inhibit learning and for development of the talents of our youth. N.D.E.A. assistance for science, mathematics, and foreign language laboratory equipment—which is essential for adequate educational programs using newly developed teaching methods—should also be continued beyond 1964.

Finally, in regard to elementary and secondary schools, I recommend a 4-year continuation of those portions of the federally affected area laws which expire June 30, 1963. These statutes now assist some 4,000 school districts located in every State, which together enroll one-third of all public elementary and secondary school pupils in the Nation. Almost 60,000 critically needed classrooms have been constructed at a cost of $1.15 billion to house more than 1,700,000

pupils; and school operating budgets have been supplemented by more than $1.7 billion. For fiscal 1964 the present provisions would be extended. Limited modifications of the existing provisions, which would take effect beginning in 1965, would overcome certain inequities demonstrated by past experience. Also, the District of Columbia should be added to the jurisdictions eligible to participate.

V. VOCATIONAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

Since the wartime administration of President Woodrow Wilson, Congress has recognized the national necessity of widespread vocational education. Although revised and extended frequently since 1917, the national vocational education acts are no longer adequate. Many once-familiar occupations have declined or disappeared and wholly new industries and jobs have emerged from economic growth and change. The complexities of modern science and technology require training at a higher level than ever before.

For this reason, 2 years ago I requested the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to convene an expert and representative committee to review and evaluate the present vocational education laws and to make recommendations for their modernization. The report of that Committee shows the need for providing new training opportunities—in occupations which have relevance to contemporary America—to 21 million youths now in grade school who will enter the labor market without a college degree during the 1960's. These youths—representing more than 80 percent of the population between the ages of 16 and 21—will be entering the labor market at a time when the need for unskilled labor is sharply diminishing. It is equally necessary to provide training or retraining for the millions of workers who need to learn new skills or whose skills and technical knowledge must be updated.

Both budgetary action and enactment of new legislation is called for. In my 1964 budget I have recommended funds which would permit doubling the number of workers to be trained by the Manpower Development and Training Act programs. These programs have, in their brief existence, already enrolled more than 18,000 men, women, and out-of-school youths who are being trained in occupations where jobs are available.

In addition, I recommend the legislation to—

(a) Expand the scope and level of vocational education programs supported through the Office of Education by replacing the Vocational Education Act of 1946 with new grant-in-aid legislation aimed at meeting the needs of individuals in all age groups for vocational training in occupations where they can find employment in today's diverse labor markets, and

(b) Provide employment and training opportunities for unemployed youth in conservation and local public service projects. The details of this latter proposal are contained in a separate bill—the Youth Employment Opportunities Act—and will be discussed in a later message to be sent to the Congress.

VI. CONTINUING EDUCATION

Education need not and should not end upon graduation at any level. An increasing number of Americans recognize the need and the value of continuing education. The accountant, the salesman, the merchant, the skilled and semiskilled worker, all interested in self-improvements, should all be afforded the opportunity of securing up-to-date knowledge and skills. Only one American in eight has even taken as much as one college course. Yet the State universities and land-grant colleges which offer the majority of extension or part-time courses enroll less than a half million people. Due to inadequate finances and facilities, these colleges can offer only a very limited adult education program. I recommend legislation authorizing Federal grants to States for expanding university extension courses in land-grant colleges and State universities. Despite our high level of educational opportunity and attainment, nearly 23 million adult Americans lack an eighth-grade education. They represent a staggering economic and cultural loss to their families and the Nation. I recommend again, as part of this comprehensive bill, a program to assist all States in offering literacy and basic education courses to adults.

The public library is also an important resources for continuing education. But 18 million people in this Nation still have no access to any local public library service and over 110 million more have only inadequate service.

Advanced age, lack of space, and lack of modern equipment characterize American public library buildings in 1963. Their rate of replacement is barely noticeable: 2 percent in a decade. There are now no Carnegie funds available for libraries—nor have there been for 40 years.

The public library building is usually one of the oldest governmental structures in use in any community. In one prosperous Midwestern State, for example, 30 percent of all public library buildings were built before year 1910, and 85 percent were erected before 1920. Many other States are in a similar situation.

I recommend enactment of legislation to amend the Library Services Act by authorizing a 3-year program of grants for urban as well as rural libraries and for construction as well as operation.

VII. CONCLUSION

In all the years of our national life, the American people—in partnership with their governments—have continued to insist that the means of education shall forever be encouraged, as the Continental Congress affirmed in the Northwest Ordinance. Fundamentally, education is and must always be a local responsibility, for it thrives best when nurtured at the grassroots of our democracy. But in our present era of economic expansion, population growth and technological advance, State, local, and private efforts are insufficient. These efforts must be reinforced by national support, if American education is to yield a maximum of individual development and national well-being.

The necessity of this program does not rest on the course of the cold war. Improvement in education is essential to our Nation's development without respect to what others are doing. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile noting that the Soviet Union recognizes that educational effort in the 1960's will have a major effect on a nation's power, progress and status in the 1970's and 1980's. According to a recent report prepared for the National Science Foundation, Soviet institutions of higher education are graduating three times as many engineers and four times as many physicians as the United States. While trailing behind this country in aggregate annual numbers of higher education graduates, the Soviets are maintaining an annual flow of scientific and technical professional manpower more than twice as large as our own. At the same time, they have virtually eliminated illiteracy, with a 23-fold increase since the turn of the century in the proportion of persons with an education beyond the seventh grade. This Nation's devotion to education is surely sufficient to excel the achievements of any other nation or system.

The program here proposed is reasonable and yet far-reaching. It offers Federal assistance without Federal control. It provides for economic growth, manpower development and progress toward our educational and humanitarian objectives. It encourages the increase of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and critical intelligence necessary for the preservation of our society. It will help keep America strong and safe and free. I strongly recommend it to the Congress for high priority action.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 29, 1963.*

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there are six titles to the President's bill. The first deals with the expansion of opportunities for individuals in higher education. Those are proposed amendments to the National Defense Education Act. Some, but not all of them, are included in the pending measure. Those which are not included are the ones which, in my opinion, in many ways would do the most good. Those which are included are those which are most readily salable and which, to use a phrase to which I hope my friend from Florida will not object when I use the words, are put in to sweeten the bill.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe my friend's use of the word "sweeten" at the present time is considerably different than his earlier use; and I have no criticism.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend very much.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the President's bill concentrated on elementary and secondary education? The committee has come forth with a bill on vocational and higher education and impacted areas. It is like trying to build a skyscraper without foundations. Is that not true?

Mr. CLARK. In all deference, the Senator is only partly correct, because there are six titles to the President's bill. The first title dealt with expansion of opportunities for individuals in higher education. That is the National Defense Education Act amendment.

The second title is expansion and improvement of higher education, which would apply to facilities, libraries and the like.

The third title is for improvement of educational quality, which is teacher training. To some extent that is based on the Conant report on the education of American teachers. Of course, that is higher education.

But the Senator is quite correct in that the fourth title is "Strengthening Public Elementary and Secondary Education." It deals with teachers' salaries and classroom construction, and it proposes to phase out impacted areas. That is the part of the bill which is not being reported at all. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that that is one of the most important parts of the bill. I regret that nothing on that subject is coming from the committee. Perhaps that is the basic reason why I am substituting the omnibus bill for the pending measure.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not extraordinary that people will go in for Federal aid for the frills, but not Federal aid for the basic elementary training upon which higher education must be based?

Mr. CLARK. I believe the Senator is correct. But I have the feeling—and I suspect the Senator from Illinois agrees with me—that our educational system needs upgrading from grade school to graduate school. There is no part of it with which we can be thoroughly satisfied. While I agree with the Senator that ignoring the problems of the primary and secondary schools is the major weakness of the bill, I suggest also that the provisions of the bill do not deal adequately with the other aspects of our educational program. I point out that title VI, Expansion of Continuing Education, which deals with adult education, with better community libraries, is to my way of thinking as important as many of the other titles.

I believe I have said enough to indicate why we should give viability to the President's message, to the President's program, and to the President's bill. I again stress that the situation is a critical one. We, I suspect, are too apt to be a few Neros with fiddles while Rome is burning. As I said yesterday—and I close on the same note—one of our best witnesses before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower said that we are engaged in a race between education and catastrophe, and catastrophe is on its way to win.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator planning to ask for a vote on his amendment, or does he intend to withdraw it?

Mr. CLARK. My present intention is to withdraw the amendment, but I could not feel it in my heart to do so until the Senator from Oregon tells the Senate why he thinks I am mistaken.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. No one is a more ardent supporter of the President's omnibus bill than is the senior Senator from Oregon. I completely agree with the bill. The Senator from Pennsylvania knows that the problem was threshed out in committee. The Senator pressed for consideration of the omnibus bill. I told him that I would have to oppose it in committee. But, as he knows, the record of the committee will show that I gave assurance to the committee that the Senators would have an opportunity to vote up or down each title of the President's bill before we got through with the program. I intend to deliver on that statement. I found myself in the position in which we had to make the installment approach. We did not have money enough to pay the full price all at once. We had to go into installment buying on the educational package. That is the end of the analogy. It is not a very good one, but it makes a point.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. As the Senator knows, I am eager to cooperate with him in moving the bill to expeditious passage. It does not seem to me wise to press my pending amendment to a yea-and-nay vote. I see no indication that an effort will be made to add the various titles of the President's bill piecemeal to the pending measure. Has the Senator from Oregon thought that we should perhaps handle those proposals in the other two education bills that are on the calendar? Otherwise we would not have an opportunity to vote on them if we do not vote on the amendments which I have proposed.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to speak on that question for a moment. The Senator knows what we seek to do from the standpoint of procedure in handling all proposed education legislation. We have taken up the bill now before the Senate. There will be before the Senate the bill relating to higher education. There will be a bill relating to libraries. There will be before the Senate the Prouty-Keating bill for the benefit of teachers in private schools.

In my judgment, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is quite correct in pointing out that, after all, the whole foundation of the American educational system is the elementary and secondary schools. We shall have to come to grips with that problem, too, because colleges can be no better than the elementary and secondary schools. The sad fact is, as some have heard me say over the years, that the American people—and we are as guilty as they—and, in our seats of responsibility, perhaps more so—because we are really cheating tens of thousands of young men and women out of a college education each year because, first, of the great mistakes we are making in our educational policy of sending children to grade schools and high schools which are so low in their standards that the students cannot qualify for college. Tens of thousands of others cannot afford to go on to college because they do not have the economic means to do so.

I have always tried to scotch the argument that if a young man or woman has incentive, ambition, and initiative he or she can go to college. That is nonsense. Many of them are in such an economic position that they cannot possibly go to college.

That is why I believe it so important that we adopt the various titles of the overall bill. We shall have an opportunity to do so.

As this session drags on, and the slow pace continues to characterize it, I say to my friend from Pennsylvania this afternoon, that I believe we may have an opportunity to vote on every title of the President's bill before this term of the Congress concludes. There will be another term. I shall try to obtain a vote on each provision this term, but I would not wish for someone to say, "You did not keep your word." I can only deliver to the extent I can obtain the cooperation of the Senate. I am satisfied that we shall have an opportunity to vote, before the two sessions of the Congress conclude.

I believe it would be wonderful if we could place on the books for the first time in our history the beginning of a rather comprehensive program of Federal aid to education.

I am satisfied that once the American people see the dividends from that program they will say to Members of Congress, "Expand it." And the program will be expanded to meet the President's objectives.

Although I am not alone, I wish to take my full share of the responsibility off the shoulders of the President. It is true that we consulted with the President, and we have talked about the parliamentary situation confronting us in both Houses. I speak for myself and not for the President. I believe this was a decision reached by a majority of us who have charge of education legislation.

It is not in derogation of the House when I point out that there is a problem in the House. We were satisfied that if we went forward with an omnibus bill a good many parliamentary barriers would exist in the House over which we could not climb—higher than the Berlin wall. There is the problem of obtaining a rule. It might not be possible to obtain a rule. We did not think we ought to wait to see. We did not think we ought to take the chance.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask the Senator a question. If he does not wish to answer the question, I shall fully understand.

Mr. MORSE. If I do not answer the Senator's question, it will be because I cannot answer the question.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator believe the Senate will pass an omnibus bill?

Mr. MORSE. I believe that, on the installment approach we are making, we shall pass on the major subject matter of each title of the omnibus bill in due course of time. I sincerely believe that. But that is the only way we can pass an omnibus bill. I think if we sought to pass the proposal now suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania we would not be able to pass it.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I heartily commend the distinguished Senator and his committee for having adopted what he calls the piecemeal approach, rather than the omnibus approach. The Senator has heard me speak frequently on this floor in regard to the omnibus approach, not merely on education, but also on agricultural matters and other things. The wisdom of his course is now being

abundantly confirmed. There was passed the other day, without any serious dissent, a bill to give aid to medical, dental, and osteopathic schools.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Alabama did that. That was done under his leadership.

Mr. HOLLAND. I know, but it is a part of the health and education program. Everyone could tell, by looking at the figures presented, that there is a shortage of professional talent in those fields which justifies Federal help of the type which is to be given under that bill.

Now the distinguished Senator from Oregon has presented a bill embodying three very important subjects; vocational education, the National Defense Education Act, and assistance to defense impacted areas.

As to vocational education, there are some of us who have as much interest in the civil rights problem as anyone else, who cannot vote for and would not vote for and would strenuously object to ever approving some of the more drastic provisions in the omnibus civil rights program. But vocational education is a part of the civil rights program, though offered now in a purely educational bill which I believe all Senators can support.

All Senators realize that the better the education of the underprivileged, regardless of what their color might be, the better equipped they will be to obtain the economic prizes which are available only to educated people. This program will go further in the long run, in my judgment, to meet many of the civil rights problems than the more drastic and coercive measures which are proposed in the omnibus program.

I am happy to have the opportunity to support in this measure the vocational education proposal, though I would have preferred that the approach be a little slower from the standpoint of the money involved. I voted yesterday for the $600 million plus authorized by the House over the 5-year period, rather than the estimated $1½ billion in obligational authority contained in the committee bill.

I approve the large expansion of vocational education. I strongly approve the expansion of the National Defense Education Act, to give more opportunities to more young people to equip themselves better than would be at all possible if they had to rely solely upon their own resources or the resources of their families.

I agree completely, as I have already stated, with the extension of aid to defense impacted areas, which I believe is simple justice, and not in the category of other programs in this and other bills, which involve the question of wisdom rather than justice. I believe the aid to impacted areas should be passed on the concept of the Federal Government doing justice to communities which are badly disturbed in their school systems by the influx of thousands of children and the simultaneous cutting down of their tax bases by taking large areas off the tax rolls.

I congratulate the Senator for this piecemeal approach. I think he is accomplishing good results by this approach. I am happy to be able to stand with him. I believe he would have been unable to accomplish the desired results if he had continued with the omnibus approach.

I believe the Senator is showing great wisdom and great practicality. I commend him warmly. I hope there will be many occasions when I can stand with him. I would not have been able to do so if he had insisted on the omnibus bill in the field of Federal aid to education. I am happy about the course the distinguished Senator has adopted, and I want him to know that I believe he is rendering great service to the entire Nation by following this approach.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida very much for his comments. His comments give me an opportunity to make a brief reference to one subject matter he raised. It may not be wise for me to comment on it, because I may be guilty of doing what I told my students never to be guilty of. I told them never to overtry their case, never to raise any issue which did not have to be raised in order to get the court to pass on the merits of the case. Nevertheless, I am not going to duck the issue. I am glad the Senator raised the civil rights point in his comments.

I commend Southern Senators who have been standing with me on this vocational education bill. In my judgment, the vocational education bill has many strengths. One of them is its uniformity of application to all people in this country irrespective of the color of their skin who need some training for employment or need some retraining or upgrading of training so that they can take new jobs because they have lost old jobs.

I was not happy about the fact that in the course of this debate I had to find myself in opposition to my good friends from Pennsylvania and New York, and others Senators on the Javits amendment this afternoon. I felt it had no place in the bill, but I think a vocational education program based upon a uniform application of the bill in the matter of training for jobs, including Negroes, is about as sound a piece of civil rights legislation as we could have before us this afternoon. I do not think any Senator from the South, the North, the East, or the West will deny that what is needed in connection with the problems of civil rights in this country is to increase job opportunities for Negroes. Job opportunities for Negroes cannot be increased if they are not trained so they can hold jobs in this day of automation.

That is one of my strongest arguments in support of my defense of the bill. It is a sound bill because it seeks to benefit the whole country in connection with the matter of training or retraining for employment.

How much time have I, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

REGULATION OF COLLECTIVE INVESTMENT FUNDS MAINTAINED BY BANKS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], and myself, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill establishing standards and procedures for the regulation and operation of collective investment funds maintained by banks in the conduct of their trust department functions.

The bill has been discussed to some degree in the Banking and Currency Committee in connection with the bill that was put through on the Securities Act some time before.

The primary objectives of this bill are twofold:

First, to provide certain basic investor protections for the participating interests in bank collective investment funds through statutory requirements for reporting and public disclosure; and

Second, to resolve the overlapping jurisdictional claims of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Comptroller of the Currency with respect to regulation of collective investment funds maintained by national banks through statutory provisions specifically vesting in the Federal banking agencies the sole authority to regulate and supervise collective investment funds maintained by national and State-chartered banks.

For 25 years national banks have been permitted to maintain pooled funds—known as common trust funds—for the investment and reinvestment of funds held by the bank in the capacity of trustee, executor, administrator, or guardian. This right was first granted in 1937 by the Federal Reserve Board, which at that time had the statutory responsibility for supervision and regulation of the trust activities of national banks.

The common trust fund has been rather widely utilized by banks for the management of certain trust and fiduciary accounts, because this pooling method permits more efficient, economical, and diversified investment of fairly small accounts than would be possible if the same accounts were to be managed and invested separately and individually. According to the 1962 survey of common trust funds conducted by the Federal Reserve Board, there were, last year, 564 common trust funds being administered by 343 banks across the Nation. Approximately 165,000 separate fiduciary accounts were pooled in these common trust funds, representing an average participation of about $21,700.

Under section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code, a bank—either national or State—could obtain tax-exempt status for its common trust fund only if that fund was maintained in conformity with the rules and regulations of the Federal Reserve Board. Thus, State-chartered banks and national banks have adhered to nearly identical procedures in the operation of their common trust funds.

In September of last year the Congress adopted legislation approved by the

President as Public Law 87-722, which transferred from the Federal Reserve Board to the Comptroller of the Currency the statutory authority over trust powers of national banks, including common trust funds. Section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code was correspondingly amended so as to provide that the tax-exempt status of common trust funds would be predicated on conformity with the rules and regulations issued by the Comptroller of the Currency.

Early this year the Comptroller of the Currency, acting under the authority of Public Law 87-722, issued a revision of the regulations governing the trust activities of national banks. With respect to collective investment funds these revised regulations included two important changes. They permitted banks to pool or commingle for investment purposes assets held by the bank as a managing agent or as a trustee for a Smathers-Keogh self-employed retirement plan.

Immediately upon the issuance of the revised regulations by the Comptroller, the Securities and Exchange Commission announced its belief that these newly authorized pooled funds bore such a similarity to mutual funds that such funds would be subject to SEC regulation under the Securities Act of 1933 and the Investment Company Act of 1940.

The Comptroller of the Currency has disputed the position of the SEC, holding that the pooling of Smathers-Keogh trusts and managing agency accounts does not involve the entry of bank trust departments into the mutual fund business but, on the contrary, represents only a modest extension of the common trust fund procedures to two other well-defined classes of fiduciary accounts.

Both the Comptroller and the SEC have remained resolute in their views on this matter. As a consequence, any bank which plans to utilize these new pooling powers for either managing agency accounts or for Smathers-Keogh trusts must presently anticipate regulation of these collective investment funds by two Federal agencies. Duplicative Federal regulation is not a circumstance to be cherished by any private institution, and it is an especially distasteful prospect for the already heavily regulated commercial banks.

This problem of duplicative regulation of bank-maintained collective investment funds was considered earlier this year by the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. That subcommittee received testimony from Chairman Carey of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. James Saxon, and witnesses representing the banking industry. The subcommittee concluded, after its study of the problem, that legislation was necessary to eliminate the present condition of overlapping claims of jurisdiction.

Mr. President, the legislation which I am introducing today is specifically designed to carry out the recommendation of the House Committee on Government Operations.

The bill, as presented, consists basically of two parts. The first part takes care of the necessary amendments to the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, in order to eliminate the jurisdictional conflict between the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Comptroller of the Currency.

The second portion of the bill provides in quite specific terms the standards and requirements which must be met by banks which establish and operate collective investment funds in connection with their trust department functions. These requirements are explained in more detail in the text of a section-by-section analysis which will immediately follow my remarks.

Mr. President, the need for this legislation is particularly critical in the case of the Smathers-Keogh self-employed retirement plans. The Smathers-Keogh Act, H.R. 10, becomes fully effective at the end of this calendar year. The terms of that act contemplate that many of these retirement plans for the self-employed will be trusteed plans with commercial banks acting as the trustee. Because of the limited size of the typical Smathers-Keogh plan, it will be necessary for the bank trustee to place the assets of these plans in a commingled fund for economic and efficient administration. If such pooled funds are subject to SEC regulations in addition to regulation by the Federal banking agencies and regulation for tax purposes by the Internal Revenue Service, it is, indeed, doubtful whether many banks will be interested in undertaking this new type of activity. In my opinion, this unfortunate turn of events would gravely limit the potential effectiveness of the Smathers-Keogh Act. I hope, therefore, that this legislation will receive early and favorable consideration by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and by both Houses of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there may be printed in the RECORD the text of a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

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

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. DOMINICK. In that connection, I should like to add that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], in the process of the debate on the Securities Act bill, previously passed by this body, stated, when I offered an amendment similar to this to the Securities Act, that it should not be taken up at that time because no hearings had been held on it, but that if such a bill were introduced he would undertake to hold hearings on it as soon as practicable. So I am hoping this bill will have hearings and that consideration of it will proceed thereafter as soon as possible.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be held at the desk through next Monday, for additional cosponsors. I feel the bill has great merit, and additional Senators may wish to sponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 2223) to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for the regulation of collective investment funds maintained by banks, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK (for himself, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. McINTYRE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXHIBIT I

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BILL ESTABLISHING REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR COLLECTIVE INVESTMENT FUNDS MAINTAINED BY BANKS

SHORT TITLE

The first section of the bill provides that it may be cited by its short title—the Bank Collective Investment Fund Act of 1963.

SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS

Section 2a of the bill defines the term "appropriate supervisory agency" as used in the bill and specifies the categories of banks which each such supervisory agency shall supervise for the purposes of this bill. It provides that: National banks and banks operating under the laws for the District of Columbia shall be supervised by the Comptroller of the Currency; other member banks of the Federal Reserve System shall be supervised by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; other federally insured banks, not falling in any of the foregoing categories shall be supervised by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; and any nonmember, State-chartered bank, which does not hold deposits insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall, if it chooses to come under the terms of this bill, be supervised by such one of the three Federal supervisory agencies as it may elect in accordance with the provisions of section 2b.

The last-mentioned category of banks covers a small group of State-chartered trust companies (about 50 according to 1962 FDIC figures) which are not members of the Federal Reserve System and which do not hold deposits insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. This provision of the bill operating in conjunction with section 2b would provide that these trust companies could voluntarily come under the terms of the bill by electing to have their collective investment funds supervised by one of the three Federal banking agencies. This choice and election has purposely been drafted in permissive rather than mandatory language to avoid any challenge of unconstitutionality.

Section 2b of the bill defines the term "bank" to mean—

(1) a banking institution organized under the laws of the United States;

(2) a member bank of the Federal Reserve System;

(3) an insured bank as that term is defined in the Federal Deposit Insurance Act;

(4) any other banking institution or trust company, whether incorporated or not, doing business under the laws of any State or of the United States, a substantial portion of the business of which consists of receiving deposits or exercising fiduciary powers similar to those permitted to national banks under section 92a of title 12, as amended, and which is supervised and examined by State or Federal authority having supervision over banks and which has filed with any one of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Deposit

Insurance Corporation, a written declaration that it elects to maintain any collective investment fund established by it in accordance with the provisions of this Act; and

(5) a receiver, conservator, or other liquidating agent of any institution or firm included in clauses (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this paragraph.

Except for the language appearing in clause (4) with respect to the filing of a written declaration this definition is closely patterned after the definition of "bank" contained in the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended.

Section 2c of the bill defines the term "collective investment fund" to mean a common trust fund or other pooled or collective fund maintained by a bank for the collective investment and reinvestment of assets contributed thereto by such bank in its capacity as trustee, executor, administrator, guardian or managing agent, or a fund consisting solely of assets of retirement, pension, profit sharing, stock bonus, or other trusts which are exempt from Federal income taxation under the Internal Revenue Code.

This definition includes all collective investment funds presently permitted to national banks by regulation 9 of the Comptroller of the Currency.

Section 2d of the bill defines the term "managing agent" to mean the capacity assumed by a bank upon the creation of an account which gives the bank possession of property and confers upon the bank investment discretion for the management of the account. The requirement that investment discretion must be conferred upon the bank imposes a heavy fiduciary obligation on the bank thus elevating this relationship above the normal principal-agent relationship.

Section 2e of the bill defines the term "plan" to mean the written plan required under section 6 of the bill. This plan will provide a rather detailed description of the manner in which the particular collective investment fund is to be operated.

SECTION 3. AMENDMENT TO THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933

This section of the bill amends Paragraph (1) of Section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 776(1)) so as to exclude from the definition of "security" contained in that Act any interest in a bank-maintained collective investment fund which is subject to the provisions of this bill. This amendment has the effect of exempting all collective investment funds subject to the requirements of this bill from the operation of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended.

SECTION 4. AMENDMENT TO THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

This section of the bill amends Paragraph (10) of Section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(10)) so as to exclude from the definition of "security" contained in that Act any interest in a bank-maintained collective investment fund which is subject to the provisions of this bill. This amendment has the effect of exempting all collective investment funds subject to the requirements of this bill from the operation of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

SECTION 5. AMENDMENT TO THE INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940

Presently Paragraph 3 of section 3(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (15 U.S.C. 80a-3(c)(3)) provides that "any common trust fund or similar fund maintained by a bank exclusively for the collective investment and reinvestment of moneys contributed thereto by the bank in its capacity as a trustee, executor, administrator or guardian" is not within the meaning of "an investment company" as that term is used in the Act. This section of the bill amends the paragraph in which the above-quoted exclusionary language appears so as to also exclude from the operation of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, any other bank-maintained collective investment fund subject to the requirements of this bill.

SECTION 6. THE PLAN, THE FINANCIAL REPORT, AND THE POWERS OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Section 6a of the bill requires that any bank covered by the bill and which maintains one or more collective investment funds shall maintain each such fund in conformity with the provisions of the bill and in conformity with the rules and regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency pertaining to collective investments by national banks. The requirement of conformity with the rules and regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency is patterned after the present provisions of Section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 584) which specifies that a bank-maintained "common trust fund" must be operated in conformity with the Comptroller's rules and regulations, pertaining to collective investments by national banks, in order to qualify for Federal income taxation.

Section 6b provides that the rules and regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency shall be directed at insuring that the collective investment funds of national banks are maintained in full accord with proper conduct of fiduciary business. It also specifies that these rules and regulations shall provide for the full disclosure of relevant information to persons having interests in accounts which are presently or may in the future participate in the collective investment funds. This section authorizes the Comptroller of the Currency to include in his rules and regulations definitions of accounting, technical, and trade terms used in the bill.

Section 6c of the bill provides that for each collective investment fund maintained by a bank, the bank shall be required to file with the appropriate supervisory agency (as defined in section 2a) a written plan (the contents of which are set forth in section 6d) describing the proposed manner in which the fund is to be operated. Also any revisions or supplements to the plan must be filed with the appropriate supervisory agency. All documents, so filed, are to be available for public inspection at the appropriate supervisory agency.

Section 6d specifies the contents of the written plan to be filed under the requirements of 6c. The purpose of the plan is to provide a detailed description of the manner in which the collective investment fund is to be operated. The items specifically required by Section 6d to be included in the written plan are provisions describing the type of types of assets in which it is contemplated the collective investment fund is to be invested, the allocation of income, profits and losses, the terms and conditions governing the admission or withdrawal of participations in the collective investment fund, the auditing of accounts of the bank with respect to the collective investment fund, the basis and method of valuing assets in the collective investment fund, the minimum frequency for valuation of assets of the collective investment fund, the period following each such valuation date during which the valuation must be made, and the basis upon which the collective investment fund may be terminated. Additionally this section requires the inclusion in the written plan of such other matters as may be required by the Comptroller of the Currency to define clearly the rights of participating interests in the collective investment fund.

Section 6e requires that banks annually prepare a financial report for each collective investment fund. The financial report is to be filed with the appropriate supervisory agency within three months (or within such other time as the Comptroller may by regulation prescribe) after the close of the accounting period covered by the report. This report like the written plan shall be available for public inspection at the supervisory agency where filed. Section 6e further requires that after filing, a copy of the financial report and a copy of any amendment to the plan, adopted during the period covered by the financial report, shall be furnished by the bank (or notice given that a copy of such report and a copy of any such amendment will be furnished on request without charge), with respect to each account participating in the fund, to each co-fiduciary and to each person who, under the instrument pursuant to which the bank is acting, has the right to be consulted about investments or to amend or revoke any terms of such instruments. Persons having only a beneficial interest in the participating accounts were purposely not included among those to whom financial reports must be furnished, for the very valid reason that the identities of such persons may not be known by the bank (i.e. a contingent remainderman in the case of a trust or several thousand employee-beneficiaries in the case of an employee pension plan). However the Comptroller of the Currency is given the authority to require, by regulation, that the financial report and amendments to the plan be furnished to persons beyond those specifically set forth in the bill and could, therefore, include certain holders of a beneficial interest.

Items to be included in the financial report are:

(1) a detailed listing of all assets and liabilities of the collective investment fund, showing in the case of assets both cost and market value and concentration by major fields;

(2) a statement of increases or decreases in gross asset valuation since the last prior report;

(3) a statement of earnings;

(4) a statement of realized gains and losses;

(5) a statement of investments purchased, sold, or redeemed since the last prior report; and

(6) such other accounting or financial information as the Comptroller of the Currency shall by regulation require to furnish adequate information to persons having interests in participating accounts.

Section 6f provides that at or prior to the time of the first participation of an account in a collective investment fund, a copy of the written plan as currently in effect, or a summary thereof, and a copy of the latest financial report shall be furnished by the bank, without charge, to those persons, who under section 6e are specifically entitled to receive copies of the financial report on an annual basis. Like 6e this section also empowers the Comptroller to specify by regulation other persons to whom such documents shall be provided. The reason for permitting a summary of the plan in lieu of the formal document, which is to be filed under Section 6c, is that in certain cases the trust agreement governing the fund may be used by the bank to meet the Section 6c requirements. In these cases a summary would be much more meaningful and informative to the layman than would the technical legal provisions of the trust instrument.

Section 6g provides that interests in a collective investment fund shall not be evidenced by any certificate and shall not be transferable except at the termination or partial termination of a trust or estate as the corpus of another trust. Under the procedures generally employed by banks which presently maintain common trust funds or similar collective investment funds the only physical evidence of participating interest in the fund is a ledger entry or similar accounting record of the bank. Thus at present there is no certification. However to prevent the growth or development of any practice which might lead to security-type trading of interests in bank-maintained

collective investment funds it is deemed advisable to prohibit certification or general transfer of such interests. The limited exception to the general prohibition on transferability is intended to permit the continued use of certain interfund transfers of participations which have been determined as being not inconsistent with accepted trust practice by the Federal Reserve Board during its regulation of trust activities by national banks. A case example of such an interfund transfer might be the transfer of a distributable share from a terminating testimentary trust to a living trust in the same pooled fund. By permitting direct transfer the need to liquidate and reinvest the proceeds would be avoided. Such transfers, of course, are not permitted if the purpose is to accomplish an improper avoidance of tax liability.

Section 6h provides certain specific and general requirements for the Comptroller of the Currency's rules and regulations pertaining to collective investment funds. It requires that the Comptroller's rules and regulations shall include provisions governing—

(1) the manner in which a bank may advertise or publicize its collective investment funds;

(2) limitations on the interests that a bank may have, as a result of creditor relationships or otherwise, in its collective investment funds;

(3) the percentage of a collective investment fund that may be represented by any one participating account;

(4) limitations on the percentage of investment by a collective investment fund in the securities of any one issuer; and

(5) maintenance of liquidity of collective investment funds.

While it would, doubtless, be possible to specify statutory standards in each of these five areas, it is judged that the sounder and more effective approach is to leave the actual drawing of limitations and restrictions to regulations which are tailored to operational experience and regulatory oversight.

This section further directs the Comptroller to promulgate such additional rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act. Such provision merely reinforces the authority granted by section 6b to the Comptroller of the Currency to prescribe rules and regulations designed to assure that the collective investment funds will be maintained in accordance with accepted fiduciary practices and that important information concerning the operation and maintenance of the fund will be provided to persons having a definable interest in a participating trust or account. It should be noted that regulation 9 of the Comptroller of the Currency already includes very comprehensive provisions dealing with such matters as public merchandising, conflict of interest, and self-dealing.

Section 6i vests the Comptroller of the Currency with the discretionary power to exempt any class or classes of collective investment funds or transactions from any provision of this bill or any rule or regulation promulgated thereunder; provided, the Comptroller determines such exemption to be in the public interest and consistent with the spirit and purposes of the bill. This discretionary power to exempt is similar, though less extensive in that it is limited to class exemptions, to the powers granted to the Securities and Exchange Commission in section 6c of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended.

Section 6j provides that the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall furnish to the Comptroller of the Currency copies of all documents (plans, financial reports, etc.) which the bill requires banks to furnish to those agencies. This provision was included to assure that the Comptroller of the Currency will have available all information needed in the exercise of his rulemaking powers under the bill.

SECTION 7. TRANSITION PERIOD

Section 7a grants a 180-day grace period, in which banks may make such changes as are necessary to bring the operation of their presently established collective investment funds into conformity with the requirements of the Act.

Section 7b makes it unlawful after the date of enactment for a bank covered by the Act to commence operation of a collective investment fund without first filing a written plan with the appropriate supervisory agency.

SECTION 8. ENFORCEMENT

This section vests responsibility for enforcement of the bill's provisions and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder in the three Federal banking agencies according to their areas of supervision as defined in section 2a. This provision avoids any dislocation of the established supervisory jurisdictions of the three Federal banking agencies.

SECTION 9. PENALTIES

This section authorizes the imposition of a fine, not to exceed $25,000, on any bank which is duly convicted of wilfully violating any provisions of the bill or the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder or which makes any untrue statement of material fact or omits the statement of material fact in any of the documents required to be filed under the provisions of this bill. It was deemed necessary to include a special penal provision in this bill since the sanctions generally available to the Federal banking agencies to effectuate these enforcement activities would not be appropriate for use in the limited area of banking covered by this bill. It should be noted that section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code (15 U.S.C. 584) already offers a strong incentive for banks to conform with the regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency pertaining to common trust funds. Failure to conform is basis for denial of exemption from Federal income taxation.

SECTION 10. EFFECTIVE DATE

This section provides that the provisions of the Act shall take effect immediately upon the date of enactment.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. I understand that the Senator from Oregon has agreed to yield some time to the Senator from Delaware. May I inquire how much time is left both in behalf of and in opposition to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 15 minutes remaining; the Senator from Oregon has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. If no Senator will raise a point of order because of the obvious conflict of interest in which I am acting, I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware from my time, on behalf of the amendment, and 5 minutes from the time of the Senator from Oregon, in opposition.

DISAPPEARANCE OF OVERSEA SHIPMENTS OF $100 MILLION OF GRAIN

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on July 16 I called to the attention of the Senate the fact that there had disappeared or had been illegally diverted approximately 24 million bushels of feed grain valued at $32 million. These 24 million bushels of feed grain had been shipped to Austria but they had never arrived at that destination. They had been shipped under the provisions of Public Law 480.

Today I have received a report from the Comptroller General of the United States. It is dated October 7. The letter accompanying the report, signed by the Comptroller General, reads in part as follows:

> In our review, we noted that commodities with an estimated export market value of approximately $100 million had been shipped to Colombia, Turkey, and Vietnam under title I during calendar year 1962 but had not been accounted for by required reports on the arrival and disposition of commodities. In the case of Vietnam, no reports of the arrival and disposition of commodities had been received since inception of the title I program in that country in 1958, although commodities with an estimated export market value of about $50 million had been shipped to that country. Reports on shipments to several other countries were not submitted on a quarterly basis but covered longer periods of time; some of these reports were submitted approximately 10 to 20 months after the shipments covered in the reports were made. We noted also that reports of commodities received by Egypt during the period February 6 through November 23, 1962, showed about 44,000 metric tons less than the quantities shown on bills of lading as having been shipped to Egypt.

The Comptroller General states further:

> On the basis of our review, we have concluded that the Department of Agriculture has not obtained sufficient information from its agricultural attachés overseas or from representatives of American Embassies nor has it had adequate procedures for ascertaining that surplus agricultural commodities sold to foreign countries and financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation under title I are received and used in authorized foreign countries and do not result in increased availability of the same or similar commodities to unfriendly nations.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the letter and excerpts from the report may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Comptroller General points out the complete lack of control by the Government over the final destination of these commodities which are sold at these low prices. They are either traded for material which we do not need or sold for soft currencies. He points out that the Government has no assurance that they are going to the country to which they are shipped.

The Comptroller General points out that there is no assurance that these are not being diverted to unfriendly nations, that some may even have been supplied to Russia and her satellites, and sold not at world prices, but at practically giveaway prices, all at the expense of the American taxpayers.

In July we found that 24 million bushels, valued at $32 million had been lost. Today the Comptroller General is saying that there is complete lack of accounting with respect to another $100 million worth of grain during calendar year 1962, that allegedly had been

shipped to Colombia, Turkey, and Vietnam.

I respectfully suggest that the time is long past due when the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should act on the resolution which was submitted on July 16, asking that the committee undertake a thorough investigation of all sales under Public Law 480. I believe that Congress has reached the point where we should stop these sales until an accounting has been made.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand the Senator to state that with respect to these surplus foods which we shipped, no accounting has been made, and that they might have gone to unfriendly nations?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the statement of the Comptroller General. On July 16 when I disclosed that we had lost the other grain, I raised that possibility and suggested that the Government did not know where it went. The Department of Agriculture issued a statement emphatically denying that any of it had gone to Russia or her satellites, although in the next paragraph of their statement they stated they did not have the slightest idea where it had gone. How these officials can tell where it did not go when they do not know where it went is something they have not explained.

Today I am reading not my statement, but the statement of the Comptroller General. He states that there is a complete lack of control, and that these goods may have gone to "unfriendly nations," in which event it could have gone to Russia, and someone could have pocketed the money. These commodities which we had practically given away could have been transferred in many different ways.

The point is that the taxpayers are paying for these goods which are being shipped to these foreign countries under the guise of getting rid of surpluses or assisting needy people in those countries.

The Comptroller General now states that $100 million worth has not gone where it was supposed to go. The Department of Agriculture has the responsibility of telling us where it went, and at least to exercise a greater degree of concern as to what is happening to these grains. I have not been able to get any indication that anyone in the Department even cares where they have gone. All I can get from them is a loose denial that there has been any loss. That statement is ridiculous. On July 16, 1963, I said 24 million bushels worth $32 million had disappeared en route to Austria. Here is another $100 million worth gone. I was wrong in that I underestimated the lost grain by $100 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the $100 million involve the cost of surplus foods that were sent to Turkey, Colombia, and South Vietnam?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The item that went to Austria——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is a separate item.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is a separate item?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; that is not covered in this Comptroller General's report. That is a separate item involving $32 million. It has finally been confirmed that that shortage exists. Now here is another $100 million worth on top of the $32 million that I mentioned. That makes a total of $132 million of agricultural commodities which have not reached the countries to which they were shipped. No one knows where these commodities went and, I regret to say, as far as the administration is concerned, they do not seem to care.

EXHIBIT 1

(Excerpts from October 1963 report to Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States on inadequate controls for determining compliance by foreign governments with restrictions placed on the disposition of agricultural commodities made available under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Department of Agriculture, June 1963.)

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, October 7, 1963.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Herewith is our report on inadequate controls within the Department of Agriculture for determining compliance by foreign governments with restrictions placed on the disposition of agricultural commodities made available under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), commonly known as Public Law 480.

Under title I of Public Law 480, the President is authorized to negotiate and carry out agreements with friendly nations or organizations of friendly nations to provide for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities and for payment to be received in local currency of the recipient country. From inception of the title I program in July 1954 through December 31, 1962, the U.S. Government signed sales agreements with 44 foreign governments. The estimated cost to the Government of financing the agricultural commodities exported under the agreements, including ocean transportation costs, was about $9.5 billion and involved the movement overseas of more than 67 million metric tons of agricultural commodities.

The law requires the U.S. Government to obtain commitments from foreign countries that will prevent the unauthorized resale or transshipment to other countries of agricultural commodities made available under title I of the act and to take steps to assure that agricultural commodities sold or transferred thereunder do not result in increased availability of those or like commodities to unfriendly nations. To determine compliance with these statutory requirements, the Department of Agriculture requires its agricultural attachés in foreign countries to obtain specified information and to submit quarterly reports showing, among other things, the quantity of commodities arriving in each country and the disposition of commodities made available. In those countries where agricultural attachés are not assigned, the Department has requested the American Embassies to submit the required information.

On the basis of our review, we have concluded that the Department of Agriculture has not obtained sufficient information from its agricultural attachés overseas or from representatives of American Embassies nor has it had adequate procedures for ascertaining that surplus agricultural commodities sold to foreign countries and financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation under title I are received and used in authorized foreign countries and do not result in increased availability of the same or similar commodities to unfriendly nations. As a result, the Department has not had adequate assurance that foreign governments are complying with statutory restrictions placed on the disposition of agricultural commodities made available under title I.

The Department has not received required information on arrival and disposition of commodities in some foreign countries; in some cases the information was obtained on an irregular basis or was not complete. Followup action to obtain required reports has not been sufficiently aggressive. Furthermore, information was not readily available in the Washington, D.C., headquarters office of the Department as to reports required and received, and there were no formal control records indicating the quantities of commodities shipped to each foreign country and the quantities reported as having arrived in each foreign country, so as to enable prompt detection and investigation of any differences. Also, effective arrangements have not been made with the Department of State to have the American Embassies obtain the required information in certain countries. In addition, the Department of Agriculture has not issued instructions setting forth the extent of independent verification expected to be made, by attachés, of information required to be obtained from foreign government agencies relative to the arrival and disposition of commodities.

In our review, we noted that commodities with an estimated export market value of approximately $100 million had been shipped to Colombia, Turkey, and Vietnam under title I during calendar year 1962 but had not been accounted for by required reports on the arrival and disposition of commodities. In the case of Vietnam, no reports of the arrival and disposition of commodities had been received since inception of the title I program in that country in 1958, although commodities with an estimated export market value of about $50 million had been shipped to that country. Reports on shipments to several other countries were not submitted on a quarterly basis but covered longer periods of time; some of these reports were submitted approximately 10 to 20 months after the shipments covered in the reports were made. We noted also that reports of commodities received by Egypt during the period February 6 through November 23, 1962, showed about 44,000 metric tons less than the quantities shown on bills of lading as having been shipped to Egypt.

We are recommending that the Secretary of Agriculture take certain specific actions to strengthen controls for determining that surplus agricultural commodities made available to foreign countries under title I are actually received and used in authorized foreign countries and do not result in increased availability of the same or similar commodities to unfriendly nations. Among other measures to be taken, we believe that the Secretary should consider the possible advantages to be achieved by requesting the assistance of the Agency for International Development, Department of State, in those countries where that Agency's personnel are located, for the performance of arrival accounting and end-use investigations of surplus agricultural commodities made available under title I.

In commenting on the matters discussed in this report, the Department of Agriculture has advised us that it plans to take certain specific steps to strengthen its current procedures for determining future compliance by foreign countries with restrictions placed on the disposition of agricul-

tural commodities made available under title I. In addition, the Department of State and the Agency for International Development have advised us of their willingness to assist the Department of Agriculture in resolving the problems presented in this report.

The benefits to be derived from the actions proposed by the Department of Agriculture will depend on the effectiveness with which these actions are carried out. We intend to review at a future date the specific actions taken by the Department and to examine into the effectiveness of such actions in providing adequate controls to determine that surplus agricultural commodities made available under title I of Public Law 480 are actually received and used in authorized foreign countries and do not result in increased availability of the same or similar commodities to unfriendly nations.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Secretary of State, to the Administrator, Agency for International Development, and to the Director, Food for Peace.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

On the basis of our review, we have concluded that the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture has not obtained sufficient information from its agricultural attachés overseas or from representatives of American Embassies nor has it had adequate procedures for ascertaining that surplus agricultural commodities sold to foreign countries and financed by CCC under title I, Public Law 480, are received and used in the authorized foreign countries and do not result in increased availability of the same or similar commodities to unfriendly nations.

In many cases FAS has not received required information on the arrival and disposition of commodities in foreign countries; in some cases the information was obtained on an irregular basis or was not complete. Followup action to obtain required reports has not been sufficiently aggressive. Furthermore, information was not readily available in the Washington, D.C., headquarters office of FAS as to reports required and received, and there were no formal control records indicating the quantities of commodities shipped to each foreign country and the quantities reported as having arrived in each foreign country, so as to enable prompt detection and investigation of any differences. Also, in those countries where agricultural attachés have not been assigned, effective arrangements have not been made with the Department of State to have the American Embassies obtain the required information for FAS. In addition, the agency has not issued instructions setting forth the extent of independent verification expected to be made, by attachés, of information required to be obtained from foreign government agencies relative to the arrival and disposition of commodities.

As a result of the above weaknesses in controls, the Department of Agriculture has not had adequate assurance that foreign governments are complying with statutory restrictions placed on the disposition of agricultural commodities made available under title I.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

Specific deficiencies disclosed by our review are described in the following sections of this report.

REQUIRED INFORMATION ON ARRIVAL AND DISPOSITION OF COMMODITIES WAS NOT ALWAYS RECEIVED

Although FAS Field Instruction No. 5 requires agricultural attachés to submit quarterly reports containing information relating to arrival and disposition of commodities made available under title I, our review disclosed that the required information was not always received. For some shipments, no reports were received; in other instances the reports were submitted on an irregular basis. In our test of the controls being exercised by the Department of Agriculture over the disposition of agricultural commodities made available under title I of Public Law 480, we selected 253 ocean bills of lading applicable to shipments of about 747,000 metric tons of surplus agricultural commodities to 14 foreign countries during the period April 1960 to November 1962. We found that FAS files did not contain reports showing evidence of arrival for about 209,000 metric tons of commodities applicable to 132 of the 253 bills of lading selected for review.

Because required quarterly reports on the arrival and disposition of commodities made available under title I were not being received, FAS brought this situation to the attention of agricultural attachés or, where no attachés were assigned, to the attention of American Embassies, in 15 countries in August 1961, and solicited the cooperation of the attachés or Embassies in furnishing the required reports. Our review in June 1963 showed that commodities had been shipped to 14 of the 15 countries during calendar year 1962 but that for 3 of these countries (Colombia, Turkey, and Vietnam) no reports on arrival and disposition of commodities had been received, although agency records indicated that commodities with an estimated export market value of approximately $100 million had been shipped under title I to the three countries during that year. In this connection, no reports of the arrival and disposition of commodities in Vietnam had been received pursuant to FAS Field Instruction No. 5 although, according to FAS records, commodities with an estimated export market value of about $50 million had been shipped to Vietnam since inception of the title I program in that country in 1958. Similarly, reports had not been received for any of the numerous shipments arriving in Yugoslavia after January 1960, and in Spain after May 1959. In this connection, the last shipment to Spain was made in December 1961.

A few reports on shipments to other countries were not submitted on a quarterly basis as required but covered longer periods of time; some of these reports were submitted approximately 10 to 20 months after shipments were made.

We discussed with an official of the Program Operations Division, FAS, the failure in many instances to obtain the required information on the arrival and disposition of commodities in foreign countries. He informed us that this failure may have been due to some extent to laxity on the part of agricultural attachés. Another contributing cause, according to the official, was that the work of the FAS section responsible for obtaining the reports suffered because the section operated without a chief from early 1960 until September 1962.

Although, as previously noted, many of the required reports had not been received for calendar year 1962, specific requests for the missing reports had not been made at the time of our review in June 1963. In our opinion, FAS should have been more aggressive in following up on the failure of attachés and Embassies to submit required reports on the arrival and disposition of commodities in foreign countries.

Many reports did not show arrivals by vessels, disposition of commodities, or measures taken by foreign governments to comply with statutory restrictions regarding disposition of commodities.

In our review of 238 reports submitted to FAS by agricultural attachés, we found that many of the reports were incomplete in that they did not show, as required by FAS Field Instruction No. 5, arrivals by vessels, disposition of commodities, or statements as to measures taken by foreign governments to comply with statutory restrictions regarding the resale or transshipment of commodities.

For example, reports from the attaché in the United Arab Republic (Egypt) on commodities arriving after September 1959 did not show arrivals by vessels; the reports showed quantities shipped from the United States rather than the quantities delivered in Egypt. In a report dated April 21, 1960, the agricultural attaché in Egypt stated that:

"Our contact in the Ministry of Supply on Public Law 480 matters does not concern itself with delivery weights and is no longer able to supply this information to us. If this information is needed, we can make an effort to obtain it from some other source." The Assistant Head, Program Analysis Section, FAS, informed us that the attaché was not requested to try to obtain such information.

Regarding the requirement that reports received from attachés must show the disposition of commodities in foreign countries, reports received from the attaché in Egypt on commodities arriving after September 1959 did not comment on the disposition of commodities. Similarly, a report dated April 9, 1962, from the acting attaché in Chile did not show information as to the disposition of over 150,000 metric tons of grains, tobacco, and vegetable oil made available to Chile under title I during the period November 1960 through September 1961.

Of the 238 reports selected by us for review, less than half included a statement obtained from foreign governments, as required by FAS Field Instruction No. 5, describing the measures taken to prevent resale or transshipment of commodities, and containing current assurances, supported by statistics, that the commodities will not result in increased availability of the same or similar commodities to unfriendly nations. In this connection, we noted a report covering shipments to Chile, wherein the acting attaché stated that "No specific measures have been established by the Government of Chile to prevent the resale or transshipment of title I commodities to other countries." However, the acting attaché indicated that other information available to him gave evidence that there had been no resales or transshipments.

We found that the Program Analysis Section, FAS, had not, in most instances, met its responsibility for initiating follow-up action with agricultural attachés concerning incomplete reports.

SALE OF WHEAT TO SOVIET UNION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield me 1 minute?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it becomes increasingly apparent with each news report that a substantial change in our national policy in trading with the Communists is to be made by Executive decision preliminary to a sale of wheat to the Soviet Union.

This change of policy, it seems to me, especially in light of prior legislative expression should be considered by the Congress. Many questions are involved. This proposed transaction is something more than the existence of the simple

facts that we have wheat to sell and the Soviets have gold with which to buy.

Pertinent to the Congress deliberation would be a study of the world wheat situation as to this country's wheat stocks, the 1963 crop production estimate, the total supply in 1963 and 1964 and our consumption, both domestic and export. Note should also be taken of wheat production and consumption in the Communist bloc nations, the total wheat export capacity of the free world other than the United States and finally a forecast of the world wheat needs in the immediate years ahead in the various parts of the world.

Mr. President, I have prepared in the briefest possible form charts dealing with these subject matters. The information is available to all through the Department of Agriculture. Such information is presented here in different form in the outline heretofore mentioned. From the cold statistics presented, there emerges the central and meaningful fact that in the future changing world, it is not inconceivable that once again our farmers may be called upon to produce maximum capacity to supply rising world grain needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement entitled "1963 World Wheat Situation."

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEARSON: 1963 WORLD WHEAT SITUATION

Possible future sales of American surplus grain to the Soviet Union gave me an opportunity to review the world grain situation in its present form and to look at Department of Agriculture forecasts for the future. The following table gives the latest USDA information on U.S. wheat stocks and how they have been consumed in past years:

U.S. wheat stocks

	Bushels
Carryover as of July 1, 1963 (including 1963 crop and all previous years) (on farm and off farm storage)	1,189,406,000
1963 crop production estimate (spring wheat not included; available Oct. 14)	1,134,051,000
Total supply for 1963–64	2,323,457,000

[Million bushels]

	Total	Domestic	Export
Grain disappearance:			
1962–63	1,200	570	630
1961–62	1,300	581	719
1960–61	1,300	638	662
1959–60	1,100	590	510

In the Communist-bloc countries, the grain picture is not too clear, but reports from U.S. citizens returning from European tours report a hard winter and severe drought during the ripening season which has seriously reduced wheat production.

Wheat production in Communist-bloc countries

	1962	1963	Average annual consumption
	Million bushels		
Albania	No report	No report	No report.
Bulgaria	60	Same	62,000,000 (import 2,000,000 from Russia).
Czechoslovakia	53	Down 3,000,000 bushels	Consumption equals production and also importing 3,000,000 bushels from Canada.
Cuba	(1)	(1)	16,400,000 bushels annually.
East Germany	40	Down	Consumption higher than production.
Hungary	69	Same	Consumption equals production.
Rumania	140	Same	Do.
Poland	90	Less	Gomulka told Freeman on recent tour crop would be slightly less than production. On Aug. 16, 1963, Poland purchased 3,700,000 bushels from Canada and also received Public Law 480 wheat from United States.
Yugoslavia	110	Production up, good corn crop	Consumption nearly equals production. Imports wheat from United States and Canada and has not purchased Russian wheat for past 5 years.
Russia	2,000	1,600,000,000 bushels; crop off at least 20 percent; may be worse.	Russia largest producer in Europe. Usually exports 150,000,000 bushels annually, mostly to Eastern Europe.
Red China [2]	No report	No report, but believe food situation is better.	Imported 200,000,000 bushels from Canada and Australia to meet demands.

[1] No measurable wheat production.
[2] 2 reports say the situation is better, 1 report says it is worse. Official prediction indicates grain situation next year will be much better in Red China.

Western nations have become the granary of the world in the past 2 years and the three major exporters of wheat are all estimated to be in a stable condition after the major sales to Russia.

Western wheat export capacity (other than United States)

	Surplus Stock	Production		Export	Domestic consumption
		1962	1963		
	Million bushels	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	
Canada	485	566	694	(1963) 309 (1962) 358	150,000,000 bushels.
Australia	[1] 150	307	----------	230	80,000,000 bushels (1962 prospects good but not as good as 1962; commence harvest in December).
Argentina	[2] 85	190	----------	50–55	130,000,000–135,000,000 bushels (1963 crop not far enough advanced; however, she expects better crop).

[1] Estimate; will be cut to 25,000,000 bushels by end of crop year.
[2] Estimate.

USDA forecast of world wheat needs in 1966

[Metric tons]

	Total consumption	Total production	Deficit (−) or surplus (+)
Latin America	14.2	11.5	−2.7
Africa	10.2	6.4	−3.8
West Asia	15.3	13.9	−1.4
Far East	34.2	21.8	−12.4
Communist Asia	31.1	26.1	−5.0
Total	105.0	79.7	−25.3

(The above figures are in metric tons; however, converting the deficit tonnage to bushels, this portion of the world is expected to be 929 million bushels short of their needs by 1966.)

	Total consumption	Total production	Deficit (−) or surplus (+)
Canada	4.8	13.8	+9.0
United States	17.1	29.9	+12.8
Western Europe	48.1	41.2	−6.9
Soviet Union	51.6	56.6	+5.0
Eastern Europe	20.4	17.4	−3.0
Australia-New Zealand	3.2	6.8	+3.6
Total	145.2	165.7	+20.5

(Converting the surplus production of this group of nations to bushels, the total is expected to amount to 753 million bushels which would be applied against the deficit of other nations. These USDA projections indicate 176 million bushels of grain would have to be drawn from surplus stocks of Western nations.)

These figures were compiled to show what our present position appears to be and what we can expect within the next 3 years. As the world population increases, it is not inconceivable that once again our farmers may be called upon to produce at maximum capacity to supply rising world grain needs.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself as much time as I may require. I am about to withdraw my amendment. Before I do so, I should like to state my reasons briefly.

First, there is a reason of tactics. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is in charge of the bill, and the chairman of the committee [Mr. HILL] have been in disagreement with me on the matter of tactics. So, I believe, are the President of the United States and his principal advisers in the

area of education. So are at least some of those in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who have been advising both the President and the White House staff, and also members of our committee. It occurs to me that when so able a group of experienced parliamentarians, who are well aware of the practical situation in the Senate and the House, and elsewhere, are in drastic disagreement with me on tactics, there is at least the possibility that I am wrong. Therefore, I am prepared to yield my judgment on tactics to that of more experienced Senators and members of the administration who are not in accord with me.

I would have liked to see the omnibus bill "take off." I would have liked to see it reported from committee. I would have liked to see the White House ask us to fight for it on the floor of the Senate, on the floor of the House, and in conference. If that had been done, I think it might have been enacted.

But I yield my own views and my own emotions, to the perhaps, wiser parliamentary experience of Senators who have the primary responsibility for handling the bill and carrying through this body and through conference, into law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania has once again demonstrated the high degree of statesmanship with which he serves in the Senate. I was in the Senator's State the other night, in Washington County, some 35 miles from Pittsburgh. There I had an opportunity to speak to 1,300 or 1,400 of his constituents at a huge banquet. During the course of my speech, I dwelt upon the leadership of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania over the years in the field of education. I devoted a part of my speech to the subject of education. I said there what I shall say on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

I said to those people of Pennsylvania, the constituents of Senator CLARK, that, in my judgment, no Member of the Senate is more dedicated to the educational needs, and to doing something about them, for the boys and girls of this country, than is the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I know how difficult it is for the Senator to follow now a parliamentary course of action about which he has serious question. When the omnibus approach was discussed in committee it did not receive full support. He has not let me forget that on one occasion, I said I was for a "minibus" approach this year rather than for the omnibus bill. I went on quickly to qualify my statement by saying that I was for a "minibus" bill in order to get the program started. We have more than a "minibus" bill before us this afternoon. We have a bill which, in my judgment, is of great significance.

But even though we differed on the parliamentary strategy that should be followed, the Senator from Pennsylvania, on amendment after amendment which would have really done great damage to the bill in committee, stood shoulder to shoulder with me and was a great source of strength to me in reporting a bill both from the subcommittee and the full committee. I would be ungrateful if I did not say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I deeply appreciate his withdrawal of the amendment.

It would be unfortunate to take his proposal to a vote, because if it were defeated—and I would do everything I could to defeat it—there would be those who would read into that defeat trouble for us in the future, when we shall be asked to have some other installment or title of the President's program passed upon.

So all I can say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, from the bottom of my heart, is, "Thank you." I appreciate his willingness to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. CLARK. I sincerely thank the Senator from Oregon for his kind words. I assure him that I know full well that there will be many more matters with respect to which we will see eye to eye. This is a rather unusual case, in which our judgment is not now entirely in accord.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Oregon will yield as much time as is necessary, in order that the Senator from West Virginia may be accommodated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield such time as I may have on the amendment; if not, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia 5 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the comment of the astute chairman of our Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is, in essence, what I had meant to say when I sought recognition.

I shall not be repetitive, but the RECORD will indicate that the commendation which has been given by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], in connection with the careful consideration of the pending measure and other proposed legislation vital to the strengthening of the educational level of this country, is one in which I heartily concur. The Senator from Pennsylvania knows that even though I joined with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and also with the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MORSE], as we considered how best to bring this measure to the floor, how to effectively proceed, at least partially, toward the aims and the goals which we all share, that I also disagreed with Senator CLARK.

But I wish to reemphasize what has been well said. The Senator from Pennsylvania has been one of the stanchest adherents of an all-out effort, which should be made, not only in this forum but throughout the country, to give to our educational system the strength which it must have if we are to meet the obligations of the Nation in the process of transition, technical change, and great challenge.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his unduly generous words.

Mr. President, the second reason why I am withdrawing my amendment is that we are again, as we have been so often in the past, largely at the mercy of the House of Representatives. We know that the other body has parliamentary procedures, which it will not hesitate to use, which would make it impossible to have the President's omnibus bill, if the Senate were to pass it, ever to be passed by the House or go to conference. While I deplore that situation, and while I hope that in the infinite wisdom of an overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives, the House will, in due course, remove from the House Committee on Rules some of the power which it now exercises—I do not believe it is out of order under our rules to say this—which is the antithesis of democracy and entirely out of order in terms of the Founding Fathers' idea as to what the House of Representatives should stand for under a democratic order in which majority rule should prevail. Nevertheless, the situation which exists is a fact of life. Therefore, I shall not press for a vote on the amendment.

My third and final reason is that to press this amendment to a final vote——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. CLARK. My third and final reason for not pressing this amendment to a vote is that it would embarrass the President of the United States, because in my opinion many Senators who would not vote for the omnibus bill, if they were confronted with a request from the White House to vote for it, would—if they were confronted with a request from the Senator in charge of the bill and the chairman of the committee to vote for it—unhesitatingly vote for this amendment. But the fact is that some Senators would be confronted with a very difficult dilemma as to whether they should support what the President once asked them to vote for, in the President's very eloquent message which he vigorously supported, or, on the other side of the dilemma, or whether they should say to the Senator in charge of the bill, the chairman of the committee, and the leadership of the Senate, that we should vote down what the President once asked for. I am not willing to put the occupant of the White House and his principal advisers in that embarrassing position.

So, Mr. President, for the three reasons I have just stated, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania is withdrawn.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island such time as he needs. If need be, I shall yield him time on the bill or, if not, then time on the amendment.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the bill before us represents a major breakthrough in the field of vocational education and training. It is a dramatic departure from our existing programs which have been oriented primarily toward the training of persons in agriculture and home economics. And in light of our space age technology, it is a program that we may well have delayed too long. This morning, my staff contacted the Department of Employment Security in Rhode Island. Our attention was called to an amazing fact—that in testimony received from leaders of the business community it was estimated that the inability to fill 1 highly skilled job could result in the loss of up to 50 semi- and unskilled positions. For example, the loss of or inability to get a setup man—a very highly skilled position—in a machine tool plant would mean a number of machines that could not be operated. This would result in a loss of jobs for the men who deliver material to the machines, the takeaway men, clerical help that make up such things as payrolls, and the unused services to the plant itself. Thus the loss of that 1 position has the vicious multiplier effect of eliminating up to 50 more jobs. It is a perfect example of the classic, for want of a nail the kingdom was lost.

Coupled with this, Mr. President, is the fact that Rhode Island cannot meet the needs of industry and business in supplying skilled and semiskilled workers. There are employers who desperately need weavers, loom fixers, turret lathe operators, screw machine operators, machine repairmen—there is a widespread need for almost all skills. And I am certain that what is true in Rhode Island is duplicated in almost every State in the country.

Rhode Island presently has an unemployment rate hovering around 7 percent. In light of the facts I have just mentioned, this unemployment rate can be substantially reduced if we can only train and provide people with the skills necessary to fill these vacant jobs. The multiplier effect which has resulted in such a high unemployment rate, can work in reverse and reduce this unconscionably high, and unnecessary percentage of unemployed workers.

The legislation we are considering will provide $108 million for fiscal year 1964, with increasing amounts over the next 4 years. It is designed to effect comprehensive changes in the field of vocational education, particularly with respect to the training of our young people—the school dropouts and those who have only completed high school. It will cut across wide areas, and explore new fields. But basically, its intent is to meet present and future, recognizable needs.

I cannot agree with those who say this program is too costly or too big. I find it difficult indeed, to equate the spending of Federal funds with the very real human factor of 4 million unemployed persons in the United States. The evidence is before us of the need for decisive action—action on the part of this Congress to help our citizens gain the skills necessary for employment. I feel we can do no less than respond to this need and act to meet it, without cutback or clamor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, do I have any time left on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No time remains on the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Then, Mr. President, from the time available on the bill, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] such time as he may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe that a statement by one great American best states the case for the bill before us. John Adams said:

> Laws for the liberal education of youth * * * are so extremely wise and useful, that, to a humane and generous mind, no expense for this purpose would be thought extravagant.

I believe that statement by the great John Adams expresses the importance of education and the sentiments of all of us.

THE HISTORY OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. President, the intervening years have seen the passage of much legislation directed toward the education of our young people—far more than we realize; but much remains to be done.

Our first venture in national support of education, the Land Ordinance of 1785, antedates not only John Adams' concern, but also the Constitution itself. Since that day we have witnessed a wide variety of legislative proposals. A brief look at the chief landmarks may assist us in gaining the needed perspective to make a proper assessment of current proposals.

The Land Ordinance and the Northwest Ordinance, setting aside a section of each township for the public support of education, were further strengthened by the Ohio Enabling Act of 1802.

During the administration of Andrew Jackson, the Federal Government appropriated to the States $47 million for the specific purpose of school construction, much as recent legislative proposals have provided.

In 1962, Congress enacted the Morrill Land Grant Act, granting each State 30,000 acres of public land per Member of Congress, for the establishment of institutes of higher education to teach agriculture and mechanics. From this act sprang the great land-grant colleges and universities of our Nation. A grand total of 118 million acres, an area approximately four times the size of the State of New York, was granted by the Federal Government for educational purposes.

In 1867, Congress expressed its concern for education on a continuing basis by creating the Office of Education.

The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 provided for Federal grants to public schools for vocational education in agriculture, trades and industries, home economics, and the training of teachers in these subjects. This was a landmark in our grants-in-aid programs, in providing specific assistance in areas where an unmet need existed.

The depression years witnessed Federal support for education through the establishment of the National Youth Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the building of schools with the help of the WPA, and grants for school-bus transportation.

During the war years this Government accepted its responsibility for assistance to education in the war-affected localities. Federal support and aid for impacted areas has been reaffirmed periodically since that time.

In 1944, we passed the most extensive and expensive education measure ever. It provided for the training of our returning servicemen under the GI bill. To this we added the program for the disposal of surplus property, which provided further assistance to education.

The Fulbright Act and the Smith-Mundt Act are evidence of our post war concern and support for education international in scope.

Realizing that a healthy mind must reside in a healthy body, we enacted the School Lunch Act and the School Milk Act.

A program of loans for college housing has received increasing support since it was begun in 1950.

To these must be added the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which provides aid for a variety of programs in areas of high priority at every level of education, from the elementary school through graduate training.

The National Science Foundation and Public Health Service grants are a relatively recent and extensive indication of Federal support for many aspects of education. The Library Services Act and support for educational television are further recognition of our diverse interest and support.

All these form an impressive, but by no means an exhaustive, list of our predecessors' efforts in this area, intended to serve as a reminder of the scope and duration of their concern. To provide further perspective, I believe an examination of the Federal programs of assistance to education over the past 25 years would prove helpful. At my request, the Legislative Reference Service has prepared a chart illustrating the funds expended by program in each fiscal year during this period. For purposes of better comparison, both actual dollar appropriations and the value of these appropriations in terms of 1963 dollars of purchasing power are given. This chart will be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks today.

THE ROLE OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Ever since the enactment of Smith-Hughes in 1917, the Federal Government has played a major role in vocational education. The George-Barden Act supplemented the Government's role in this area.

Some change in the emphasis of vocational education is long overdue. This bill provides for such action in line with the recommendations of the President's Advisory Panel on Vocational Education. This is necessary in order to fulfill the Nation's needs for trained manpower to supply our increasingly complex and demanding labor market. New jobs require special skills. Training and retraining are constantly needed in order to keep workers abreast of our rapidly changing technology.

Much of our recent effort has not been directed toward the areas of primary need. Ten million members of our labor force are employed in office occupations, but no funds are presently provided for this area. While we still have a need for better trained personnel in agriculture and home economics, these are no longer the areas of greatest need. We must update our efforts and must provide greater flexibility in the vocational aid programs. The proposed legislation is designed to achieve this end.

Area-vocational-technical schools presently provide training for less than one in five high school students in our larger cities. There were 900 applications for 500 vacancies in the Minneapolis Vocational School this fall; and there would have been many more except for the fact that it was general knowledge that the chances of acceptance were slight. For a large percentage of our youth who will not be going to college, and who cannot gain admission to vocational training, the present program is woefully inadequate. When we add to this number the large number of dropouts, we witness the development of a large pool of future unemployables who will swell our welfare costs. How much better it would be to prepare them now for jobs, rather than be faced with this task after they are out of school and are out of work.

RESEARCH AND PILOT PROGRAMS

Section 4(c) of the Senate committee version of this bill provides for a most significant authorization of 15 percent or $16.2 million, of the first year's funds, to be earmarked for research grants, leadership training, and pilot or developmental programs. Much research now receives Federal support under the NDEA, Cooperative Research, and the National Science Foundation. Frankly, we are doing far too little. Unless we can improve the efficiency of teaching and the speed of learning, we are going to be inundated by the problem confronting us. The expanding demands for better educated and trained manpower to cope with our increasingly complex technology and social system require increased investment in research, in new educational techniques, and technology.

We spend an estimated one-tenth of 1 percent on research in education, compared to 3 to 5 percent expenditures by private industry in this area. Some industries spend a greater share on market research in the color and shape of the container than we do on improving educational efficiency. As Tom Clemens, Acting Chief of New Media in the Office of Education, recently put it:

> If we conducted research and development in rocketry as we do in education we would still be trying to perfect a bigger and better catapult.

The Federal Government may have extensive research contracts, concentrated in a relatively few universities, but little of it is directed toward education, in general; and vocational education, in particular, is ignored.

We cannot expect the local school district and teacher training institution to take the financial lead in research, in view of the pressing day to day problems confronting them. The Federal Government must assume more of this responsibility, because local governments, in their attempts to solve the pressing problems of today, will, of necessity, rely on other school districts, or States, or other bodies to do something about the long-range problems involving research and experimentation.

STUDENT LOAN FUNDS

I am not going to address myself to all sections of the bill before us, although they all merit our support. I should like, however, to call particular attention to the increase in the student loan funds, as provided under title II of the NDEA. These would be increased from the present $90 million to $125 million for the fiscal year 1964.

This section also provides for raising the institutional limit from the present $250,000 ceiling to $800,000.

These are most needed changes. Currently approved capital contributions total $122 million for the fiscal year 1964. For the State of Minnesota they total $3,890,478, from an original request of over $4 million. Our allocation under the present authorization was only $2,307,412, or 69 percent of the approved requests.

Because of the $250,000 limitation on funds for any one institution, the students at the University of Minnesota were able to borrow only that small portion of total requests of $1,017,000. Three other institutions in Minnesota had requests in excess of the $250,000 limit. Even the proposed ceiling of $800,000 is too low, but it would permit the students in the larger institutions to receive considerably greater equity of treatment than that accorded them under the present law.

Mr. President, I cannot believe that this Congress is going to refuse to provide the capital necessary in order to make loans to able, willing, and needy students. It is a sound investment.

The present proposal should be considered not only in the light of what we have done in the past, but also in terms of what we have failed to do and the increased magnitude of the task confronting us. The question is, not whether we are doing as much as we did yesteryear, but whether we are doing enough to meet the infinitely more complex problems confronting this Nation today, and to provide for the rapidly burgeoning numbers of young people involved. This bill builds in modest fashion upon the groundwork which has been developed over the years.

Extensive public debate has been waged, in recent years, over Federal aid to education. Congress has acted both timidly and inadequately. The people have time and again indicated their support of increased Federal aid. The latest poll, the Louis Harris poll, published in the September 9 issue of the Washington Post, showed 59 percent in favor, only 27 percent opposed, and 14 percent undecided. If the undecided are excluded, the figures are 70 percent in favor and 30 percent opposed. I only wish all our legislative measures enjoyed such a high degree of public understanding and support.

To do less than this proposal calls for would challenge us to demonstrate that there is no need, or that the National Government is so impoverished, and other units so much less so, that we cannot afford to appropriate the relatively paltry funds required for its operation. With State and local debt increasing 190 percent during the past decade, compared to a 10 percent increase in net Federal debt during the same period, we cannot refuse to assume responsibility for a proper share of the financial burdens which the future of education entails.

Even a cursory examination of what we have previously done and what we are now being asked to do, when compared to existing resources, should put to rest the mind of our most foreboding prophet of deficit and doom. During the past 25 years we have spent over $49 billion, in terms of 1963 dollars, on education. This is an average of $2 billion a year. Actual dollar expenditures have exceeded $41 billion over this 25-year period. We are now spending at a $2¼ billion annual rate. This is less than the 25-year average, when compared to our gross national product, our national budget, or the number of our young people to be educated. It is less than half of what we were spending per year in the 1947–50 period. In 1950—not our peak year—we were spending more than 1.1 percent of our gross national product on Federal aid to education. In 1962, this had dropped to less than four-tenths of 1 percent.

Today, few among us would question the wisdom of the investment we made at that time. Let us not be found wanting when, 15 years hence, our present decisions are judged from a position of like perspective. Let us fervently hope that our successors and those of us who may still be here will be able to say that the 88th Congress faced the task before it and heeded both the words of John Adams and those of Cicero, when he asked:

> What greater or better gift can we offer the Republic than to teach and instruct our youth?

We cannot be satisfied with less than has been proposed. We cannot permit some future foreign historian to pick from the ruins of our civilization a copy of Whittier's "In School Days" and see

therein, not the poet's nostalgic recollections of childhood, but our epitaph:

Still sits the school-house by the road,
A ragged beggar sunning;
Around it still the sumachs grow,
And blackberry-vines are running.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his leadership. This is good legislation, and it is long overdue. It will do much to provide equality of opportunity for millions of our people, and will do a great deal to insure the continuing prosperity and strength of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table entitled "Payments to States and Individuals Under Selected Programs of the Federal Government Relating to Education, 1938–63 Fiscal Years," and one entitled "Federal Expenditures for Education: GNP and Population."

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

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years

	1938		1939		1940	
	Actual (CPI 49.1) [1]	Adjusted (215.7 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 48.4) [1]	Adjusted (218.8 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 48.8) [1]	Adjusted (217.0 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($13,438,805)	($28,987,500)	($15,241,157)	($33,347,651)	($21,626,229)	($46,928,916)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	575,204	1,240,715	1,325,000	2,899,100	3,961,875	8,597,269
School milk					756	1,640
Shared revenues: [3]						
New Mexico and Arizona forests	31,466	67,872	23,554	51,536	23,391	50,758
National forests	1,167,215	2,517,682	1,215,924	2,660,442	1,455,972	3,159,459
Mineral leasing	2,684,709	5,790,917	2,207,106	4,829,148	2,098,716	4,554,214
Taylor Grazing Act	431,193	930,083	515,464	1,127,835	373,485	810,462
Submarginal lands						
Office of Education:						
Defense vocational training (high school)						
War-affected localities:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
Federally affected areas:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
National Defense Education Act—States						
NYA student aid—high schools	8,549,018	18,440,231	9,954,109	21,779,590	13,712,034	29,755,114
II. Higher education	(15,602,021)	(33,653,559)	(17,598,645)	(38,505,796)	(19,963,558)	(43,321,510)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	4,530,000	9,771,210	5,030,000	11,005,640	5,030,000	10,915,100
Office of Education:						
Howard University	530,000	1,143,210	540,000	1,181,520	557,000	1,208,697
Mentally retarded—Fellowships						
National Defense Education Act—Individuals						
Cooperative research						
Teachers of the deaf						
NYA student aid—Colleges	10,542,021	22,739,139	12,028,627	26,318,636	14,376,558	31,197,713
Veterans building construction and equipment to educational institutions						
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]						
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and traineeships						
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, training grants						
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and Assistance to schools						
National Science Foundation: Fellowships						
Department of State: Educational exchange						
Inter-American Educational Foundation						
Defense vocational training (colleges)						
III. Extension education, special education and other assistance	(207,089,512)	(446,692,075)	(151,521,249)	(331,528,493)	(129,130,220)	(280,212,616)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	17,540,622	37,835,122	17,968,122	39,314,251	18,584,624	40,328,673
Experiment stations	6,292,500	13,572,922	6,841,250	14,968,655	7,448,750	16,163,788
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	21,775,977	46,970,782	21,775,977	47,645,838	21,775,977	47,253,870
War training food production						
War relocation education centers						
Education of CCC enrollees						
American Printing House for Blind	75,000	161,775	175,000	382,900	125,000	271,250
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for Deaf)	145,000	312,765	150,950	330,279	150,950	327,562
Library services						
Surplus property:						
Real						
Personal						
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits						
Maritime education						
WPA:						
School buildings	122,135,687	263,446,676	61,630,050	134,846,549	42,123,170	91,407,278
Education projects	34,529,036	74,479,130	37,980,900	83,102,209	28,243,054	61,287,427
Interior: Education of Indians	4,595,690	9,912,903	4,999,000	10,937,812	10,678,695	23,172,768
Total	236,130,338	509,333,134	184,361,051	403,381,940	170,720,007	370,463,042

	1941		1942		1943	
	Actual (CPI 51.3) [1]	Adjusted (206.4 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 56.8) [1]	Adjusted (186.4 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 60.3) [1]	Adjusted (175.6 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($89,158,582)	($184,436,112)	($134,988,159)	($251,617,930)	($145,135,268)	($254,857,531)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	13,118,908	27,077,426	21,858,957	40,745,096	[5] 17,563,000	30,840,628
School milk	592,103	1,222,101	1,473,801	2,747,165	5,801,573	10,187,562
Shared revenues: [3]						
New Mexico and Arizona forests	22,786	47,030	22,833	42,561	26,887	47,214
National forests	1,555,755	3,211,078	1,692,877	3,155,523	2,502,543	4,394,466
Mineral leasing	2,245,740	5,048,007	2,742,980	5,112,915	2,853,162	5,010,152
Taylor Grazing Act	556,955	1,149,555	549,252	1,023,806	490,333	861,025
Submarginal lands						

See footnotes at end of table.

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years—Con.

	1941		1942		1943	
	Actual (CPI 51.3) [1]	Adjusted (206.4 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 56.8) [1]	Adjusted (186.4 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 60.3) [1]	Adjusted (175.6 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary—Continued						
Office of Education:						
Defense vocational training (high school)	$57,701,316	119,095,516	$99,704,280	$185,848,778	$113,877,914	$199,969,617
War affected localities:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
Federally affected areas:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
National Defense Education Act—States						
NYA student aid—high schools	13,365,019	27,585,399	6,943,179	12,942,086	2,019,856	3,546,867
II. Higher education	(24,242,291)	(50,036,089)	(30,906,156)	(57,609,074)	(30,171,084)	(52,980,423)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	5,030,000	10,381,920	5,030,000	9,375,920	5,030,000	8,832,680
Office of Education:						
Howard University	567,160	1,170,618	760,756	1,418,049	1,064,000	1,868,384
Mentally retarded—Fellowships						
National Defense Education Act—Individuals						
Cooperative research						
Teachers of the deaf						
NYA student aid—Colleges	14,170,029	29,246,940	9,237,211	17,218,161	3,809,523	6,689,522
Veterans' building construction and equipment to educational institutions						
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]						
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and traineeships						
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, training grants						
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools						
National Science Foundation: Fellowships						
Department of State: Educational exchange						
Inter-American Educational Foundation						
Defense vocational training (colleges)	4,475,102	9,236,611	15,878,189	29,596,944	20,267,561	35,589,837
III. Extension education, special:						
Education and other assistance	(125,112,959)	(258,233,148)	(143,211,104)	(266,945,497)	(127,052,410)	(223,104,031)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	18,591,002	38,371,828	18,956,918	35,335,695	18,956,950	33,288,404
Experiment stations	6,862,500	14,164,200	6,926,207	12,910,450	6,926,207	12,162,419
Office of Education	21,775,977	44,945,617	21,768,122	40,575,779	21,768,122	38,224,822
Vocational education						
War training food production						
War relocation education centers			1,803,000	3,360,792		
Education of CCC enrollees	125,000	258,000	125,000	233,000	125,000	219,500
American Printing House for the Blind	143,000	295,152	142,000	264,688	182,700	320,821
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for Deaf)						
Library services						
Surplus property:						
Real						
Personal						
Veterans' Administration education and rehabilitation benefits						
Maritime Education			38,948,268	72,599,572	69,924,336	122,787,134
WPA:						
School buildings	39,974,704	82,507,789	25,846,520	48,177,913		
Educational projects	27,233,406	56,209,750	18,785,939	35,016,990		
Interior—Education of Indians	10,407,370	21,480,812	9,909,130	18,470,618	9,169,095	16,100,931
Total	238,513,832	492,705,349	309,105,419	576,172,501	302,358,762	530,941,985

	1944		1945		1946	
	Actual (CPI 61.3) [1]	Adjusted (172.8 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 62.7) [1]	Adjusted (168.9 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 68.0) [1]	Adjusted (155.7 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($225,968,855)	($390,474,180)	($118,704,627)	($200,492,114)	($114,036,364)	($177,554,617)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	7,814,149	13,502,849	5,796,384	9,790,093	5,833,555	9,082,845
School milk	26,585,420	45,939,606	41,613,080	70,284,492	51,290,171	79,858,796
Shared revenues: [3]						
New Mexico and Arizona forests	38,476	66,487	35,809	60,480	39,334	61,243
National forests	4,066,307	7,026,578	4,149,662	7,008,779	3,463,764	5,393,081
Mineral leasing	4,310,006	7,447,690	4,029,152	6,805,238	4,046,280	6,300,058
Taylor Grazing Act	507,755	877,401	498,044	841,196	480,079	747,483
Submarginal lands						
Office of Education:						
Defense vocational training—High School	59,287,855	102,449,413	48,770,467	82,373,319	535,662	[6] 834,026
War-affected localities:						
Construction	[7] 72,275,212	124,891,566			[8] 12,731,733	19,823,308
Maintenance and operation	[7] 51,083,675	88,272,590	13,812,029	23,328,517	[8] 35,615,785	5,453,777
Federally affected areas:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
National Defense Education Act—States						
NYA student aid—High schools						
II. Higher education	(18,629,111)	(32,191,104)	(12,816,078)	(21,646,356)	(11,029,275)	(17,172,581)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	5,030,000	8,691,840	5,030,000	8,495,670	5,030,000	783,710
Office of Education:						
Howard University	891,340	1,540,236	908,000	1,533,612	911,000	1,418,427
Mentally retarded—fellowships						
National Defense Education Act—individuals						
Cooperative research						
Teachers of the deaf						
NYA student aid—colleges						
Veterans building construction and equipment to educational institutions						
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]						
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and traineeships						
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, training grants						

See footnotes at end of table.

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years—Con.

	1944		1945		1946	
	Actual (CPI 61.3) [1]	Adjusted (172.8 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 62.7) [1]	Adjusted (168.9 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 68.0) [1]	Adjusted (155.7 percent) [1]
II. Higher education—Continued						
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools						
National Science Foundation: Fellowships						
Department of State: Educational exchange						
Inter-American Educational Foundation					[11] $5,088,275	$7,922,444
Defense vocational training (colleges)	$12,707,771	$21,959,028	$6,878,078	$11,617,074		
III. Extension education, special education and other assistance	(119,922,250)	(207,225,649)	(152,445,104)	(257,496,672)	(399,459,095)	(621,957,812)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	18,996,950	32,826,730	22,996,840	38,841,663	23,394,062	36,424,555
Experiment stations	7,001,207	12,098,086	7,001,207	11,841,929	7,206,208	11,220,066
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	21,768,122	37,615,315	21,768,122	36,766,358	21,768,122	33,892,966
War training food production			[12] 1,587,923	2,682,002		
War relocation education centers					[13] 6,307,711	9,821,106
Education of CCC enrollees						
American Printing House for Blind	125,000	216,000	125,000	211,125	125,000	194,625
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for Deaf)	155,200	268,186	204,100	344,725	167,000	260,019
Library services						
Surplus property:						
Real						
Personal						
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits			24,973,000	42,179,397	295,000,000	459,315,000
Maritime education	62,434,921	107,887,543	64,399,352	108,770,506	35,487,274	55,253,686
WPA:						
School buildings						
Education projects						
Interior: Education of Indians	9,440,850	16,313,789	9,389,560	15,858,967	10,003,718	15,575,789
Total	364,520,216	629,890,933	283,965,809	479,635,142	524,524,734	812,685,010

	1947		1948		1949	
	Actual (CPI 77.8) [1]	Adjusted (136.1 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 83.8) [1]	Adjusted (126.4 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 83.0) [1]	Adjusted (127.6 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($95,440,604)	($129,905,663)	($105,161,992)	($132,924,757)	($120,135,502)	($153,292,901)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	77,619,229	105,639,771	86,767,946	109,674,684	94,924,931	121,124,212
School milk [2]						
Shared revenues:						
New Mexico and Arizona forests	49,217	66,984	57,095	72,168	60,775	77,549
National forests	4,624,570	6,294,040	6,040,470	7,635,154	7,780,076	9,927,377
Mineral leasing	5,984,135	8,144,408	9,539,517	12,057,949	11,330,647	14,457,906
Taylor Grazing Act	517,113	703,791	256,964	324,802	185,211	236,329
Submarginal lands						
Office of Education:						
Defense vocational training (high school)						
War affected localities						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation	[10] 6,646,340	9,045,669	2,500,000	3,160,000	5,853,862	7,469,528
Federally affected areas:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
National Defense Education Act—States						
NYA student aid—high schools						
II. Higher education	(9,108,991)	(12,697,336)	(187,852,936)	(237,455,151)	(60,321,308)	(76,969,988)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	5,030,000	6,845,830	5,030,000	6,357,920	5,030,000	6,418,280
Office of Education:						
Howard University	2,995,414	4,076,758	427,480	549,375	5,121,450	6,534,970
Mentally retarded—Fellowships						
National Defense Education Act—Individuals						
Cooperative Research						
Teachers of the deaf						
NYA student aid—Colleges						
Veterans Building Construction and Equipment to Educational Institutions			[17] 166,460,104	210,405,571	23,196,110	29,598,236
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College Housing Loans [4]						
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and Traineeships						
Public Health Service: Fellowships, Traineeships, Training Grants						
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools						
National Science Foundation: Fellowships						
Department of State: Educational exchange						
Inter-American Educational Foundation	1,083,577	1,774,748	14,820,352	18,732,925	26,973,748	34,418,502
Defense vocational training—Colleges			1,115,000	1,409,360		
III. Extension education, special education and other assistance	(2,931,590,110)	(3,989,893,480)	(3,831,997,886)	(4,819,418,327)	(3,254,346,842)	(4,152,546,418)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	27,322,824	37,186,363	27,322,824	34,536,050	30,836,263	39,347,072
Experiment stations	7,206,208	9,807,649	8,950,807	11,313,820	9,703,707	12,381,930
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	21,768,122	29,626,414	25,035,122	31,644,394	27,127,882	34,615,177
War training food production						
War relocation education centers						
Education of CCC enrollees						
American Printing House for the Blind	125,000	170,125	125,000	158,000	125,000	159,500
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for the Deaf)	247,800	337,256	259,500	373,512	320,500	408,958
Library services						
Surplus property:						
Real	[14] 284,473,734	387,168,752	[18] 21,336,642	26,969,515	39,402,958	50,278,174
Personal	[15] 254,050,280	345,762,431	[19] 145,261,269	183,610,244	[19] 85,598,180	109,223,278

See footnotes at end of table.

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years—Con.

	1947		1948		1949	
	Actual (CPI 77.8) [1]	Adjusted (136.1 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 83.8) [1]	Adjusted (126.4 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 83.0) [1]	Adjusted (127.6 percent) [1]
III. Extension education, etc.—Continued						
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits	$2,313,233,484	$3,148,310,113	$3,584,666,608	$4,531,019,088	$3,035,382,120	$3,873,147,432
Maritime education	10,112,081	13,762,542	7,254,414	9,169,579	7,654,991	9,767,769
WPA:						
School buildings						
Educational projects						
Interior:						
Education of Indians	13,050,577	17,761,835	11,785,700	14,897,125	18,195,241	23,217,128
Total	3,036,139,705	4,132,496,479	4,125,012,814	5,189,798,235	3,434,803,652	4,382,809,307

	1950		1951		1952	
	Actual (CPI 83.8) [1]	Adjusted (126.4 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 90.5) [1]	Adjusted (117.0 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 92.5) [1]	Adjusted (114.5 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($144,945,186)	($183,210,715)	($157,443,951)	($184,209,952)	($220,762,968)	($253,342,617)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	112,599,713	142,326,037	118,081,894	138,155,816	98,466,313	112,743,928
School milk						
Shared revenues: [3]						
New Mexico and Arizona forests			71,930	84,158	107,294	122,852
National forests	7,813,896	9,876,765	8,362,897	9,784,589	13,974,027	16,000,261
Mineral leasing	10,569,004	13,359,221	13,908,542	16,272,994	16,391,932	18,768,762
Taylor Grazing Act	297,986	376,654	288,385	337,941	331,984	380,122
Submarginal lands	228,447	288,757	3,008	3,519	552,174	632,239
Office of Education:						
Defense vocational training (high school) war-affected localities:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation	6,737,223	8,515,850				
Federally affected areas:						
Construction			2,955,566	3,458,012	55,494,893	63,541,652
Maintenance and operation	6,698,917	8,467,431	[18] 13,771,729	16,112,923	35,941,311	41,152,801
National Defense Education Act—States						
NYA student aid—high schools						
II. Higher education	(90,981,928)	(115,001,536)	(48,613,439)	(56,877,724)	(68,148,116)	(78,029,593)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	5,030,000	6,357,920	5,030,000	5,885,100	5,030,000	5,759,350
Office of education:						
Howard University	9,508,500	12,019,123	4,262,000	4,986,540	4,001,000	4,581,145
Mentally retarded—fellowships						
National Defense Education Act—individuals						
Cooperative research						
Teachers of the deaf						
NYA student aid—colleges						
Veterans building construction and equipment to educational institutions	37,015,534	46,787,635				
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]			16,895,000	19,767,150	24,413,000	27,952,885
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and trainee ships						
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, training grants					9,481,000	10,855,745
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools						
National Science Foundation: Fellowships						
Department of State: Educational exchange	39,427,894	49,836,858	22,426,439	26,238,934	25,223,116	28,880,468
Inter-American Educational Foundation						
Defense vocational training—colleges						
III. Extension education, special education, and other assistance	(3,028,391,373)	(3,827,886,134)	(2,214,699,981)	(2,591,199,298)	(1,597,788,550)	(1,829,467,075)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	32,159,840	40,650,038	32,141,338	37,605,365	72,057,930	82,506,330
Experiment stations	11,006,207	13,911,846	11,016,208	12,888,963	11,028,708	12,627,871
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	26,622,628	33,651,002	26,685,054	31,221,513	25,862,968	29,613,098
War training food production						
War relocation education centers						
Education of CCC enrollees						
American Printing House for Blind	125,000	158,000	125,000	146,250	125,000	143,125
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for Deaf)	353,800	447,203	368,200	430,794	390,000	446,550
Library services						
Surplus property:						
Real	[18] 6,678,041	8,441,044	[18] 1,463,470	1,712,260	[18] 1,515,375	1,735,104
Personal	[20] 110,306,652	139,427,608	[20] 47,843,129	55,976,461	[20] 38,741,660	44,359,201
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits	2,815,021,445	3,558,186,544	2,062,647,580	2,413,297,990	1,415,523,711	1,620,773,835
Maritime education	6,755,004	8,538,325	5,292,414	6,192,124	4,377,133	5,011,817
WPA:						
School buildings						
Education projects						
Interior: Education of Indians	19,362,756	24,474,524	27,117,588	31,727,578	28,166,065	32,250,144
Total	3,234,318,487	4,126,098,385	2,420,757,371	2,832,286,974	1,886,699,634	2,160,839,285

See footnotes at end of table.

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years—Con.

	1953		1954		1955	
	Actual (CPI 93.2) [1]	Adjusted (113.6 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 93.6) [1]	Adjusted (113.1 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 93.3) [1]	Adjusted (113.5 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($369, 163, 671)	($419, 369, 931)	($399, 506, 616)	($451, 841, 983)	($424, 622, 726)	($481, 946, 803)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	133, 540, 019	151, 701, 462	176, 220, 595	199, 305, 493	152, 071, 195	172, 600, 806
School milk					17, 220, 281	19, 545, 019
Shared revenues: [3]						
New Mexico and Arizona forests	131, 588	149, 484	122, 755	138, 836	102, 579	116, 427
National forests	17, 358, 503	19, 719, 259	18, 697, 371	21, 146, 727	16, 393, 583	18, 606, 717
Mineral leasing	17, 255, 527	19, 602, 279	20, 675, 791	23, 384, 320	23, 605, 409	26, 792, 139
Taylor Grazing Act	346, 165	393, 243	350, 461	396, 371	347, 838	394, 796
Submarginal lands	448, 049	508, 984	461, 034	521, 429	374, 968	425, 589
Office of Education:						
Defense vocational training—high school						
War affected localities:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
Federally affected areas:						
Construction	134, 089, 151	152, 325, 276	112, 854, 536	127, 638, 480	129, 256, 192	146, 705, 778
Maintenance and operation	65, 994, 669	74, 969, 944	70, 124, 073	79, 310, 327	85, 250, 681	96, 759, 532
National Defense Education Act—States						
NYA student aid—high schools						
II. Higher Education	(93, 972, 860)	(106, 753, 169)	(94, 040, 322)	(106, 359, 605)	(96, 271, 402)	(109, 268, 042)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	5, 030, 000	5, 714, 080	5, 051, 500	5, 713, 247	5, 051, 500	5, 733, 453
Office of Education:						
Howard University	4, 047, 000	4, 597, 392	2, 555, 000	2, 889, 705	7, 654, 000	8, 687, 290
Mentally retarded—fellowships						
National Defense Education Act—individuals						
Cooperative research						
Teachers of the deaf						
NYA student aid—colleges						
Veterans' building construction and equipment to educational institutions						
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]	51, 545, 000	58, 555, 120	48, 357, 000	54, 691, 767	47, 153, 000	53, 518, 655
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and traineeships					790, 000	896, 650
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, and training grants	9, 991, 000	11, 349, 776	13, 104, 000	14, 820, 624	14, 046, 000	15, 942, 210
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools						
National Science Foundation: Fellowships			1, 726, 978	1, 953, 212	1, 808, 667	2, 052, 837
Department of State: Educational exchange	23, 359, 860	26, 536, 801	23, 245, 844	26, 291, 050	19, 768, 235	22, 436, 947
Inter-American Educational Foundation						
Defense vocational training—colleges						
III. Extension education, special education and other assistance	(894, 925, 687)	(1, 016, 635, 582)	(798, 179, 118)	(902, 740, 582)	(916, 683, 872)	(1, 040, 436, 196)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	32, 117, 059	36, 484, 979	32, 129, 979	36, 339, 006	39, 675, 000	45, 031, 125
Experiment stations	11, 041, 208	12, 542, 812	11, 773, 708	13, 316, 064	15, 733, 708	17, 857, 759
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	25, 336, 460	28, 782, 219	25, 418, 894	28, 748, 769	30, 350, 881	34, 448, 250
War training food production						
War relocation education centers						
Education of CCC enrollees						
American Printing House for the Blind	185, 000	210, 160	185, 000	209, 235	215, 000	244, 025
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for Deaf)	503, 000	571, 408	451, 000	510, 081	674, 000	764, 990
Library services						
Surplus property:						
Real	722, 710	820, 999	5, 209, 351	5, 891, 776	4, 270, 953	4, 847, 532
Personal	56, 805, 475	64, 531, 020	85, 634, 352	96, 852, 452	105, 739, 398	120, 014, 217
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits	734, 073, 888	833, 907, 937	600, 350, 904	678, 996, 872	679, 890, 169	771, 675, 342
Maritime education	4, 023, 883	4, 571, 131	4, 228, 737	4, 782, 702	2, 593, 290	2, 943, 384
WPA:						
School buildings						
Educational projects						
Interior: Education of Indians	30, 117, 004	34, 212, 917	32, 797, 193	37, 043, 625	37, 541, 473	42, 609, 572
Total	1, 358, 062, 218	1, 542, 758, 682	1, 291, 726, 056	1, 460, 942, 170	1, 437, 578, 000	1, 631, 651, 041

	1956		1957		1958	
	Actual (CPI 94.7) [1]	Adjusted (111.8 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 98.0) [1]	Adjusted (108.1 percent)	Actual (CPI 100.7) [1]	Adjusted (105.2 percent [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($452, 105, 682)	($505, 454, 094)	($520, 991, 874)	($563, 192, 217)	($490, 131, 961)	($515, 618, 822)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	181, 574, 361	203, 000, 136	230, 407, 202	249, 070, 185	174, 499, 551	183, 573, 528
School milk [2]	45, 842, 194	51, 251, 513	60, 023, 914	64, 885, 851	65, 182, 562	68, 572, 055
Shared revenues:						
New Mexico and Arizona forests	114, 301	127, 789	129, 404	139, 886	105, 474	110, 959
National forests	19, 412, 708	21, 703, 408	28, 490, 343	30, 798, 061	26, 975, 307	28, 378, 023
Mineral leasing	24, 255, 983	27, 118, 189	28, 256, 124	30, 544, 870	34, 380, 278	36, 168, 052
Taylor Grazing Act	365, 923	409, 102	358, 270	387, 290	401, 293	422, 160
Submarginal lands	459, 795	514, 051	491, 389	531, 192	558, 249	587, 278
Office of Education:						
Defense Vocational Training—high school						
War-affected localities:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
Federally affected areas:						
Construction	94, 607, 593	105, 771, 289	75, 054, 616	81, 134, 040	78, 746, 855	82, 841, 691
Maintenance and operation	85, 472, 824	95, 558, 617	97, 780, 612	105, 700, 842	109, 282, 392	114, 965, 076
National Defense Education Act—States						
NYA student aid—high schools						

See footnotes at end of table.

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years—Con.

	1956		1957		1958	
	Actual (CPI 94.7) [1]	Adjusted (111.8 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 98.0) [1]	Adjusted (108.1 percent)	Actual (CPI 100.7) [1]	Adjusted (105.2 percent) [1]
II. Higher education	($241,557,837)	($270,061,661)	($287,019,854)	($310,268,463)	($327,764,485)	($344,808,238)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	505,500	5,647,577	5,051,500	5,460,672	5,051,500	5,314,178
Office of Education:						
Howard University	5,006,000	5,596,708	3,686,200	3,984,782	4,212,000	4,431,024
Mentally retarded—fellowships						
National Defense Education Act—individuals						
Cooperative research			1,000,000	1,081,000	2,300,000	2,419,600
Teachers of the deaf						
NYA student aid—colleges						
Veterans' building construction and equipment to educational institutions						
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]	191,231,000	213,796,258	213,411,000	230,697,291	234,522,000	246,717,144
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and traineeships	2,053,000	2,295,254	2,938,000	3,175,978	4,380,000	4,607,760
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, training grants	15,666,000	17,514,588	36,252,000	39,188,412	45,224,000	47,575,648
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools			3,943,551	4,262,979	7,476,623	7,865,407
National Science Foundation: Fellowships	2,266,528	2,533,978	2,132,985	2,305,757	3,196,538	3,362,758
Department of State: Educational exchange	20,283,809	22,677,298	18,604,618	20,111,592	21,401,824	22,514,719
Inter-American Educational Foundation						
Defense vocational training—colleges						
III. Extension education, special education and other assistance	(1,092,089,829)	(1,220,956,429)	(1,127,134,778)	(1,218,432,695)	(1,125,696,346)	(1,184,232,557)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	45,475,000	50,841,050	49,865,000	53,904,065	50,715,000	53,352,180
Experiment stations	19,549,708	21,856,574	22,969,708	24,830,254	23,581,708	24,807,957
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	33,180,364	37,095,647	37,063,018	40,065,122	38,733,174	40,747,299
War training food production						
War relocation education centers						
Education of CCC enrollees						
American Printing House for the Blind	234,000	261,612	240,000	259,440	338,000	355,576
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for the Deaf)	2,764,000	3,090,152	3,162,000	3,418,122	2,420,000	2,545,840
Library services			2,050,000	2,216,050	5,000,000	5,260,000
Surplus property:						
Real	4,123,339	4,609,893	2,629,772	2,842,784	2,454,261	2,581,883
Personal	163,597,933	182,902,489	176,146,705	190,414,588	238,942,173	251,367,166
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits	781,858,944	874,118,299	786,952,509	850,695,662	709,726,348	746,632,118
Maritime education	2,744,405	3,068,245	2,836,229	3,065,964	3,049,845	3,208,437
WPA:						
School buildings						
Educational projects						
Interior: Education of Indians	38,562,136	43,112,468	43,219,837	46,720,644	50,735,837	53,374,101
Total	1,785,753,348	1,996,472,184	1,935,146,506	2,091,893,375	1,943,592,792	2,044,659,617

	1959		1960		1961	
	Actual (CPI 101.5) [1]	Adjusted (104.3 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 103.1) [1]	Adjusted (102.7 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 104.2) [1]	Adjusted (101.6 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($593,990,967)	($618,932,579)	($678,346,497)	($696,661,852)	($701,504,341)	($712,728,410)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	203,344,753	212,088,578	226,111,648	232,216,662	226,300,000	229,920,800
School milk	72,600,189	75,121,997	79,400,000	81,543,800	86,685,047	88,072,008
Shared revenues: [3]						
New Mexico and Arizona forests	117,161	122,199	113,861	116,935		
National forests	22,204,787	23,159,593	29,668,588	30,469,640	[22] 35,671,616	36,242,362
Mineral leasing	35,807,080	37,346,784	36,430,776	37,414,407	34,736,941	35,292,732
Taylor Grazing Act	432,855	451,468	448,000	460,096	641,000	651,256
Submarginal lands	460,109	479,894	452,894	465,122	391,987	398,259
Office of Education:						
Defense vocational training—high school						
War-affected localities:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
Federally affected areas:						
Construction	76,192,027	79,468,284	70,553,171	72,458,107	59,248,637	60,196,615
Maintenance and operation	138,873,887	144,845,464	166,660,735	171,160,575	207,639,466	210,961,697
National Defense Education Act—States	43,958,119	45,848,318	68,506,824	70,356,508	50,189,647	50,992,681
NYA student aid—high schools						
II. Higher education	(265,661,644)	(277,085,096)	(364,772,521)	(374,621,380)	(620,591,580)	(630,521,046)
Agriculture: Land grant colleges	5,051,500	5,268,715	5,051,500	5,187,891	7,276,500	7,392,924
Office of Education:						
Howard University	4,636,300	4,835,661	5,498,000	5,646,446	5,490,000	5,577,840
Mentally retarded—fellowships	1,000,000	1,043,000	308,191	316,512	813,683	826,702
National Defense Education Act—individuals	3,194,834	3,332,212	18,068,873	18,556,733	34,442,434	34,993,513
Cooperative research	2,700,000	2,816,100	3,200,000	3,286,400	3,356,000	3,409,696
Teachers of the deaf						
NYA student aid—colleges						
Veterans' building construction and equipment to educational institutions						
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]	135,993,000	141,840,699	193,041,000	198,253,107	432,878,000	439,804,048
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and traineeships	4,799,000	5,005,357	6,200,000	6,367,400	6,860,036	6,969,797
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, training grants	70,357,000	73,382,351	87,602,000	89,967,254	71,437,000	72,579,992
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools	4,707,671	4,910,101	5,315,182	5,458,692	5,951,930	6,047,161
National Science Foundation: Fellowships	6,631,857	6,917,027	11,139,724	11,440,497	12,959,997	13,167,357
Department of State: Educational exchange	26,590,482	27,733,873	29,348,051	30,140,448	39,126,000	39,752,016
Inter-American Educational Foundation						
Defense vocational training—colleges						

See footnotes at end of table.

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years—Con.

	1959		1960		1961	
	Actual (CPI 101.5) [1]	Adjusted (104.3 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 103.1) [1]	Adjusted (102.7 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 104.2) [1]	Adjusted (101.6 percent) [1]
III. Extension education, special education and other assistance	($1,045,669,111)	($1,090,632,883)	($1,017,126,717)	($1,044,589,139)	($864,937,816)	($878,776,792)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	53,715,000	56,024,745	53,715,000	55,165,305	63,373,746	64,387,726
Experiment stations	24,445,708	25,496,873	24,445,708	25,105,742	31,521,495	32,025,839
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	41,399,068	43,179,228	39,140,434	40,197,226	39,797,725	40,434,489
War training food production						
War relocation education centers						
Education of CCC enrollees						
American Printing House for the Blind	400,000	417,200	400,000	410,800	400,000	406,400
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for Deaf)	972,000	1,013,796	1,229,000	1,262,183	1,074,000	1,091,184
Library services	6,000,000	6,258,000	6,131,000	6,296,537	7,414,221	7,532,849
Surplus property:						
Real	4,665,834	4,866,465	[24] 25,000,000	25,675,000	31,000,000	31,496,000
Personal	279,763,762	291,793,604	[24] 425,000,000	436,475,000	376,000,000	382,016,000
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits	581,467,457	606,470,558	387,915,575	398,389,296	253,489,629	257,545,463
Maritime education	3,265,908	3,406,342	4,016,000	4,124,432	5,108,000	5,189,728
WPA:						
School buildings						
Education projects						
Interior: Education of Indians	49,574,374	51,706,072	50,134,000	51,487,618	55,759,000	56,651,144
Total	1,905,321,722	1,986,650,558	2,060,245,735	2,115,872,371	2,187,033,737	2,222,026,248

	1962		1963	Total	
	Actual (CPI 105.4) [1]	Adjusted (100.5 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 105.9) [1]	Actual	Adjusted
I. Elementary and secondary	($856,279,000)	($860,560,771)	[21] ($922,042,000)	($8,130,837,602)	($9,353,932,618)
Agriculture:					
School lunch [3]	279,900,000	281,300,000	169,993,000		
School milk	83,900,000	84,319,500	105,000,000		
Shared revenues: [3]					
New Mexico and Arizona forests					
National forests	25,155,000	25,280,775	27,315,000		
Mineral leasing	39,066,000	39,261,330	45,000,000		
Taylor Grazing Act	214,000	215,070	529,000		
Submarginal lands	([23])		([23])		
Office of Education:					
Defense vocational training—high school					
War-affected localities:					
Construction					
Maintenance and operation					
Federally affected areas:					
Construction	64,190,000	64,510,950	100,897,000		
Maintenance and operation	246,625,000	247,858,000	282,322,000		
National Defense Education Act—States	117,229,000	117,815,146	190,986,000		
NYA student aid—high schools					
II. Higher education	(597,819,000)	(600,808,095)	(607,887,000)	(4,243,343,442)	(4,662,589,615)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	14,519,000	14,591,595	14,500,000		
Office of Education:					
Howard University	7,007,000	7,042,035	7,492,000		
Mentally retarded—fellowships	1,495,000	1,502,475	1,500,000		
National Defense Education Act—individuals	49,230,000	49,476,150	42,285,000		
Cooperative research	4,644,000	4,667,220	6,985,000		
Teachers of the deaf					
NYA student aid—colleges	1,495,000	1,502,475	1,500,000		
Veterans' building construction and equipment to educational institutions					
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]	339,768,000	341,466,840	300,000,000		
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and traineeships	9,651,000	9,699,255	13,300,000		
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, and training grants	117,512,000	118,099,560	150,522,000		
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools	5,342,000	5,368,710	5,700,000		
National Science Foundation: Fellowships	16,800,000	16,884,000	21,500,000		
Department of State: Educational exchange	30,356,000	30,507,780	42,603,000		
Inter-American Educational Foundation					
Defense vocational training—colleges					
III. Extension education, special education, and other assistance	(798,328,000)	(802,319,640)	(715,245,000)	(28,809,774,919)	(35,220,804,220)
Department of Agriculture:					
Extension programs	57,649,000	57,937,245	61,611,000		
Experiment stations	36,207,000	36,388,035	38,207,000		
Office of Education:					
Vocational education	53,463,000	53,730,315	56,877,000		
War training food production					
War relocation education centers					
Education of CCC enrollees					
American Printing House for Blind	670,000	673,350	739,000		
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for Deaf)	1,256,000	1,262,280	1,458,000		
Library services	8,231,000	8,272,155	7,500,000		
Surplus property:					
Real	60,000,000	60,300,000	50,000,000		
Personal	380,000,000	381,900,000	345,000,000		
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits	142,476,000	143,188,380	85,479,000		
Maritime education	4,875,000	4,899,275	4,675,000		

See footnotes at end of table.

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years—Con.

	1962		1963	Total	
	Actual (CPI 105.4)[1]	Adjusted (100.5 percent)[1]	Actual (CPI 105.9)[1]	Actual	Adjusted
III. Extension education, special education, and other assistance—Continued					
WPA:					
School buildings					
Education projects					
Interior: Education of Indians	53,501,000	53,768,505	63,699,000		
Total	2,252,426,000	2,263,688,506	2,245,174,000		
Grand total				41,183,955,963	49,237,326,453

[1] Adjusted sums were determined by increasing actual sums by percentage increase in Consumer Price Index, all items, between the year concerned and the first 9 months of fiscal year 1963. Consumer Price Index (1957–59=100) and percentage increase given for each year.
[2] Where applicable combines estimated value of commodities distributed and Federal funds allotted.
[3] Funds may be used for public schools or roads according to State legislature's direction.
[4] Amounts are stated in gross unadjusted sums.
[5] Combines school milk and "indemnity plan."
[6] Computations for July 1, 1945, to Jan. 28, 1946.
[7] Allotments, fiscal years 1941–44.
[8] Allotments, fiscal year 1945 to Feb. 28, 1946.
[9] Includes allotments for extended school services, fiscal year 1945 to Feb. 28, 1946.
[10] Allotment.
[11] Cumulative, fiscal years 1942–46.
[12] Allotment, July 8 to Dec. 31, 1945.
[13] Cumulative, fiscal years 1943–46.
[14] Cumulative, June 1944 to December 1947, value of property donated.
[15] Cumulative, June 1944 to December 1947, acquisition cost to Government of property donated.
[16] Entitlements—all years.
[17] Cumulative, September 1946 through February 1948. Cost for construction and fair value of equipment.
[18] Fair value of transfers to all nonprofit institutions through 1950. 1951–59 for educational institutions only.
[19] Acquisition value of property donated. Estimated amounts distributed to educational institutions.
[20] Estimated amount distributed to educational institutions only, at acquisition costs.
[21] Does not include surplus commodity distribution.
[22] Includes shared revenues for New Mexico and Arizona—forests.
[23] Not available.
[24] Fiscal years 1960–63 acquisition costs of property distributed to schools, hospitals, and civil defense agencies.

Sources: U.S. Treasury—annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances; U.S. Office of Education—"Federal Funds for Education" (for various years). U.S. Bureau of the Budget—"The Budget of the U.S. Government" (for various years), appendix.

Federal expenditures for education: GNP and population

Year	Federal aid in millions	Federal aid in 1963 dollars, in millions	Gross national product in 1963 dollars, in billions	Population
1938	236	509		
1939	184	403		
1940	171	370	218	132,600,000
1941	239	493		
1942	309	576		
1943	302	531		
1944	365	630		
1945	284	480	361	140,500,000
1946	525	813		
1947	3,036	4,132		
1948	4,125	5,190		
1949	3,435	4,383		
1950	3,234	4,126	359	152,300,000
1951	2,421	2,832		
1952	1,887	2,161		
1953	1,358	1,543		
1954	1,292	1,461		
1955	1,438	1,632	451	165,900,000
1956	1,786	1,996		
1957	1,935	2,091		
1958	1,944	2,045		
1959	1,905	1,986		
1960	2,060	2,115	518	180,700,000
1961	2,187	2,222		
1962	2,252	2,264	558	186,000,000
1963	2,245	2,245		

Sources: Legislative Reference Service, Statistical Abstract of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to make several other observations on the pending legislation.

One of the important parts of the bill is the one which increases the research and special project grants from 5 percent to 15 percent. This is an area that deserves full support. Research and training have long constituted one of the most sorely needed aspects of this program. If we ever hope to expand the program, measures which will provide trained personnel and improved methods seem indispensable.

First. One of the good features of this bill is that it gives added flexibility to the entire program.

Second. Perhaps the most significant portion, and one which provides a forward-looking approach, is the one which establishes a work-study program for young people in need of part-time work in public institutions, so that they may earn up to $45 a month, and thus be able financially to undertake full-time vocational training. This would call for the expenditure of $50 million initially.

Third. Other committee amendments that are of special significance include (a) The one which permits the training of semiskilled as well as "skilled," under the definition of vocational education; (b) the provision which allows high schools that give vocational education programs to come under the terms of vocational schools.

Fourth. There is also included an amendment which would extend the NDEA for 3 years. It would be amended in two significant ways: (a) The authorizations for the student loan program would be increased from the present $90 million to $125 million, and then progressively to $150 million by 1967. These funds are now exhausted; (b) the institutional ceiling in the student loan program would be raised from $250,000 to $800,000.

Fifth. Part C of the bill would extend the impacted areas legislation to include the District of Columbia, while extending the enabling Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874, for 3 years.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much.

I wish to say to my colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], that I owe her both an apology and an expression of thanks, because earlier this afternoon I understood that she wished me to yield her some time, and I had planned to do so; but on the way along, something has intervened. However, I am soon going to be through with the bill; and then my colleague can take the floor in her own right. I am very sorry I have not previously yielded that time to her.

Mr. President, I now yield time on the bill to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I support H.R. 4955, a bill that would greatly strengthen basic vocational education across this Nation, extend and expand the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, and provide the provisions of Federal funding for schoolchildren in those districts impacted by Federal activity.

In my opinion, this measure would direct Federal expenditures to those key points in our educational system which will result in the expansion of our total, well-trained, manpower pool and will be of tremendous value for an increasing economy. This is legislation which provides assistance at not just one level or with one type of education but offers an opportunity for assistance at the secondary and higher levels of education, in vocational and general education. It is a bill designed to stimulate local and State expenditures, thereby multiplying the effect of each Federal dollar.

The provisions for vocational education would redirect, expand and modernize our training programs so that they will be both of high quality and realistic in terms of the Nation's projected manpower needs for job opportunities. In fiscal year 1964 this sought-for act would increase Federal funds for vocational education by $108 million more than the $57 million now provided. For the State of West Virginia, this would mean an increase from the present Federal spending of approximately $640,000 by an amount of $1,217,405, nearly 200 percent of the present expenditure.

In addition to this expansion of the basic vocational education programs, this proposal provides for a new work-study

program by which young men and women now unable to receive appropriate training because of their lack of funds could be paid for employment in a public agency thereby earning sufficient funds to continue their vocational education. West Virginia would be allotted some $568,788 out of the total of $50 million to be made available to all the States during fiscal year 1964.

The third vocational education provision would be for the purpose of establishing vocational education residential schools. It would attempt to find a new approach to handling some of the social and personal problems that are related to school attendance while one is at home, thereby enhancing the value of training.

Together, these three important programs will help the Federal Government to realize its important role in providing and stimulating a vocational education suited to manpower and economic needs in this and the coming decades.

The second part of H.R. 4955, to expand and extend the National Defense Education Act, also has my earnest approval. This important act, which has now 5 years of splendid accomplishment, must first be extended, and secondly, improved and strengthened so that it fulfills the purposes originally designed. I call attention to one particular amendment to the National Defense Education Act that is of vital concern to those of us in West Virginia, as well as those in other States. I speak now of the student loan program which has become such a valued success that present authorizations are no longer adequate. The institutions of higher education are applying for funds in the sum of $125 million while there are only $90 million available. Institutions in my State for fiscal year 1964 requested some $1,380,000. Only 65 percent or $880,000 could be made available for such students. Provision within H.R. 4955 would authorize $125 million of student loans for this fiscal year and would increase amounts appropriately in the next 2 fiscal years to more effectively meet the demand of this extremely important phase of educational aid.

Another feature of H.R. 4955 embraces amendments to the student loan program. At present no institution may receive in excess of $250,000 in 1 year for loans to its students. West Virginia University could have used more than $300,000 in the current academic year. There are, Mr. President, 121 institutions across our country that also requested more than $250,000 for this year. By this bill we would raise that ceiling to $800,000, thereby permitting the use of loan funds to the extent that institutions prove their needs.

Other titles of the National Defense Education Act would be altered so that this excellent instrument of Federal assistance is updated and made more appropriate to the particular needs of American education. I urge that the Senate give strong support in extension of this act as provided in the pending measure.

I stress there is reason, also, to extend Public Laws 815 and 874. Since 1950 Federal funds through these laws have been assisting local educational agencies in circumstances where the Federal Government has had a particular responsibility for aiding such agencies in educating federally connected children. From 1951 to 1962 more than $1 billion has been provided under Public Law 815 for construction. West Virginia during that period has been assisted by $243,148 of Federal funds. Under Public Law 874, providing for operating expenses of local educational agencies that have federally connected children approximately $247 million were made available in fiscal year 1962. Of that amount West Virginia was the recipient of $141,120. The extension of these two laws for 3 years is of vital importance not only to those school districts which are directly affected but also because it is some measure of the responsibility that the Federal Government shares in educating America's youth.

I wish to express appreciation to Chairman HILL, of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, for his reasoned counsel and valued leadership. I believe our thanks to Senator MORSE is shared in by all Members of this body, even those in disagreement with his viewpoint, for the fair manner in which he couched his sponsorship of this bill. He has been dedicated to the high purpose of a better educational system for our country. Within our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and in the Senate itself we have had a thorough consideration of this bill.

Mr. President, I urge once again that the Senate give overwhelming approval to the three parts in this educational bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate has listened to one of the most able members of the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman—the Senator from West Virginia. We spent hours and hours and days and days in the hearings at this session of Congress on proposed education legislation. The Senator from West Virginia has one of the best attendance records at those hearings of any member of the committee. Not only did he attend, but in my judgment his examination of the witnesses was exceedingly helpful in bringing out the evidence that we needed in order to present to the Senate the facts that were presented in the volumes of hearings. I wish to thank him for the great cooperation he extended to me at all times.

I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. I rise in support of the pending legislation. First, I compliment the chairman of the subcommittee and the Senator in charge of the proposed legislation. I particularly wish to direct my remarks to the extension of Public Laws 815 and 874. The extension of those two sections is of vital importance to my native State of Nevada, where we have experienced a vast and explosive growth due to defense installations. It is all too true that we, in a State that is the fastest growing State in the entire Union, have been unable to keep up with the school population.

We welcome Federal installations and we like to think that our wide open expanses offer much to our Nation in our space and nuclear activities. Nevertheless, we realize along with this effort tremendous burdens are placed on our communities. In southern Nevada, where we now have many defense activities, some of our schools have been on half-day sessions for 5 years. Our population is rising percentagewise faster than any other State in our Nation.

Nevadans are rugged individuals. They are perfectly willing to carry their share of our national defense effort; however, we are caught in a complex situation where our citizenry has been unable to meet the educational needs without Federal assistance in federally impacted areas.

We also have the reverse of a situation, where just 4 years ago, one county had three times more defense employees in a Federal complex than are working today. The county expanded its schools to provide educational facilities to meet the demands of federally housed and federally based families with children of school age. The population of the county is approximately the same as it was during times of increased employment. Yet there was no taxable income from property taxes to assist the school district in maintaining its plant facilities.

It is in such situations as these, that demand the attention of Members of this body and demand Federal assistance to maintain and educate our youth under proper standards.

Mr. President, I believe H.R. 4955 is a necessary and equitable bill and I will support its provisions. Under the Senate formula, the State of Nevada will receive $98,770 for vocational training; $72,000 under the work study provisions of the bill. Public Laws 815 and 874 will aid materially. In 1962, Nevada schools received $1,573,650. These figures are small indeed compared to our total authorized national request; but they will have far-reaching and beneficial effects in meeting our educational needs. It will be money well spent. I believe the bill should receive the support of this body.

Failure to extend Public Laws 815 and 874 would cause untold damage in an area where the defense installations have been shrunk, as well as cause great damage schoolwise in areas that experience a great population growth.

I commend the senior Senator from Oregon for his effective work in this field and for his realistic approach in extending that program for a total of 3 years.

I also wish to add that I am delighted to note from the report that for the first time the Senator from Oregon has brought under the coverage of those two statutes, Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, the District of Columbia. I remember that about 3 or 4 years ago I pointed out on the floor of the Senate some of the needs of the District of Columbia, and that we should attempt to find sources to meet those needs. The Senator, I believe for the

first time, was the author of an amendment which would bring the District of Columbia into the impacted area program. At that time the effort was not successful. I would say to my good friend from Oregon that I hope this time it will be completely successful, because I believe the school needs of the District of Columbia in this federally impacted area, with the great problems that we have in the District of Columbia, should be taken care of in the same manner as they are in the States that surround us.

I also commend the Senator from Oregon for the attention he has given to the implementation, the acceleration, and the augmentation of the amounts included in the bill for the national defense educational loan program. It is a worthy program. It is not only worthy of the present generation but will do untold good as we move forward through the many problems that we face. We cannot undersell our youth. The costs of a higher education are increasing yearly. Returns to our Nation cannot be measured in dollars alone. This is a minute part of such a program. Students seeking loans and desiring to advance their education are young people of ambition. They are our Nation's hope along with thousands of other students, whose parents are financially able to educate their own children.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my reply to the Senator from Nevada is that I am going to quit while the quitting is good. I appreciate his remarks very much. The Senator from Nevada is the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, on which I have the honor to serve as a member. His support of the bill means a great deal to me. I appreciate it very much. In my judgment, he is one of the great chairmen of Senate committees.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the role of the Federal Government in the area of vocational education is a historic one, dating back more than 100 years to the first Land Grant College Act. This was the first demonstration of the Federal Government's faith in a system of academic and vocational education for those who work with their hands as well as with their heads. This concept was broadened in 1917 by the Smith-Hughes act to include high schools. Further breadth was added in 1946 with the passage of the George-Barden Vocational Education Act. These were reasonable measures designed to meet the needs of a growing population. No one can seriously question their effectiveness. They have performed a valuable service and performed it well.

The present program has made a valuable contribution to the Nebraska educational system, particularly in the area of vocational agricultural education. And I would welcome the opportunity to support a reasonable expansion of the present program in order to meet the needs of our day. In this bill, however, we are not confronted with a reasonable program. We are being handed another in this administration's inexhaustible supply of crash programs.

In dollars, this bill is 15 times the President's original proposal for vocational education as presented in his education message to Congress on January 29 of this year. It calls for the expenditure of $1.435 billion over a period of 5 years as compared with the President's original proposal to spend $92 million over a period of 4 years. Certainly, the demands for vocational education have not grown by this much during the past 8 months.

Mr. President, we all know that these increases were brought about as a result of the President's civil rights message of June 19. In that message, he stressed the high rate of unemployment among our high school dropouts and unskilled youths. With this bill he proposes to take these high school dropouts off the rolls of the unemployed by placing them in training schools and subsidizing them while they are there.

Thus, Mr. President, this is no longer a bill designed to meet the expanded needs of vocational education. There are some who regard it as a relief bill which is designed to improve the politically embarrassing unemployment statistics necessarily issued by the Labor Department.

Such an approach to the unemployment problem is not novel. Earlier this year, the Senate passed the Youth Conservation Corps bill and approved the extension of the Manpower Training and Development Act. Both of these measures were designed to alleviate the unemployment problem in the ranks of the high school dropouts. Both approached the problem in substantially the same manner proposed in this bill.

With the Youth Conservation Corps bill, the Senate authorized the expenditure of $500 million over a period of 5 years. In the manpower training and development bill, the Senate increased the authorization for 1 year from $161 million to $322 million.

If we pass this bill in its present form the Senate will have succeeded in authorizing $2,257 million during this session of Congress for the primary purpose of relieving unemployment in the age bracket between 15 to 20, and in particular for the high school dropouts.

This does not take into consideration the money which is already being spent for this same purpose under the Area Redevelopment Act and the retraining provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Mr. President, the problem of providing technical schooling for those young men and women who need it and want it, is, of course, a serious one. Finding a useful and productive place in our society for the youngster who leaves school should be an objective of all thoughtful persons.

But, like so many of today's complicated difficulties, it cannot be solved merely by drenching it with money, as one douses a campfire, no matter what the administration believes.

The President once criticized the foreign aid program as "bureaucratically fragmented." Yet he approaches this problem in precisely the manner of which he was critical. Administration of these programs will be scattered across several agencies of Government with inevitable waste, duplication, and ineffectiveness.

Mr. President, in addition to the vocational education provisions of this bill which would substantially benefit my own State, this bill contains a section which provides for the extension of the impacted areas legislation. This provision is particularly important to Nebraska citizens because of large numbers of military personnel in various parts of the State. For these reasons, I would like very much to support this aspect of the bill.

However, I cannot in good conscience vote for the entire measure in its present form.

In a few months we will be debating a tax bill which calls for across-the-board reductions amounting to approximately $11 billion. The people of this Nation need and deserve a tax cut. In an effort to rally support for the tax bill the President promised to maintain "an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting outlays to only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of national need."

The inflated proposal we have under consideration today certainly belies any intention to keep that promise. If the President really wishes to gain the confidence of the American people, he should curtail the steady stream of spending proposals with which he has bombarded the Congress. This measure would be an excellent place to start.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BILL: A GOOD STEP FORWARD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the bill before us, H.R. 4955, while of modest proportion, will help solve some of the national education needs of the Nation. I regret that it is not more comprehensive. It should be. But I do regard H.R. 4955, as amended by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, desirable, and shall vote for it.

This proposed legislation endorses and implements the words of President John F. Kennedy who earlier this year in his message on education to the Congress observed:

> We must give special attention to increasing the opportunities and incentives for all Americans to develop their talents to the utmost—to complete their education and to continue their self-development throughout life.

Provision A of H.R. 4955 will help in this development as it relates to the vocational education and training of high school students, high school dropouts, post high school youth preparing to enter the labor field or those who are working but need training or retraining. Help will also be available to those who may be handicapped.

I commend the Members of the Senate Education Subcommittee for paying special attention to the need for construction of area vocational education schools in, as the report on H.R. 4955 points out, "large urban areas having substantial numbers of high school dropouts and unemployed youth," and for

seeing the need for a second new program which would initiate the establishment of "a work-study program for young people in need of part-time work in public institutions so that they may earn up to $45 a month, and thus be able financially to undertake full-time vocational training."

Mr. President, this Nation needs both of these programs and I hope the Congress will approve them.

Automation with its many blessings has many debits. As automation speeds our productivity so does it add to our unemployment rolls and place more Americans on the nonproductive list—where they do not want to be and where they need not be, especially if we take the proper steps to head off such unemployment by adequate training.

I have said many times that I regard unemployment as the most serious problem confronting our Nation today. It was for this very reason that I introduced legislation earlier in this Congress which would increase the amount available for the accelerated public works program from $900 million to $2.6 billion, the amount spent overseas for foreign economic assistance.

When I introduced S. 1121 on March 19, I said it was time for us to do as much for the folks at home as for those abroad. I called for an end to half-measures. I am delighted that from the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has come a positive response.

Part B of the bill before us would extend for 3 years the provisions of the National Defense Education Act and contains four amendments to the general provisions of the act. I will not discuss these amendments in detail. They have been thoroughly explained by the able members of the committee, but I endorse them. Certainly, for example, the National Defense Education Act should be extended to American Samoa.

The National Defense Education Act has been of substantial benefit to Alaska. In September Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, who is doing a fine job in that position, informed me that since the act was signed into law September 2, 1958, Alaska has received funds totaling slightly more than $557,000.

It is pertinent to comment on amendments to title VI of the National Defense Education Act which would extend the title for 3 years and authorize, in addition, the training of teachers of pupils for whom English is a second language.

It is disturbing to read in the committee report on H.R. 4955, as amended by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee:

> Our domestic need is great for teachers of English as a second language—for schools in Puerto Rico, for the 800,000 Spanish-speaking children who are in the schools of New York City alone, for the 45,000 Indian children in Federal schools most of whom have a native language other than English, and for the many thousands of classes across the country which must be organized for native speakers of foreign languages both in the schools and in Americanization programs.

Many Alaskans have written, telephoned, or wired, or talked to me personally to express the hope that Public Law 815, relating to public school construction, and Public Law 874, relating to the operation and maintenance cost of public schools, would be extended.

The bill we are considering would extend both programs for a 3-year period, or to June 30, 1966. Under the extension the District of Columbia would be brought under this coverage. I concur.

Public Law 815 has been of considerable benefit to Alaska. In the period from 1951–62, the State has received $29,283,725 for public school construction.

Public school construction facilities within Alaska are cramped. Gov. William Egan advises me that Alaska needs approximately 200 classrooms to relieve overcrowded conditions and approximately 125 classrooms to replace those which are obsolete.

Today, in the year 1963, some 500 pupils attending rural elementary schools in the 49th State will not have access to high school. This is a sorry situation.

Further, Governor Egan tells me that our independent school districts are bonded to capacity to finance minimum elementary and secondary school construction and cannot expand curriculum offerings into vocational areas.

So it is painfully clear, Mr. President, that the language of H.R. 4955 is needed.

In closing, I wish to compliment again the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his ceaseless efforts on behalf of improved educational opportunities for the children and adults of this Nation. I want also to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for his long and tireless service in this area.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield back the remainder of his time except for 1 minute, which I would ask that he yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time except 1 minute, which I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I take this occasion once again to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for the superb skill and sound generalship he has shown in handling the bill now ready for a vote. He has performed in his usual courteous, gracious, and efficient manner. I believe the bill is thoroughly understood. I hope that it will be passed overwhelmingly. To the Senator from Oregon I extend the greatest credit possible.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for the remarks of a biased friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the minority yield back all time on the bill?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield back all remaining time.

Mr. MORSE. All time is yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 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. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the 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?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] 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], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON and Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 4, as follows:

[No. 186 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Aiken	Bartlett	Bennett
Allott	Bayh	Bible
Anderson	Beall	Boggs

Brewster	Jackson	Nelson
Burdick	Javits	Neuberger
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Pearson
Carlson	Keating	Pell
Church	Kennedy	Prouty
Clark	Kuchel	Proxmire
Cotton	Lausche	Randolph
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Dominick	Long, La.	Saltonstall
Douglas	Magnuson	Scott
Edmondson	Mansfield	Simpson
Ellender	McCarthy	Smathers
Ervin	McClellan	Smith
Fong	McGee	Sparkman
Fulbright	McGovern	Stennis
Gore	McIntyre	Symington
Gruening	McNamara	Talmadge
Hart	Mechem	Walters
Hartke	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Hill	Morse	Yarborough
Holland	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Humphrey	Mundt	Young, Ohio
Inouye	Muskie	

NAYS—4

Hickenlooper	Thurmond	Williams, Del.
Hruska		

NOT VOTING—16

Byrd, Va.	Engle	Morton
Case	Goldwater	Robertson
Cooper	Hayden	Russell
Curtis	Johnston	Tower
Dirksen	Metcalf	
Eastland	Miller	

So the bill (H.R. 4955) was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to correct section numbers in H.R. 4955.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, to extend for three years the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress (federally affected areas), and for other purposes."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Presiding Officer appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MORSE, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. JAVITS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to correct two typographical errors in the committee amendment, as amended, to H.R. 4955, as follows:

On page 34, line 16, strike out "officers" and insert in lieu thereof "offices."

On page 43, line 15, strike out "18" and insert in lieu thereof "8."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed, as passed.

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

H.R. 4955

[As amended and passed in the Senate]

An Act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, to extend for three years the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress (federally affected areas), and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

PART A—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Declaration of purpose

SEC. 1. It is the purpose of this part to authorize Federal grants to States to assist them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs of vocational education, and to provide part-time employment for youths who need the earnings from such employment to continue their vocational training on a full-time basis, so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State—those in high school, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps—will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $108,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $153,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $198,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter $243,000,000, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this part.

Allotments to States

SEC. 3. (a) Eighty-five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the number of persons in the various age groups needing vocational education and the per capita income in the respective States as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year—

(1) An amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged fifteen to nineteen, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

(2) An amount which bears the same ratio to 20 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty to twenty-four, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

(3) An amount which bears the same ratio to 15 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty-five to sixty-five, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which is less than $10,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States under such subsection, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under section 5 shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use under the approved plan of such State for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(d)(1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, and (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75.

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and September 30 of the preceding fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this part. Allotment ratios shall be computed on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes for a State and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Commerce.

(3) The term "per capita income" for a State or for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for any fiscal year, means the total personal income for such State, and for all such States, respectively, in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year, divided by the population of such State, and of all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

(4) The total population and the population of particular age groups of a State or of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

Uses of Federal funds

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), a State's allotment under section 3 may be used, in accordance with its approved State plan, for any or all of the following purposes:

(1) Vocational education for persons attending high school;

(2) Vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market;

(3) Vocational education for persons (other than persons who are receiving training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-415), the Area Redevelopment Act (Public Law 87-27), or the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-794)) who have already

entered the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment;

(4) Vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program;

(5) Construction of area vocational education school facilities, but not more than 10 per centum of a State's allotment for any year may be used for the construction of facilities for a high school department, division, or other unit described in section 8 (2) (B);

(6) Ancillary services and activities to assure quality in all vocational education programs, such as teacher training and supervision, program evaluation, special demonstration and experimental programs, development of instructional materials, and State administration and leadership, including periodic evaluation of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities.

(b) At least 40 per centum of each State's allotment for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1968, and at least 25 per centum of each State's allotment for any subsequent fiscal year shall be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) or (5), or both, of subsection (a), and at least 3 per centum of each State's allotment may be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (6) of subsection (a), except that the Commissioner may, upon request of a State, permit such State to use a smaller percentage of its allotment for any year for the purposes specified above if he determines that such smaller percentage will adequately meet such purposes in such State.

(c) Fifteen per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner to make grants to colleges and universities, to State boards, and with the approval of the appropriate State board, to local educational agencies, to pay part of the cost of research and leadership training programs and of experimental, developmental, or pilot programs developed by such institutions, boards, or agencies, and designed to meet the special vocational education needs of youths, particularly youths in economically depressed communities, who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education programs, and of communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed.

(d) For the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of residential vocational education schools for certain youths of high school age, there are also authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and such sums as the Congress may determine for each of the next four fiscal years, for grants by the Commissioner to State boards, to colleges and universities, and to public educational agencies, organizations, or institutions for the construction, equipment, and operation of residential schools to provide vocational education (including room, board, and other necessities) for youths, at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the time of enrollment, who need full-time study on a residential basis in order to benefit fully from such education. In making such grants, the Commissioner shall give special consideration to the needs of large urban areas having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed and shall seek to attain, as nearly as practicable in the light of the purposes of this subsection, an equitable geographical distribution of such schools.

State plans

SEC. 5. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments of Federal funds under this part shall submit through its State board to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the State plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies; and, if such State board does not include as members persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor in the State, and a person or persons representative of junior colleges, technical institutes, or other institutions of higher education which provide programs of technical or vocational training meeting the definition of vocational education in section 8(1) of this Act, provides for the designation or creation of a State advisory council which shall include such persons, to consult with the State board in carrying out the State plan;

(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in allocating each such allotment among the various uses set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 4(a), and in allocating Federal funds to local educational agencies in the State, which policies and procedures insure that due consideration will be given to the results of periodic evaluations of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities, and to the relative vocational education needs of all groups in all communities in the State, and that Federal funds made available under this part will be so used as to supplement, and, to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State or local funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the uses set forth in section 4(a) so that all persons in all communities of the State will as soon as possible have ready access to vocational training suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit therefrom, and in no case supplant such State or local funds;

(3) provides minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, directors, and others having responsibilities under the State plan;

(4) provides for entering into cooperative arrangements with the system of public employment offices in the State, approved by the State board and by the State head of such system, looking toward such offices making available to the State board and local educational agencies occupational information regarding reasonable prospects of employment in the community and elsewhere, and toward consideration of such information by such board and agencies in providing vocational guidance and counseling to students and prospective students and in determining the occupations for which persons are to be trained; and looking toward guidance and counseling personnel of the State board and local educational agencies making available to public employment offices information regarding the occupational qualifications of persons leaving or completing vocational education courses or schools, and toward consideration of such information by such offices in the occupational guidance and placement of such persons;

(5) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this part;

(6) provides assurance that the requirements of section 7 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this part; and

(7) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve a State plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), and shall not finally disapprove a State plan except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State board designated pursuant to paragraph (1) of such subsection.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board administering a State plan approved under subsection (b), finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State board that no further payments will be made to the State under this part (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under this part (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(d) A State board which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (b) or (c) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the Commissioner may modify or set aside his action. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

Payments to States

SEC. 6. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall be paid on condition that there shall be expended for such year, in accordance with the State plan approved under section 5 or the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act

of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, or both, an amount in State or local funds, or both, which at least equals the amount expended for vocational education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts.

(b) Subject to the limitations in section 4(b), the portion of a State's allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each succeeding year, allocated under the approved State plan for each of the purposes set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying one-half of the State's expenditures under such plan for such year for each such purpose.

(c) The portion of a State's allotment for any fiscal year allocated under the approved State plan for the purpose set forth in paragraph (5) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying not to exceed one-half of the cost of construction of each area vocational education school facility project.

(d) Payments of Federal funds allotted to a State under section 3 to States which have State plans approved under section 5 (as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds so allotted.

Labor standards

SEC. 7. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this part shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Definitions

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this part—

(1) The term "vocational education" means vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes (including field or laboratory work incidental thereto) under public supervision and control or under contract with a State board or local educational agency, and is conducted as part of a program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment as semiskilled or skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations (including any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment in business and office occupations, and any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment which may be assisted by Federal funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, but excluding any program to fit individuals for employment in occupations which the Commissioner determines, and specifies in regulations, to be generally considered professional or as requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree). Such term includes vocational guidance and counseling in connection with such training, instruction related to the occupation for which the student is being trained or necessary for him to benefit from such training, the training of persons engaged as, or preparing to become vocational education teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors for such training, travel of students and vocational education personnel, and the acquisition and maintenance and repair of instructional supplies, teaching aids and equipment, but does not include the construction or initial equipment of buildings or the acquisition or rental of land.

(2) The term "area vocational education school" means—

(A) a specialized high school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational education to persons who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

(B) the department, division, or other unit of a high school providing vocational education to persons who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

(C) a technical or vocational school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational education to persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

(D) the department, division, or other unit of a junior college or community college or university which provides vocational education, under the supervision of the State Board, leading to immediate employment but not leading to a baccalaureate degree,

if it is available to all residents of the State or an area of the State designated and approved by the State Board, and if, in the case of a school, department, division, or other unit described in (C) or (D), it admits as regular students both persons who have completed high school and persons who have left high school.

(3) The term "school facilities" means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment) and interests in land on which such facilities are constructed. Such term shall not include any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

(4) The term "construction" includes construction of new buildings and expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and includes site grading and improvement and architect fees.

(5) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(6) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(7) The term "State board" means the State board designated or created pursuant to section 5 of the Smith-Hughes Act (that is the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11-15, 16-28)) to secure to the State the benefits of that Act.

(8) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, or any other public educational institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a vocational education program.

(9) The term "high school" does not include any grade beyond grade 12.

(10) The term "Vocational Education Act of 1946" means titles I, II, and III of the Act of June 8, 1936, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i-15m, 15o-15q, 15aa-15jj, 15aaa-15ggg).

(11) The term "supplementary vocational education Acts" means section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U.S.C. 30) (relating to vocational education in Puerto Rico), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 31-33) (relating to vocational education in the Virgin Islands), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U.S.C. 34) (relating to vocational education in Guam).

Advisory Committee on Vocational Education

SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on Vocational Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Committee"), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, one representative each of the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor, and twelve members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such twelve members shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public, and not more than six of such members shall be professional educators. The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than twice a year.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, the Vocational Education Act of 1946, and supplementary vocational education Acts, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans under section 5 and the approval of projects under section 4 (c) and (d).

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Amendments to George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Acts

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in title I, II, or III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15i-15m, 15o-15q, 15aa-15jj, 15aaa-15ggg), or in the Smith-Hughes Act (that is, the Act approved February 23, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11-15, 16-28)), or in supplementary vocational education Acts—

(a) any portion of any amount allotted (or apportioned) to any State for any purpose under such titles, Act, or Acts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, or for any fiscal year thereafter, may be transferred to and combined with one or more of the other allotments (or apportionments) of such State for such fiscal year under such titles, Act, or Acts, or under section 3 of this part and used for the purposes for which, and subject to the conditions under which, such other allotment (or apportionment) may be used, if the State board requests, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, that such portion be transferred and shows to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that transfer of such portion in the manner requested will promote the purpose of this part;

(b) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for agriculture may be used for vocational education in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects, whether or not such occupation involves work of the farm or of the farm home, and such education may be provided without directed or supervised practice on a farm;

(c) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for home economics may be used for vocational education to fit individuals for gainful employment in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects;

(d) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for distributive occupations may be used for vocational education for any person over fourteen years of age who has entered upon or is preparing to enter upon such an occupation, and such education need not be provided in part-time or evening schools;

(e) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for trade and industrial occupations may be used for preemployment schools and classes organized to fit for gainful employment in such occupations persons over fourteen years of age who are in school, and operated for less than nine months per year and less than thirty hours per week and without the requirement that a minimum of 50 per centum of the time be given to practical work on a useful or productive basis, if such preemployment schools and classes are for single-skilled or semi-skilled occupations which do not require training or work of such duration or nature; and less than one-third of any amounts so allotted (or apportioned) need be applied to part-time schools or classes for workers who have entered upon employment.

Extension of practical nurse training and area vocational education programs

SEC. 11. (a)(1) Section 201 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15aa) is amended by striking out "of the next eight fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

(2) Subsection (c) of section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out "of the next seven fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

(b) Section 301 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 15aaa) is amended by striking out "of the five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

Periodic review of vocational education programs and laws

SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), shall, during 1966, appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education for the purpose of reviewing the administration of the vocational education programs for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this Act and other vocational education Acts and making recommendations for improvement of such administration, and reviewing the status of and making recommendations with respect to such vocational education programs and the Acts under which funds are so appropriated.

(b) The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twelve persons who shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public.

(c) The Council is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

(d) The Council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this part and other vocational education Acts) to the Secretary, such report to be submitted not later than January 1, 1968, after which date such Council shall cease to exist. The Secretary shall transmit such report to the President and the Congress.

(e) The Secretary shall also from time to time thereafter (but at intervals of not more than five years) appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education, with the same functions and constituted in the same manner as prescribed for the Advisory Council in the preceding subsections of this section. Each Council so appointed shall report its findings and recommendations, as prescribed in subsection (d), not later than July 1 of the second year after the year in which it is appointed, after which date such Council shall cease to exist.

(f) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

Work-study programs for vocational education students

SEC. 13. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the next four fiscal years such sums as may be necessary, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this section.

(b)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated under subsection (a) for such year as the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of the State, in the preceding fiscal year bears to the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of all the States in such preceding year.

(2) The amount of any State's allotment under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under subsection (c) shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under paragraph (1) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this paragraph during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment for such year.

(c) To be eligible to participate in this section, a State must have in effect a plan approved under section 5 and must submit through its State board to the Commissioner a supplement to such plan (hereinafter referred to as a "supplementary plan"), in such detail as the Commissioner determines necessary, which—

(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the supplementary plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies;

(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in approving work-study programs, under which policies and procedures funds paid to the State from its allotment under subsection (b) will be expended solely for the payment of compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs which meet the requirements of subsection (d), except that not to exceed 1 per centum of any such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is the greater, may be used to pay the cost of developing the State's supplementary plan and the cost of administering such supplementary plan after its approval under this section;

(3) sets forth principles for determining the priority to be accorded applications from local educational agencies for work-study programs, which principles shall give preference to applications submitted by local educational agencies serving communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or who are unemployed, and provides for undertaking such programs, insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

(4) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this section;

(5) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(d) For the purposes of this section, a work-study program shall—

(1) be administered by the local educational agency and made reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all youths in the area served by such agency who are able to meet the requirements of paragraph (2);

(2) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who (A) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student in a vocational education program which meets the standards prescribed by the State board and the local educational agency for vocational education programs assisted under the preceding sections of this part, or in the case of a student already enrolled in such a program, is in good standing and in full-time attendance, (B) is in need of the earnings from such employment to commence or continue his vocational education program, and (C) is at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the commencement of his employment, and is capable, in the opinion of the appropriate school authorities, of maintaining good standing in his vocational education program while employed under the work-study program;

(3) provide that no student shall be employed under such work-study program for more than fifteen hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session, or for compensation which exceeds $45 in any month or $350 in any academic year or its equivalent, unless the student is attending a school which is not within reasonable commuting distance from his home, in which case his compensation may not exceed $60 in any month or $500 in any academic year or its equivalent;

(4) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be for the local educational agency or for some other public agency or institution;

(5) provide that, in each fiscal year during which such program remains in effect, such agency shall expend (from sources other than payments from Federal funds under this section) for the employment of its students (whether or not in employment eligible for assistance under this section) an amount that is not less than its average annual expenditure for work-study programs of a similar character during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which its work-study program under this section is approved.

(e) Subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 5 (pertaining to the approval of State plans, the withholding of Federal payments

in case of nonconformity after approval, and judicial review of the Commissioner's final actions in disapproving a State plan or withholding payments) shall be applicable to the Commissioner's actions with respect to supplementary plans under this section.

(f) From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the Commissioner shall pay to such State an amount equal to the amount expended for compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs under the State's supplementary plan approved under this section, plus an amount, not to exceed 1 per centum of such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is the greater, expended for the development of the State's supplementary plan and for the administration of such plan after its approval by the Commissioner. From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such payment shall equal 75 per centum of the amount so expended. No State shall receive payments under this section for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under subsection (b) for such fiscal year.

(g) Such payments (adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds allotted under subsection (b).

(h) Students employed in work-study programs under this section shall not by reason of such employment be deemed employees of the United States, or their service Federal service, for any purpose.

Federal control

SEC. 14. Nothing contained in this part shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

Short title

SEC. 15. This part may be cited as the "Vocational Education Act of 1963".

PART B—EXTENSION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Amendments to title I—General provisions

SEC. 21. (a) Section 103(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam," each time it appears therein.

(b) Subsections (g) and (h) of such section 103 are amended by inserting "or, if such school is not in any State, as determined by the Commissioner" after the words "as determined under State law" wherever such words appear in such subsections.

(c) Subsection (i) of such section 103 is amended by striking out "does not include" and inserting in lieu thereof "includes" and by inserting before the period ", except that no such school or institution shall be eligible to receive any grant, loan, or other payment under this Act".

(d) Subsection (k) of such section 103 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", or any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school".

Amendments to title II—Loans to students in institutions of higher education

SEC. 22. (a) The first sentence of section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for the two succeeding fiscal years, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1964, to continue or complete their education" and inserting in lieu thereof "$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and the next fiscal year, $125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $135,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $145,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the next three fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for school years ending prior to July 1, 1967, to continue or complete their education".

(b) Section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out "1964" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1967".

(c) Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, section 203(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "$250,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$800,000".

(d) (1) Subparagraph (2)(A)(i) of subsection (b) of section 205 of such Act is amended by inserting "or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner" after "at an institution of higher education".

(2) Subparagraph (3) of such subsection is amended by inserting "or in an elementary or secondary school overseas of the Armed Forces of the United States" after "State".

(3) The amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall apply to any loan (under an agreement under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act only with the consent of the institution which made the loan. The amendment made by paragraph (2) of this subsection shall apply with respect to service as a teacher (described in such section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) performed during academic years beginning after the enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made before or after such enactment.

(e) Section 206 of such Act is amended by striking out "1968" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1971".

Amendments to title III—Financial assistance for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction

SEC. 23. (a) Section 301 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

(b)(1) The second sentence of subsection (a)(2) of section 302 of such Act is amended by striking out "as soon as possible after the enactment of this Act, and again between July 1 and August 31 of the year 1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "between July 1 and August 31 of each odd-numbered year". The third sentence of such subsection is amended to read as follows: "Each such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation, except that the allotment ratios promulgated in 1959 shall be conclusive for each of the four fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1964".

(2) Effective with respect to allotments under section 302 or section 305 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, such section 302 is further amended by striking out subsection (a)(4) and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or section 305(a), for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and section 305(a), respectively, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or section 305(a), as the case may be, for such year."

(c) Section 303(a)(1)(A) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting "and published" after "printed", and (2) by inserting "of test grading equipment for such schools and specialized equipment for audiovisual libraries serving such schools, and" after "or both, and".

(d) The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 304 of such Act is amended by striking out "four succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "seven succeeding fiscal years".

Amendments to title IV—National defense fellowships

SEC. 24. (a) Section 402 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

(b) Such section is further amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 402", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this section but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine."

(c) Subsection (b) of section 404 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition."

Amendments to title V—guidance, counseling, and testing

SEC. 25. (a) Section 501 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and $17,500,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the three succeeding fiscal years".

(b)(1) Effective with respect to allotments under section 502 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, the third sentence of such section is amended by striking out "$20,000" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000".

(2) Effective with respect to allotments under such section 502 for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, such section 502 is further amended by inserting "(a)"

after "SEC. 502." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 501 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year."

(c)(1) Subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 503 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) a program for testing students who are not below grade 7 in the public elementary or secondary schools of such State, and if authorized by law in corresponding grades in other elementary or secondary schools in such State, to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program: *Provided*, That no such program shall provide for the conduct of any test, or the asking of any question in connection therewith, which is designed to elicit information dealing with the personality, environment, home life, parental or family relationships, economic status, or sociological or psychological problems of the pupil tested; and".

(2) Subparagraph (2) of subsection (a) of such section 503 is amended by striking out "public secondary schools" and inserting in lieu thereof "public elementary or secondary schools", and by inserting "who are not below grade 7" after "students" in clause (A) thereof.

(d) (1) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of such Act is amended by striking out "four succeeding fiscal years", and inserting in lieu thereof "seven succeeding fiscal years", and by inserting before the semicolon ", including amounts expended under the State plan for State supervisory or related services in public elementary or secondary schools in the fields of guidance, counseling, and testing, and for administration of the State plan".

(2) The first sentence of subsection (b) of such section 504 is amended by striking out "the cost of testing students in any one or more secondary schools", and inserting in lieu thereof "the cost of testing students, who are not below grade 7, in any one or more elementary or secondary schools", and by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

(e)(1) Section 511 of such Act is amended to strike out "five succeeding fiscal years" and to insert in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

(2) Such section is further amended to insert "who are not below grade 7 in elementary or" after "students," and to insert "elementary or" after "counseling or guidance in a public".

Amendment to title VI—Language development

SEC. 26. (a) Section 601 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "1964" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1967".

(b) Section 611 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years", and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "As used in this section 'modern foreign language' includes English when taught to persons for whom English is a second language.".

Amendments to title VII—Research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes

SEC. 27. (a) Section 701 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "printed and published materials," after "motion pictures," and after "auditory aids,".

(b) Section 731 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "printed and published materials," after "motion pictures," wherever appearing therein.

(c) Section 761 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "printed and published materials," after "motion pictures," wherever appearing therein.

(d) Section 763 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

Amendments to title X—Miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 28. (a) Section 1008 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam,".

(b) Section 1009(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

PART C—FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

Amendments to Public Law 815

SEC. 31. (a)(1) The first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by striking out "1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1966".

(2) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended by striking out "1963" each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1966".

(3) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out "1960–1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "1963–1964".

(b)(1) Paragraph (1) of section 15 of such Act is amended in the third sentence by striking out "and (B)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(B) for one year beyond the end of the fiscal year in which occurred the sale or transfer thereof by the United States, any property considered prior to such sale or transfer to be Federal property for the purposes of this Act, and (C)".

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall be effective on and after July 1, 1962.

(c) Section 15(13) of such Act is amended by inserting "the District of Columbia," after "Guam,".

Amendments to Public Law 874

SEC. 32. (a) Sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), are each amended by striking out "1963" each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1966".

(b)(1) Paragraph (1) of section 9 of such Act is amended by striking out "housing" in clause (B) of the third sentence.

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall be effective on and after July 1, 1962.

(c) Section 9(8) of such Act is amended by inserting "the District of Columbia," after "Guam,".

Comprehensive study

SEC. 33. The Commissioner of Education shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before January 1, 1965, a full report of the operation of Public Laws 815 and 874, as extended by this Act, and his recommendations as to what amendments to these laws should be made if they are further extended.

Effective dates

SEC. 34. The amendments made by sections 31 and 32 shall, except as otherwise provided, be effective July 1, 1963.

TRIBUTE TO STAFF MEMBERS FOR WORK ON H.R. 4955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to express, very briefly, my appreciation to a wonderful staff, who made possible the preparation of the material on behalf of the committee that was brought to the floor this afternoon.

I believe we have one of the most able legal counsels on the Hill assigned to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I refer to Mr. Jack Forsythe, who has been with us a good many years. His legal counsel has been found by me to be unfailingly correct. He performed yeoman service in connection with the bill, and I want to thank him publicly for his splendid work.

We also have the very brilliant staff member, Mr. Charles Lee, who in connection with this bill, performed many hours of work far beyond the line of duty.

On behalf of the full committee, I express to both of these gentlemen the very sincere gratitude for the wonderful staff work they have given us.

I also wish to express my heartfelt thanks to Mike Bernstein, minority counsel, and to Ray Hurley, minority professional staff member.

The best evidence I can give of the high esteem in which I hold Mike Bernstein as a member of the legal staff of the committee is that I have been trying to hire him away from the Republicans. They have too much of an attachment or hold on him. He does excellent work.

Whenever I present any problems to him that call for presentation of legal opinions to the committee, I never fail to receive the same quality of service that we receive from Jack Forsythe. What I said about Charles Lee is equally applicable to the minority counsel, Ray Hurley.

Also, I wish to mention a team that was made available to us, at our request, from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who worked with us throughout our committee consideration of H.R. 4955. I refer to the following gentlemen:

Dr. Peter Muirhead, Assistant Commissioner of Education and Director of Program and Legislative Planning.

Dr. Samuel Halperin, Director of Legislative Services Branch, Office of Education.

Mr. B. A. Lillywhite, Associate Director of Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, Office of Education.

Mr. Theodore Ellenbogen, and his colleague, Mr. Reginal Conley, Office of the

General Counsel, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Gordon Ambach, Office of Program and Legislative Planning, Office of Education.

And Dr. Walter M. Arnold, Assistant Commissioner of Education and Director of Division of Vocational and Technical Education.

During the hearings on the bill, we good naturedly said that Senators conducted a seminar, and from time to time we assigned seminar papers to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They were hard, tough assignments, but we never asked for a memorandum from these men whose names I have just read which they did not prepare, and their work was of a very high caliber.

On behalf of the committee, I thank them all.

Lastly, I want to thank the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze, and the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Keppel, for the splendid cooperation they extended to our committee.

PROCUREMENT OF EXPERT ASSISTANCE BY INDIAN TRIBES IN CASES BEFORE THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 447, H.R. 3306, and that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3306) to establish a revolving fund from which the Secretary of the Interior may make loans to finance the procurement of expert assistance by Indian tribes in cases before the Indian Claims Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, after line 22, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 7. After the date of the approval of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall approve no contract which makes the compensation payable to a witness before the Indian Claims Commission contingent upon the recovery of a judgment against the United States.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. For the information of his colleagues, will the Senator from Montana inform us what his schedule is for the remainder of the day, what he anticipates may be taken up tomorrow, and any further information as to the rest of the week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be delighted to respond to the question raised by the distinguished acting minority leader.

Following action on the pending bill, it is the leadership's intention to bring up Calendar No. 533, Senate bill 1588, a bill reported by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which I understand is approved on both sides.

Following that, it is intended to lay before the Senate tomorrow as the pending business, Calendar No. 425, S. 1915, the so-called Proxmire bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Following action on that bill, it is anticipated that the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 534, S. 649, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Following that, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 535, H.R. 6143, an act to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the instruction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

The latter two measures will not necessarily be considered in that order. They may come up this week or next week, but as of now, that is the best information I can give the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator contemplate that he will move to have sessions each day this week—Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the majority leader be in a position to inform us when he intends to bring up the rule change as to germaneness? Can he give us a date?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island take that up with the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. PASTORE. I did that. He said he was going to take that matter up in the policy committee. I understand that the Republican policy committee met today. I was wondering if we could ask the distinguished Senator from California what is to be done in that connection. I think it would be helpful to bring about a rule of germaneness in debate for 3 hours after the morning hour, so as to expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. May I say to my colleague that the distinguished minority leader was compelled to leave Washington for Chicago. He will return the day after tomorrow. With the great patience which the Senator from Rhode Island always exhibits, I would appreciate his withholding the question until the Republican leader returns.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall be very glad to accommodate him in that regard.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I happen to be chairman of the Republican policy committee. The matter was not taken up today in the policy committee, so no answer can be given to the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. It was not taken up?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. It was not brought up today. So I cannot give him an answer. It will probably be discussed at a later time.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. HILL, and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 2220. A bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

S. 2221. A bill providing for the establishment of a national cemetery in Fort Reno, Okla., on certain lands presently under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2222. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to encourage the settlement of jurisdictional disputes in the maritime industry; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. DOMINICK (for himself, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

S. 2223. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for the regulation of collective investment funds maintained by banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2224. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ambrosio Medina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 2225. A bill for the relief of Christiane Antoine Bronas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S.J. Res. 124. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December of each year as Wright Brothers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S.J. Res. 125. Joint resolution providing for the recognition of the 50th anniversary of the American Society for Metals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S.J. Res. 126. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

SHIPMENT OF GRAIN TO U.S.S.R.

Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. DOMINICK) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 210) to recommend that at least 50 percent of grain sold to U.S.S.R. be

shipped in U.S. flag vessels and that ships in violation of presidential embargo in relation to trade with Cuba be barred from participation, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE SALE OF SURPLUS PRODUCE TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. SCOTT) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 211) establishing the Select Committee on the Sale of Surplus Agricultural Produce to Communist Countries, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

ENCOURAGEMENT FOR PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS WHO RECEIVE STUDENT LOANS TO PRACTICE IN CERTAIN AREAS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists. The bill embodies the amendment that I offered on the floor of the Senate. It was rejected by a very narrow margin. But many Senators gave their assurance that if it was introduced as a separate bill, they would support it.

I ask unanimous consent that it remain at the desk until the close of business for tomorrow for Senators who wish to do so to sign as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The bill (S. 2220) to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists, introduced by Mr. COTTON (for himself, and Mr. HILL and Mr. BURDICK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SETTLEMENT OF JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES IN MARITIME INDUSTRY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill which, if adopted, will declare the policy of the United States to be that there shall be no stoppage in the movement of vessels under the U.S. flag because of disputes between two labor unions or more.

At present, two vessels are laid up because of disputes between two labor unions. One is the U.S. nuclear propelled vessel the *Savannah*, and the other is the passenger vessel *America*.

This bill provides that there shall be no strike, lockout, or interruption of work in connection with any dispute between two labor unions serving the merchant marine.

The bill contemplates the orderly adjustment of the dispute between the two parties. If they cannot, in accordance with the procedure outlined in the bill, settle the dispute between themselves, one of the parties if it has consented to arbitration in the peaceful negotiations, may then certify to the Secretary of Labor that the dispute exists between two labor unions, that one party has agreed to arbitration and the other has not.

The Secretary of Labor then shall attempt still to procure a settlement by negotiation and conciliation. If he is unsuccessful in procuring the settlement, he then, under the bill, is authorized to appoint an arbiter or a board of arbiters who shall give a hearing to both parties. At the close of the hearing he shall render his decision dealing with the manner in which the dispute should be settled. That decision will be final.

Mr. President, in my judgment, while we look adversely upon arbitration, this subject is of such importance that it warrants the approach which I have suggested. The Government simply cannot suffer viewing contests in disputes between labor unions which impose unjustified wrongs and damages upon the operators of ships, exploitation of the rights of American citizens, and disrepute throughout the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2222) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to encourage the settlement of jurisdictional disputes in the maritime industry, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SHIPMENT OF GRAIN TO U.S.S.R.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution relating to the sale of grain to the U.S.S.R. The resolution provides that not less than 50 percent of the cargoes involved in any wheat transaction with Russia be carried by American-flag vessels. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be held at the desk until the close of business tomorrow for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received, appropriately referred, and under the rule, be printed in the RECORD; and, without objection, the resolution will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The resolution (S. Res. 210) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 210

Whereas the U.S. Government is contemplating the sale of millions of bushels of wheat to the Soviet Union; and

Whereas it is reported that representatives of the Soviet Union have indicated their willingness to conclude a cash sale; and

Whereas it appears that the United States may improve its mounting balance-of-payments deficits as a result of such a sale; and

Whereas it would appear that the Soviet Union has estimated that its grain supplies from domestic production this year would be as much as 18 percent below the 1962 level; and

Whereas it appears that the Soviet Union is most anxious to purchase U.S.-produced grain; and

Whereas serious concern has been expressed by Members of Congress in relation to the U.S. mounting balance-of-payments deficits; and

Whereas it is a fact that the U.S. Government policy, at the moment is to encourage the use of U.S.-flag vessels wherever possible in order to assist our balance-of-payments earning posture; and

Whereas it would appear that under certain terms and conditions governing the sale of such grain the mandatory use of U.S.-flag vessels for delivery of the grain to Russia would not be required under present law; and

Whereas it is a fact that the U.S. maritime industry is depressed and employment therein is at low level: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that one of the conditions of the sale should be the mandatory participation of U.S.-flag vessels in the delivery of not less than 50 percent of the cargoes involved in such transactions; and be it further

Resolved, That foreign-flag vessels which have engaged in transportation to Cuba since the Presidential embargo shall under all circumstances be barred from participation in these transactions.

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY AGRICULTURAL SALES TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution calling for the establishment of a Senate select committee to study all the implications of the proposed Soviet wheat deal and of sales of agricultural produce in general to Communist-bloc countries. Senators COOPER, DOMINICK, MUNDT, PROXMIRE, and SCOTT have joined me as cosponsors.

This is a modest resolution. It does not ask that we reject the Soviet bid to purchase American wheat out of hand or under all circumstances. It simply asks that before concluding the proposed transaction, we pause and give careful study to all its implications, and to the terms of sale that could most effectively protect the interests of the free world.

The resolution points out that there is no immediate danger of famine in the Soviet Union. It asks the select committee to be appointed under its terms to report to the Senate by February 1 of this coming year. And it expresses the sense of the Senate that no grain deal should be concluded with the Soviets

until the results of the committee's study are available for the guidance of the administration.

There are some who have spoken out in support of the proposed transaction, with no strings attached. There are others who have expressed their categorical opposition to it.

There are still others who, while they oppose selling to the Soviet Union at a subsidized price, would be willing to sell wheat to the Soviets on appropriate terms and subject to certain elementary conditions.

But no matter which viewpoint we are disposed to support, I believe that all of us are agreed that the proposed wheat sale to the Soviet Union is a matter of very great importance, a matter that may have many serious implications, for better or for worse, from the standpoint of the free world.

It is not a matter which should be decided by snap decision or by hurried judgment designed to meet some imaginary deadline.

It is a matter, on the contrary, that calls for both conscientious study and earnest deliberation. Above all, it is the kind of matter that should be the subject of careful consultation between the executive and the legislative branches.

The haste with which we appear to be rushing into this transaction is both unwise and unbecoming. There is no valid reason why we cannot give ourselves a few months to study this many-sided problem before a decision is made.

There will be no famine in the Soviet Union before February of next year. Nor is there any danger that the Soviets will take their bid elsewhere if we refuse to sign an agreement tomorrow and on their terms.

The fact is that the Soviets cannot purchase the quantities of grain they require from any other source. The unprecedented purchases of wheat on the world market by both Red China and the Soviet Union have completely exhausted the substantial reserves which previously existed in Canada, Australia, and other countries.

As matters now stand, the United States commands virtually the entire available surplus of food grains.

It has been suggested that over the coming 2 years the Soviets may require imports of some 10 million tons of wheat, beyond the imports for which they have already contracted. But the world wheat market has now become so tight that the Soviet Union would be hard put to find a half million tons outside the United States.

In all the haste to conclude a deal with the Soviet Union, the fact that the United States now has a corner on the world wheat market is generally ignored. But this fact by itself has a many-sided significance.

First of all, it signifies that we have reached a point where the prices previously prevailing on the world market become meaningless: For all practical purposes, the world price of wheat is now the American domestic price.

If, in the face of this situation, we now permit the Soviets to purchase American surplus wheat at last year's world market prices, we would be guilty of a several hundred million dollar giveaway for which no justification can be offered, political, commercial, or moral.

Our unique position as custodian of the world's entire wheat surplus has another grave implication.

The underdeveloped countries of the world requires substantial annual imports of grain foods in order to maintain their peoples at a bare subsistence level.

Over the coming 2 years, at least, these underdeveloped countries will be completely dependent on the United States for their imports of wheat and other basic food grains.

Before making any irrevocable long-term commitments to the Soviet Union, humanity as well as commonsense dictates that we make a careful study of the potential demands from all sources over the coming 2 to 3 years.

Mr. President, the Soviet economic crisis confronts us with an unprecedented opportunity to underscore the economic advantages of freedom and the total economic ineptitude of Communist tyranny. I hope we will take advantage of this opportunity.

I hope that in our propaganda to the Soviet sphere and to the uncommitted countries we will make the contrast between the agricultural surpluses that prevail in the great countries of the free world and the chronic agricultural shortages that are the rule wherever communism holds sway.

I hope that we will pin the blame for these shortages squarely where it belongs: on the principle of compulsion which is at the heart of Communist philosophy and economic practice. Forced collectivization does not work because the peasants who are thus collectivized lose all incentive to produce. And this basic difficulty is compounded when, as is the case in the virgin lands, millions of people have been transferred against their will to a remote and difficult area of the Soviet Union.

The basic weakness of Communist tyranny is the fact that wherever it has succeeded in taking power, it has displayed an infallible genius for converting food surplus areas into food deficit areas, or in preventing the expansion in agricultural production which has proceeded, decade by decade, in virtually all of the countries of the non-Communist world.

But, beyond pressing our propaganda advantage, I hope that we will not hesitate to press the tremendous political and strategic advantages inherent in the present situation.

The Soviets must have American wheat in order to survive: this fact is basic. We are in a position to impose conditions in the interest of freedom, and I believe we should impose them.

The very least we can do is to insist that, as a condition of bailing the Soviets out of their new manmade agricultural crisis, the Soviets call a halt to their subversive activities in this hemisphere and elsewhere.

If we fail to exact even this elementary concession from the Soviets in return for the sale of wheat to them, then we shall be placing ourselves in the position of indirectly abetting the subversion of the free world by financing and feeding an enemy who is daily encouraging acts of violence and terrorism in Venezuela and other Latin American countries; who is inciting Sukarno against the newborn state of Malaysia; and who is giving direct material and political support to the Communist insurgents in Laos and Vietnam.

Mr. President, I hope that my resolution will be reported to the floor as expeditiously as possible.

I hope that the proposed sale of massive quantities of wheat and other agricultural surplus to the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc will be given the careful study which it merits.

And I hope that the administration will see fit to agree to the several months' delay proposed by this resolution before itself entering into any agreement with the Soviet Union or before granting permission for private sales to the Communist bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 211) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas the massive purchases of wheat on the world market by Communist China and the Soviet Union has for the first time in history created a situation in which one nation—the United States— commands virtually the world's entire available surplus of food grains; and

Whereas this confers on the United States the responsibility of controlling future world trade in food grains, and endows it with immense potential political and strategic advantages; and

Whereas it is clear that the Soviet Union, despite its unprecedented purchases from Canada, Australia, and other countries, can meet its own heavy requirements only by drawing on the American grain surplus; and

Whereas the underdeveloped countries of the world must also look in coming years to the American grain surplus to meet their own food deficits; and

Whereas in the absence of any immediate danger of famine in the Soviet Union, the question of whether and under what circumstances to sell grain to the Communist bloc countries should not be decided by snap judgment but by careful deliberation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established a select committee of the Senate to be known as the Select Committee on the Sale of Surplus Agricultural Produce to Communist Countries (hereinafter referred to as the select committee) consisting of nine Members of the Senate of whom five shall be members of the majority party and four shall be members of the minority party. The President of the Senate shall designate one Senator to serve as chairman of the select committee, and such Senator shall be from those Senators appointed from the majority party.

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the select committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee.

(c) A majority of the members of the select committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that the select committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony. The select committee shall adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate governing standing committees of the Senate.

(d) No legislative measure shall be referred to the select committee, and it shall have

no authority to report any such measures to the Senate.

(e) The select committee shall cease to exist on February 29, 1964.

Section 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the select committee to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to the acceptance of any offer of the Soviet Union or other Communist bloc country to purchase surplus wheat or other surplus agricultural produce from the United States. It shall be the further function of the select committee to determine the relative advantages and disadvantages of accepting any such offer and to determine the circumstances under which the sale of surplus wheat and other grain to the Soviet Union or other Communist bloc countries can be reconciled with the best interests of the free world. In carrying out such study and investigation the select committee shall give special consideration to:

1. The unique position of the United States as custodian of the world's entire surplus of wheat.

2. The probable wheat requirements in coming years of the Soviet Union and other Communist bloc countries.

3. The probable wheat requirements in coming years of our allies and of the underdeveloped countries of the world.

4. The consequences of any such sales by this country upon its balance-of-payments problem.

5. The question of extending credit to the Soviet Union in connection with any such sale, with specific reference to the settlement of the long overdue debt to this country of $800 million for American lend-lease aid to the Soviet Union during World War II.

6. The desirability of revising present laws governing the sale of surplus agricultural commodities to foreign nations.

7. The potential impact that the replenishment of the strategic food reserve of the Soviet Union may have on Soviet control over the satellites and on Soviet aggressiveness.

8. The potential impact of the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union on the conduct of the cold war generally, and whether a demand for an abatement of Communist subversive activities in this hemisphere and elsewhere should be imposed as a condition of sale.

9. The possibility and desirability of concerted future trade policy, as it relates to wheat and other grain, with the other two major free world producers, Canada and Australia.

(b) On or before January 31, 1964, the select committee shall submit to the Senate a report of its study and investigation together with its recommendations for any measures which it considers to be necessary or desirable.

Section 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the select committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony orally or by deposition; and (7)employ and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable, except that the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for comparable duties.

(b) Upon request made by the members of the select committee selected from the minority party, the committee shall appoint one assistant or consultant designated by such members. No assistant or consultant appointed by the special committee may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,600 the annual gross rate of compensation of any individual so designated by the members of the committee who are members of the minority party.

(c) With the prior consent of the department or agency concerned, the select committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of the General Accounting Office or any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis or otherwise the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, the select committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the select committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

(d) Subpenas may be issued by the select committee over the signature of the chairman or any other member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the select committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Section 4. The expenses of the select committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the select committee.

Section 5. It is further declared to be the sense of the Senate that no sale of wheat or other agricultural surplus should be concluded with the Soviet Union or any other Communist country until the results of the study and investigation authorized by this resolution are available for the guidance of the administration.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to express, from this side of the aisle, a warm word of appreciation for the highly constructive resolution which the Senator from Connecticut has submitted. I have been happy to join as a cosponsor of the resolution, because obviously the delay from now until February 1 will not have any direct bearing on whether the Soviets can use the wheat if they get it.

The Senator from Connecticut has provided us with some real food for thought. To me, one of the disturbing features of our foreign policy is that we are afraid to win the cold war. We tremble in the face of victory.

At this particular time in the cold war, the Russian food supply is breaking down, so far as their capacity to supply themselves and their satellite countries is concerned. We should not now retreat in the face of victory.

Appropriate consideration of the resolution should be given by the committee to get all the facts before us, because a major switch in American foreign policy is involved. It appears that we are resolved never to win in the cold war, because when victory becomes apparent, we start a retreat.

I salute the Senator from Connecticut for making another major contribution in the field in which he is already very well versed and distinguished, that is, preaching the doctrine of consistency in the cold war against communism.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 217)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill—S. 1915—to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 6, after line 13, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to issue, within sixty days after the enactment of this Act, recommendations with respect to minimum standards for milk for manufacturing purposes, and shall include in such recommendations sanitation standards equivalent to those recommended by the United States Public Health Service for grade A fluid market milk (contained in a publication of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Milk Ordinance and Code"). Any recommendations issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall supersede any recommendations heretofore issued by the Department of Agriculture on the same subject.

PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEM IN THE SENATE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] may be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 202, relating to a public address system in the Senate.

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

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 8, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 13. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.;

S. 453. An act to change the name of the Memphis lock and dam on the Tombigbee River near Aliceville, Ala.;

S. 743. An act to furnish to the Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Association medals in commemoration of this 250th anniversary of his birth;

S. 812. An act to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America;

S. 814. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 1125. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th

anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood;

S. 1936. An act authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the Act approved March 23, 1906; and

S. 1994. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of certain waterfowl feathers and down from the national stockpile.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY AT ARKANSAS STATE FAIRGROUNDS, LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last Thursday my State was honored by a visit from the President. In his speech at the Arkansas State Livestock Show the President discussed a theme which is overlooked all too often these days when it is the fashion to blame either the Federal Government or the Communists for all the ills of modern society. The point that much of the progress throughout the country, and certainly in my own State, would not have happened had there not been a close working relationship between the local, State, and Federal Governments was made in the President's usual able manner.

We are grateful that the President took time from his busy schedule to spend a day with us.

I commend his speech to Senators and other readers of the RECORD and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, ARKANSAS STATE FAIRGROUNDS, LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Ladies and gentlemen, Governor Faubus, distinguished guests, I appreciate very much the hospitality shown to all of us and the chance to visit what Congressman MILLS has described as the greatest State in the Union and to have a chance to say a few words about Arkansas and the South and the country.

I am particularly glad to be here in company with the Arkansas delegation which occupies a position of influence not only affecting the welfare of this State, but also the welfare of the United States, because the men whom you send from Arkansas, by virtue of their long service, now occupy a position of the highest importance affecting the welfare of every American regardless of where he may live and, thus, the senior Senator, Senator MCCLELLAN, who occupies the position as head of the investigating committee on which I once served, has served this country and State with distinction and has been the architect of a good many of the dams and basins which we have looked at from the air today.

The junior Senator from Arkansas, Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on which I once served with him, who was the floor manager of the legislation recently passed to make it possible for both the Soviet Union and the United States and the world not to resume once again atmospheric testing which destroys our atmosphere and our hopes for peace; and your Congressman, WILBUR MILLS, who is chairman of the committee which determines taxes, which determines the level of income, which determines the tariffs, the chairman of the committee which recently, last week, in the Congress passed the most far-reaching economic bill which has passed the House of Representatives in 15 years; and Chairman HARRIS, from this State, of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, who now works on a bill this week which will do more for mental health and mental retardation in children than any bill the Congress of the United States has ever passed. And Congressman GATHINGS and Congressman TRIMBLE, who serve on the Agriculture Committee and the Rules Committee.

These men write the laws which affect not only this State, but all the States, and I think they write good laws, and I am glad to come down here and salute them and salute the people who sent them to Washington.

These are forward-looking measures and they are forward-looking men, and their contribution to the welfare of this country may come as a surprise to those whose view of the South may be distorted by headlines and headline seekers. The old South has its problems and they are not yet over, nor are they over in the rest of the country, but there is rising every day, I believe, a new South, a new South of which Henry Grady spoke about 80 years ago, and I have seen it in your universities, in your cities, in your industries—the new South I saw this morning on the Little Red River, the dams and reservoirs through the White River, and the Arkansas River Basin in a sense symbolizes the new South for they mean navigation for your commerce, protection for your cities, opportunity for your people.

Why is it that before these great developments this State steadily lost population and now, in recent years, this State has grown far faster than the rest of the United States? These things don't just happen. They are made to happen. They represent effort by the people here. They represent basically effort and leadership by the people here, but they also represent effort by the people of the United States working through the Congress which makes it possible to build these dams, which makes it possible to develop this State, which makes it possible to develop the United States.

This State, this country, the National Government has not invested hundreds of millions of dollars in Arkansas in order to dominate the State. Far from it. The fact of the matter is that these great projects will pay for themselves many times over as the State of Arkansas rises in income.

At one time, 25 years ago, the Federal Government spent $20 in this State for every dollar that this State sent to Washington. Now it is 2 to 1. Then it will be even, and sooner or later in the next 10 years this State, with its steadily rising income, will be among the most prosperous in the country. That is the new South. That is what cooperative effort can do.

It is too bad that headlines haven't reported that in the past 5 years, southern colleges and universities have increased their expenditure by 40 percent, their physical plant by 50 percent, the average faculty salary by 25 percent. All of this represents an investment in people and resources, and I am proud to say that the National Government has had its part in this great, cooperative effort—in guaranteeing the homes, in making it possible to guarantee the crops, in building these dams, in contributing to the universities and the schools, in helping in vocational training, in helping to build hospitals, in all these things that make it possible to release the energy of the people of Arkansas and cause this State to steadily move upward.

That is what I am proud of, and that is what this country is proud of and this State is proud of.

Since the close of the Second World War, the relative importance of manufacturing has grown twice as fast in this State as in the Nation as a whole—four times faster than the rate of manufacturing employment, four times faster in Arkansas than it has in the rest of the Nation.

Per capita income does not lag behind as much as it used to. In 1940, the per capita income in this State was about $300 or more. Now it is five times as much in 21 or 22 years. Those things just don't happen.

I think that a lot of that comes from the wise decisions that this country made in the thirties under the administration of Franklin Roosevelt and which have been built upon since then which have permitted us in this State and country to enjoy prosperity from 1945 until 1963, in contrast to the depression which occurred in this State from 1919 to 1935. And those who wish to turn the clock back, those who wish to stand still, those who wish to end the partnership which exists between this State and the National Government and every other State should just read the history of Arkansas from 1919 to 1935.

This rising tide in this State and in the South and in the Nation must continue. We must build those dams, we must use our resources, we must educate our children, we must provide jobs for our people. These are the great assignments which this generation of Americans in the sixties has before it.

I am glad to say the people of Arkansas and the Members of Congress you sent there have recognized it. This is no time to stand still. This country of ours occupies a position of unique leadership throughout the world. Without the United States, the cause of freedom would long ago have been washed away.

There are 1 million Americans serving outside our borders today defending the cause of freedom all around the globe. This is an assignment which we have accepted, which has been thrust upon us, and I think we accept it with pride, but in order to meet our commitments to ourselves and those who depend upon us, this country must continue to make a great national effort all over the country, North and South, East and West, in order to move our life forward, in order to make it possible for us to find the jobs for the people who are coming after, in order to make it possible for your sons and daughters to go to college.

We are going to have twice as many trying to get into college in 1970 as in 1960. You are going to have 10 million Americans trying to get jobs in the next 2½ years.

This country has great opportunities and great responsibilities and I hope that this State and others like it will associate together to provide a fairer opportunity for all Americans, to realize their talents, to make something of themselves, to give them a fair chance which is what we stand for and which our Constitution promises.

So I come here today with a good deal of satisfaction and pride and appreciation for what your Congress has done, what your State has done, most of all what our country has done.

This great new South contributes to a great new America, and you particularly, those of you who are young, I think, can look forward to a day when we shall have no South, no North, no East, no West, but one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. That is what we are building in this country today.

SPREAD OF SOCIALISM AND DICTATORSHIP IN AFRICA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to an article entitled "Welensky Blasts 'Pomp' of Africa Independence," written by

Arch Parsons, and published in the Washington Post of today, October 8, 1963.

According to the article, Sir Roy Welensky, the outgoing Prime Minister of the Central African Federation, is concerned with the very items I discussed when I was in Southern Rhodesia last December. At that time the politicians there, particularly this Dr. Hastings Banda who is now in Washington, and other persons, took offense at the objective judgments I made on the impending dissolution of the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland, or the Central African Federation.

Sir Roy Welensky comes to the same conclusion that I reached when I was in Southern Rhodesia. I stated then that Nyasaland was incapable of a successful "independent" government because it had no natural resources and few trained personnel. While it might have had one good leader in Dr. Banda, that alone was not sufficient to make Nyasaland independent.

I stated then that in order for Nyasaland to be able to proceed to develop its own resources, it would be necessary for it to obtain assistance from the United States or from some other source. I predicted that Great Britain would desire to wash its hands of the entire business, and that our Nation would then be called upon to supply the cash needed to operate this "independent" country.

Of course, this turned out to be the case, and I should like to read from this statement, as follows:

Welensky appeared to be seeking to cut the ground out from under the reported purpose of Banda's visit for economic help—

And I join him in that—

Nyasaland will lose about $20 million in British assistance when it becomes independent, Welensky said, adding with a trace of sarcasm, "I assume our American friends will step in and play the role of generous donors once again."

Welensky, in this article, points up a strange and serious paradox in our foreign policy as it is directed toward the continents of South America and Africa. He need not have gone so far afield to find paradoxical examples. In my report to the Senate on our operations in Africa, I gave attention to the paradox which is evident in regard to our attitude toward the Congo and the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from that report be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS IN AFRICA

A PARADOX OF POLICY

But, comparing our foreign policy stand on the Katanga question and the situation confronting the Nyasaland-Rhodesia Federation, which is equally important if less dramatic and expensive, we run into a strange paradox. On the one hand we have strongly advocated the integration of Katanga with the Central Government, while on the other hand we have expressed support for, or at least expressed no objection to the British policy of granting independence to the territory of Nyasaland—all in the name of self-determination.

Nyasaland is as poor as Katanga is rich. The native leaders of the Nyasaland territory are attempting to break away from the federation of which it is a part. Ninety percent of Nyasaland's population makes its living through subsistence agriculture of the lowest level. Some of its needed revenues for governmental operations are obtained from the mineral-rich Rhodesias. Where will these revenues come from once Nyasaland is independent? Who will be the Santa Claus? The suspicion is that much of the burden will be ours, for how can taxes be laid on a people to whom the plow is little known, who do all of their farming with the hoe and rake, who have scarcely used an ox or a burro for transportation or traction, even though these animals are available?

Who will suffer because of independence? The natives. What shall it profit them to gain independence if, in the process, they lose the means by which their Government can be sustained and operated for their benefit. I suppose they feel that we will come in to provide them with a new source of revenue. Of course, this should not be permitted. Now it may be that Nyasaland is not obtaining sufficient aid from the Rhodesias, and that the present leadership in that territory does not feel secure, but that problem could no doubt be met when independence for the Federation becomes a reality.

It is often charged that those who do not favor immediate independence for all the people of Africa are "excessively concerned with economics." I found this attitude prevailing in many quarters when I was on my tour. Perhaps the concern on my part, and on the part of others, is excessive. But the fact remains that without a stable and productive economic system there is little chance of any real development.

It is true that our aid may build some of the schools and a few hospitals; it may train a few teachers, or a few technicians. But our total effort can amount to no more than a drop in the bucket. Teachers must be paid, students must have books, and technicians must have the tools with which to work. These will be necessary as long as any country remains in any coherent form. They cannot be provided by us forever. The best we may do is point the way and provide a very small beginning.

The drive for true self-determination requires an economic base from which to move, and many new countries in Africa, including Nyasaland, do not have it. It requires a population that may be taxed and it requires, above all, the historical background and the continuing facilities needed to provide a long succession of responsible leaders.

THE FAULTY PARALLEL

The advocates of immediate independence are fond of pointing to the story of America's struggle for independence against the British. They delight in saying, "In the opinion of Great Britain, your own country was not ready for independence when you sought it." This much of the analogy between our country and the people of Africa is no doubt true; beyond this point, however, it breaks down completely.

A people who can produce a Declaration of Independence; a people who can produce the Federalist Papers; and a people whose leaders draw up these documents with the certain knowledge that a great proportion of the population will be able to read them, is eminently prepared for independence. A nation whose population by nature contains the habits of thrift necessary for capital accumulation, whose population, because of environment if nothing else, has gained the necessary habits of hard work, is certainly ready for independence.

At the time of the inception of American independence, our people were bound together by a common language. In hardly a nation in Africa south of the Sahara is there a national population sharing a lingua franca outside of that necessary for the carrying on of trade and commerce. While in some cities English or French may predominate, 20 miles out into the bush the lines of oral communication break down almost completely.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do hope that the President of the United States will not agree to assist Dr. Banda. I believe it would be a serious mistake for us to take any steps which would further encourage the dissolution of the Federation of North and South Rhodesia and Nyasaland. If we make the first grant of funds, it will merely be the first aid we will be called upon to give in order to maintain a government incapable of maintaining itself. We should quit the tiptoe diplomacy that we are practicing in Africa.

I hope, I repeat, that the President will not promise Dr. Banda any support, except as I suggested in my report, a small amount of technical assistance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article to which I have referred, to be followed with a further excerpt from my African report relative to the situation in the federation.

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1963]

WELENSKY BLASTS POMP OF AFRICA INDEPENDENCE

(By Arch Parsons)

Sir Roy Welensky, the outgoing Prime Minister of the near-defunct Central African Federation, accused the United States and Britain yesterday of allowing the spread of socialism and dictatorship in Africa.

Welensky asserted that American and British policy toward African nations amounts to a "double standard" under which what is regarded as "anathema" at home is viewed as "acceptable" for Africans. How can one deplore the trend in South America and yet condone the same in Africa? he asked.

The Central African Federation, composed of the British territories of Nyasaland and Northern and Southern Rhodesia, is being dissolved. Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia have refused further association with the white-dominated Southern Rhodesian government.

Speaking at a luncheon of the National Press Club, Welensky said he is being "kicked out" of office as a result of British policy and plans to withdraw from politics. "I've not come to this country to ask for anything," he said.

Sir Roy is scheduled to confer with President Kennedy this morning.

Giving the "costly pomp of independence" to new African nations, Welensky said, means only that they will be subservient to "more ruthless and exacting masters than ever colonialism came near to being." He charged that "the Western Powers have made it almost certain that political change in Africa must be by assassination."

Welensky took particular aim at Nyasaland, declaring that it has an annual per capita income of about $70—"what is spent in Britain on an ordinary dog"—and asserting that 15 Africans have been arrested there recently "for no more than criticizing the head of state."

The man to whom he was referring, Nyasaland's Prime Minister Hastings Banda, is also in the United States. He will have an opportunity to present his side of the story to President Kennedy at a meeting scheduled for Thursday.

Welensky appeared to be seeking to cut the ground out from under the reported purpose of Banda's visit: economic help.

Nyasaland will lose about $20 million in British assistance when it becomes independent, Welensky said, adding with a trace of sarcasm, "I assume our American friends will step in and play the role of generous donors once again."

U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS IN AFRICA

The federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland has a population of about 8,200,000. North Rhodesia produces much copper and gold and other minerals, while South Rhodesia developed more agriculturally. Much acreage was given to the Europeans as an inducement to settle in the area. The federation was established in 1953, and is now in a state of instability toward self-government and/or independence, because Nyasaland is eager to secede from the federation. I was informed that the British would soon consent to Nyasaland's wishes. In North Rhodesia there is well-organized African leadership opposing the conservative white factions. South Rhodesia's main concern is the degree of African representation in its legislature.

North Rhodesia has a total population of 2,309,000, with 84,900 non-Africans; South Rhodesia, 3,030,000, with 243,000 non-Africans; and Nyasaland, 2,800,000, with 21,400 non-Africans—a total population of 8,139,000 in the federation. Its total area is 487,000 square miles—as large as Texas, California, Wisconsin, and Massachusetts combined.

During my visit in 1953, formation of the federation was just about to come into being. It was to consist of South Rhodesia, a self-governing colony since 1923; North Rhodesia and Nyasaland, which were British protectorates under the direct administration of the British Colonial Office.

The fear of the native Africans domiciled in North Rhodesia and Nyasaland that they would be ruled by the Europeans who were residing in all three areas of the proposed federation, led to an agreement that powers regulating the daily life of the Africans, would remain with the territorial government. Certain common services and powers affecting Europeans primarily were given to the federal government. It was also provided that North Rhodesia and Nyasaland should continue to enjoy separate governments under the protection of the British crown for as long as their respective peoples desired. It was also agreed that the federation would attain independence only when the inhabitants of the three territories expressed a desire for it themselves.

The principal responsibilities of the Federal Government are in the spheres of external affairs (where certain functions have been delegated by the United Kingdom Government) and in such matters as defense, immigration, imports and exports, citizenship, customs, and currency and coinage. As a matter of fact, the principal responsibilities retained by the territorial governments are the administration of African affairs, African agriculture, African primary and secondary education, police and internal security, and labor. There were certain provisions made for the review of the federal constitution within a certain period, in order to determine whether changes would be in order.

Reviews have been made, and certain recommendations followed, but it looks as through secession will be demanded by Nyasaland, as well as Northern Rhodesia. The main advocate of secession, from what I can understand, is Nyasaland, the poorest and least able to take care of itself. From all indications, tremendous progress had been made by the federation as a whole since 1953 and up to about 1961, when there developed rumblings of possible secession by Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia.

It would be a serious mistake to arrest the great industrial development that has taken place since federation. There is no doubt that many of the natives—the blacks—have benefited and are now benefiting from such development. I could hardly believe my eyes when I flew over a portion of Salisbury as we approached the airfield. When I was here in 1953 there were no skyscrapers, there were few fine schools and churches, or modern homes. Today the city is a real metropolis. This area has attained, in only a few years, second place in all of Africa for industrial development. Its further progress is even more promising if only the existing leadership can be maintained. If each territory is to go its own way, it will be calamitous to the natives. Especially will that be true of Nyasaland, by far the poorest of the three territories.

It would be far better to permit the federation to continue to function, and perhaps in a short period of time independence could be granted to the federated states as a unit. It would be tragic if secession were permitted. If it should happen then Nyasaland's progress will be greatly retarded for lack of resources. Almost 100 percent of its black population is engaged in subsistence farming. Most of the farming is done by hand—with the hoe and the rake.

There are only 42 teachers who would qualify for teaching in the secondary schools now in existence, I was informed. Nyasaland receives much financial help from the Federal Government because the territories of Northern and Southern Rhodesia are very rich in mineral and manufacturing resources. Nyasaland will require outside aid for an indefinite period should secession occur, and it might be well to warn its present leadership that such aid will not come from the United States. Let the British, who are not objecting to secession, from what I can understand, take over the burdens of this unfortunate area of Africa.

Unscrupulous leaders are fanning jealousy toward the whites, and trying to build up race hatred for everything the white man stands for—even such benefits as law and order, medicine and education. I was told that in Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia the institutions of civilization are being portrayed as part of the federation, and the federation as the enemy of the natives.

Churches, schools, hospitals, and farm buildings, particularly those used for the benefit of the Africans themselves, have been destroyed by fire. Supporters of moderate political parties have been physically attacked, and such programs as the inoculation and dipping of cattle against disease have been stopped in many places because of intimidation and because the dipping tanks have been filled with stones. The vaccination of Africans against smallpox and spraying against malaria have been opposed for political gain and called the "white man's evil."

It seems that the ultimate aim of this is to destroy all support for the present Federal Government, thus clearing the way for the local extremist leaders to rule without challenge and for their own benefit. While the terrorist acts are being carried on in the name of "freedom" and "independence," they are really the efforts of a few corrupt and self-seeking leaders to gain political control regardless of their people's welfare.

It is my belief that the whole issue at the international level is saturated in politics. No doubt the United Kingdom and the United States are anxious to retain the support of the secessionists in the United Nations. I find it strange that our Government has done all in its power to prevent the State of Katanga in the former Belgian Colony from seceding for fear the Congo will break up into many separate "independent" countries. But in the case of the Federation of North and South Rhodesia and Nyasaland, we are not objecting. We are apparently willing to go along with the United Kingdom. This appears to be inconsistent and fuzzy diplomacy, to say the least.

PROFITS FROM SPACE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, at a time when the Congress is involved in a discussion of the validity and the worth of making large sums of appropriation money available for our efforts in space, it seems to me particularly timely that a splendid article, entitled "Our Spin-Off Profits From Space," written by Dr. Toby Freedman, and published in This Week magazine for October 6, 1963, should be printed in the RECORD for the edification of Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this article.

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

OUR SPIN-OFF PROFITS FROM SPACE

(By Dr. Toby Freedman)

A distinguished U.S. Senator expressed himself this way: "What do we want with this vast worthless area—these endless mountains, deserts, and whirlwinds of dust? I will not vote one cent from the public treasury for the project."

But it wasn't the moon the Senator was referring to. It was California. Daniel Webster, 120 years ago, was opposing the appropriation of $50,000 to establish mail service to the Far West.

Space scientists today are in the same spot as Webster's opponents in 1844—who couldn't predict the discovery of gold in 1848. We can't foresee exactly what we will get out of our proposed $20 to $40 billion trip to the moon. But we are following one of the great laws of history: the dedicated pioneer shall have his discovery. It may not be what he was looking for. But it may be better.

All great pioneering efforts have this in common—the enthusiasm, excitement, and adventure they generate release tremendous intellectual and emotional energies. The orginal goal may not be reached but the byproducts may even surpass that goal.

Columbus failed to reach India, but stumbled on a continent. Alexander Fleming wondered why his staphylococci culture was getting moldy. The mold was penicillin.

The Apollo manned lunar program also will have its share of glorious accidents. It is rapidly unfolding into a measure of the total technical competence of this Nation—the most demanding national goal the United States has ever set for itself in peacetime. The more than 9,000 industrial organizations contributing to space flight are uncovering new facts, new products, and new ways to do things.

In the same way the manned moon shot, still several years in the future, has already brought discoveries which have changed our lives, from the new nosecone ceramics to newly opened medical research paths. I have compiled a list of some of the great spin-off benefits that the space age has already ushered in.

MEDICAL MIRACLES

Electronic circuits similar to those used in spaceship guidance systems will soon help make the blind see, the deaf hear and the lame walk. A portable radar set worn on the chest is being tried out for certain blind people. An electronic "organ of Corti" for one type of deafness is now in the prototype stage and a Brooklyn surgeon, by closing a switch, enabled a paralyzed patient to stand up and walk.

A farmer—a stroke victim—in Illinois wears a space suit. He isn't going to the moon. But the pressurized suit took him out of bed and made it possible for him to work again.

INSIDE WORK

A revolutionary development by a space lab made it possible for a 500-kilocycle transmitter to work 8 hours nonstop on electrical power generated across electrodes implanted under a rat's skin. No biological functions were disturbed in the process. This is of intense interest to medical men, since it allows electronic devices implanted in the body to regulate its functions or to monitor physiological reactions without using any extremely connected wires.

A "breathing checker" used on Project Mercury astronauts in space is now aiding cancer research.

FLASH WARNINGS

Electronic sensors similar to those plastered on the astronauts' bodies to measure their physical reactions to spaceflight now act as "electronic nurses" in hospitals to signal for flash warnings of changes in patients' conditions.

TINY HELPERS

Pinpoint-size ball bearings for satellite equipment are now used in ultra-high-speed painless dental drills. Tiny transistors designed for spacecraft equipment have made possible lightweight hearing aids.

NEW CANCER SURGERY

Cryogenic cancer surgery in which cancerous cells are literally frozen to death owes its development to low-temperature liquids used in space.

HEALTHY PEOPLE, TOO

Not only the sick but healthy people will benefit from medical spin-offs. In fact, a new branch of medicine has been created: the study of healthy people and the enhancement of their capabilities.

X-ray equipment developed for examination of Polaris rocket motors makes it possible to produce human X-ray photographs at only one-thirtieth the previous radiation exposure.

NONMEDICAL MIRACLES

Since I am a physician I have naturally thought of the successes of the space program in my own field, contributions that to my mind have already paid back the cost. But many scientists point to great achievements in other areas:

Space research has also developed a new housepaint that never needs renewing, and a glass that stays sterile permanently.

A system of weather satellites will lead to accurate prediction and partial control of the weather, saving billions for agriculture, for the lumber, transportation, and retail marketing industries.

Besides reducing the waste of water resources and the damage inflicted by storms, research on concentrated food for astronauts may break the back of world hunger. Worldwide communication systems using telstar-like satellites will advance international understanding and cooperation.

Studies of the earth in the clear light of space may tell us more about our own planet—such as the surprising discovery we made a few years ago that we're pear-shaped—than we can ever learn from its surface.

MORE TO COME

I have 100 pages of notes on other spin-offs from the space program, from jet-drills for mining taconite and computers that teach Spanish to the possibility of air-conditioned clothing operated by tiny sun-power satellite generators. But I am convinced that the greatest returns lie in the future, as unknown to us as California gold in 1844.

All these benefits—and the moon, too—will be ours for an annual cost of $5 billion which, by the way, is less than we spend every year on face powder, lipstick, and nail polish.

In any case, the Old World is gone forever. As President Kennedy said, "Space is there and we're going to climb it." The only question is will we get to the moon—first or second?

ERIEVIEW

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on September 30 I spoke in this Chamber regarding the proposed Erieview urban renewal project in Cleveland, Ohio. Printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my remarks were an article and an editorial from the Cleveland Press.

At that time I was critical of the fact that an employee of the General Accounting Office was permitted to conduct an investigation and write a report on a matter in which it was stated he admitted he was somewhat prejudiced. Now, an article has appeared in the Plain Dealer, one of Ohio's great newspapers in Cleveland, Ohio, and one of the great newspapers of the Nation, wherein Marion R. Beeman, who before his retirement last May was head of the Cleveland Office of the General Accounting Office, denies that he was prejudiced against the Erieview project.

In the interests of fairness, also, in order that my colleagues may have all the facts before them, I ask unanimous consent that this article "Prejudice Not Mine, Retorts GAO Aid," which appeared in the Plain Dealer on October 3, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

PREJUDICE NOT MINE, RETORTS GAO AID

(By James M. Naughton)

Genial, gracious Marion R. Beeman, 67, likes nothing better in retirement than to read a good book or putter in the garden of his Moreland Hills home.

Beeman retired in May from his post as head of the Cleveland office of the U.S. General Accounting Office, which is charged with making sure—for Congress—that Federal money is spent properly.

The gray-haired, gray-mustached Beeman smiles a lot in conversation. He speaks openly and frankly. It is easy to tell he appreciates the value of a word.

One word—prejudiced—has made of Beeman overnight a national villain. He was criticized in a Senate speech Monday by U.S. Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio. YOUNG said Beeman's actions "jeopardized the future development of a great city * * *." The speech is a part of history, as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Beeman laid the groundwork for a GAO report on the U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, which sharply criticized the Agency for its approval of plans to demolish standard buildings in Cleveland's Erieview urban renewal project.

On September 23, a story in the Cleveland Press quoted Beeman as saying he was "somewhat prejudiced" against Erieview before starting his investigation. An editorial the next day in the Press claimed "The Dice Were Loaded" against Erieview because of Beeman's prejudice.

Actually, Beeman said yesterday in an interview, the dice were loaded against Beeman and the GAO. Not until yesterday's interview did he make public his ire over what he says was a misquotation.

"It doesn't hurt me one way or the other," he explained. "My friends know the truth."

He is speaking out, he said, because "what I do feel bad about is an attempt to try to discredit one of our GAO office reports. To try to make our office look bad through an unjustified attack one me—that I don't like."

Beeman said he has pride in the GAO and in the work he did for it.

Senator YOUNG has since admitted to a Plain Dealer Washington bureau reporter that he had only the two Press articles to support his Senate speech criticizing Beeman.

He also admitted that he did not see a September 24 Plain Dealer story quoting Beeman, in clarification, as having "no ill feeling before, during, or after our study against the city, HHFA, or Erieview. We were just collecting the facts and turning them over to our Washington office."

Beeman said the Press reporter who quoted him as being "somewhat prejudiced" angled for several minutes to get those words in Beeman's mouth.

"I don't recall using it," Beeman said yesterday. "Saying you are 'somewhat prejudiced' is like saying you are 'somewhat pregnant.' I'm not silly enough to say that."

He reiterated that "some 30 people" worked on the GAO report—through six stages of revision and review in Washington—before it became a finished product.

YOUNG was quoted in his Senate speech as saying: "It has now come to light that the GAO official who wrote the first report was Marion R. Beeman and that he was 'somewhat prejudiced' against Erieview even before he began his report."

Beeman pleasantly remarked he held no grudge against YOUNG.

"I'm a registered Democrat," he said. "I always had respect for YOUNG. I voted for him before and I'll probably vote for him again."

He said the GAO is "responsible to Congress, including Senator YOUNG. Our duties are to protect Federal funds, to be sure they are spent the way Congress intended."

In his remarks to the Senate, YOUNG said he had studied the report thoroughly and also that "some of the suggestions merit further consideration, particularly those regarding the classification of substandard buildings."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HRUSKA BEFORE NEBRASKA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Nebraska Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts held its 23d annual convention in Norfolk, Nebr., October 6 to 8.

Their programs are always of great educational and inspirational nature. This year was no exception. There is always kept in mind by their committees and officers the close and dedicated interest which all of the membership stoutly maintain in the field of soil and water conservation.

The meeting in Norfolk marked the end of a 2-year term as president for Mr. Elmer Juracek, of O'Neill. His leadership has been constructive and sound. The convention elected in his place Merlon England, of North Platte, heretofore vice president of the group. Confidence was generally shared that Mr. England would carry on as president in the best traditions of that office.

It was my good fortune to be on the program on Monday, October 7. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made on that occasion be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA, BEFORE THE NEBRASKA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, 23D ANNUAL CONFERENCE, NORFOLK, NEBR., OCTOBER 7, 1963

President-elect England, President Juracek, members and friends of the Nebraska Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, it is good to be with you today to report to you as your Senator and to visit about the progress and the problems of soil and water conservation.

Principally, I want to discuss two bills now in the Congress, both growing out of the recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources of the 86th Congress. Its report was made to the first session of the 87th Congress in January 1961.

This was one of the most important studies ever undertaken by a congressional committee. Its subject may lack the drama of civil rights, or crime hearing or the tax reduction bill, but in its overall impact, it has vastly more significance. It is literally a life and death matter.

This report brought into sharp and startling focus the urgency of the need for action to head off the day when shortages of water supplies will constitute a significant barrier to our economic and social progress.

The committee made five major recommendations, each one of which was backed up by volumes of testimony, charts, graphs, and projections. Briefly stated, the recommendations were:

First. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should prepare and keep up to date plans for comprehensive water development and management for all major river basins of the United States.

Second. The Federal Government should stimulate more active participation by the States in planning and undertaking water development and management activities by setting up a 10-year program of grants to the States for water resources planning.

Third. The Federal Government should undertake a coordinated scientific research program on water.

Fourth. The Federal Government should prepare biennially an assessment of the water supply demand outlook for each of the water resource regions of the United States.

Fifth. The Federal Government in cooperation with the States should take steps to encourage efficiency in water development and use.

Those recommendations were not made lightly. They were made against a background of studies which identified several major portions of the United States, which by 1980 will be short of water to meet its commitments to a growing population and increased demands by agriculture and industry.

Among the five major "trouble regions" is our upper Missouri Valley. And the year 1980 is only 17 years away.

The recommendations were based on the committee's belief that future water demands can be met best by a proper combination of the following efforts: (a) construction program; (b) scientific research; (c) development of known technical methods; and (d) strengthening of Government policies affecting water development and use. However, the select committee report wisely observes:

Such a combination of efforts cannot be achieved overnight, and will require the combined efforts of the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government, as well as a continuation and strengthening of work in these fields by State and local governments and private enterprise.

Earlier this year, I was pleased to join with Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, in cosponsoring a bill to implement recommendation No. 3 of the Senate report. That bill, S. 2, establishes at land-grant colleges and universities water resource research laboratories to pursue on a broad front answers to the questions of how best to conserve and manage our water resources.

S. 2, as you know, has been passed by the Senate and hearings have already been held in the House. There is a very good chance that it will be approved this year, permitting the initiation of water research centers at colleges and universities across the Nation by 1964, or at the latest, by 1965.

It is a good bill and will mean a great deal for Nebraska. One of its chief attractions is the fact that it is based on the time-honored concept of the Hatch Act of 1887 which first established the system of agricultural experiment stations at colleges of agriculture. It laid out a pattern of Federal-State cooperation which has worked remarkably well.

We have a rather different problem, however, in a bill now before the Senate to implement recommendations 1 and 2 of the select committee's report. This bill, also introduced by Senator ANDERSON, is called the River Basin Commission bill, or S. 1111. It is a revision of a similar measure offered 2 years ago which encountered very stiff resistance from those who contend that States' water rights are paramount to Federal rights. This has been a definite national policy of a century's standing. The hearings before the combined Committees on Public Works and Interior and Insular Affairs deadlocked on this old, old controversy.

The bill, in addition to making funds available to the States for developing water plans, would have created a Water Resources Council composed of the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Army.

The controversial provision dealt with the establishment of individual river basin planning commissions. The States objected, among other things, to setting up a commission at the request of only one State; they contended that two-thirds of the States involved should make the request.

More than that, however, the States balked at the idea of appointment by the President of the members of the commissions. They argued that this meant Federal domination. They insisted on the right to appoint their own representatives. And finally, the States wanted language written into the bill which would recognize the primary rights of States to their own water resources.

Senator ANDERSON recognizing the old and deep division of opinion on the State versus Federal water rights, has this year introduced a compromise bill which appears to go a long way toward solving the problem.

In seeking such a solution, he has my fullest support, because like it or not, planning of some kind is going to be done whether the Congress provides an orderly way or not. It will require the best efforts of all of us who are concerned about the conservation of soil and water to work diligently toward this end. There is not much time.

Senator ANDERSON has attempted to meet the objections raised in the last Congress by working out with representatives of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments language which is intended to preserve the status quo in regard to water rights and to let the debate over that issue proceed.

Whether this will accomplish its objective, it is difficult to say.

There are, moreover, some aspects of the bill which I find particularly troublesome. The river commissions will have a chairman appointed by the President. The other representatives come from each of the States involved and each of the agencies which the President finds has a substantial interest in the planning. As a practical matter, this will mean the Department of Interior, Army—that is the Corps of Engineers—Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Commerce, and perhaps the Bureau of the Budget. That means that in nearly all cases there will be half a dozen Federal representatives, plus the Chairman.

Few of these commissions will involve six States, so the Federal view will be better represented than the States. It seems to me consideration might be given to allowing each State two representatives to better balance the Commission.

It is true that so far as voting is concerned, there are only two votes, that of the Chairman, appointed by the President, and the vice chairman, appointed by the States. That seems a fair division, but recalling the top-heavy Federal representation on the Commission, the States may be overwhelmed by sheer weight.

Another thorny question revolves around adequate compensation for disturbed or appropriated State water rights. The argument is made that this has no place in a planning bill, but to provide for this in the legislation itself might go a long way toward meeting the objections of those who fear the arbitrary action of Federal bureaus.

I am sure that S. 1111 is not a perfect bill. Even if it is enacted this year—and that is only a 50–50 proposition at the moment—it would take from 5 to 10 years to organize the commissions, make the studies and complete the reports.

Ten years from now would be 1973 and that would be only 7 years away from the 1980 date of water shortage forecast by the Senate select committee.

It is for that reason that I support the principle and purpose of S. 1111. Overall, it it is a good bill. I shall develop my views more fully during debate on the floor of the Senate and I am hopeful that the measure may be improved along the lines discussed with you here today.

The Nation, under the leadership of people like you who are dedicated to the conservation of our resources, must very soon make up its mind. The solution may wait, but the problem will not.

TWENTY YEARS OF RECLAMATION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the development of the modern West owes much to the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation. It has created green, fertile fields out of deserts and helped provide the power for a complex economy of industry and commerce.

An analysis of the Bureau's work appeared September 3 in the Powell Tribune. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Powell Tribune, Sept. 3, 1963]

TWENTY YEARS OF RECLAMATION

The Bureau of Reclamation will look back on 20 years of river basin administration September 9, when regional offices were established in the West, September 9, 1943.

At one time Billings, headquarters for region No. 6, served the entire Missouri River Basin drainage. Later, region No. 7 was established in Denver.

A look at the past, just since September 1943 in region No. 6, reveals the construction of 12 storage dams and reservoirs, and two other multiple-purpose dams are under construction.

The 14 reservoirs, located in northern Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota will have a total capacity of 6,783,000 acre-feet.

In the same period, 115,000 irrigable acres have been made available for irrigation, represented by 14 units or projects, which includes the Heart Mountain unit. Currently under construction are the facilities for an additional 49,700-acre unit which includes acreage under Yellowtail Dam.

Within the Upper Missouri River Basin, the Bureau says it is continuing work in preparation of some additional 90 irrigation units located in Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and northern Wyoming which will serve 2½ million acres of land, about one-tenth of which is to be provided a supplemental water supply.

Other benefits of the Bureau's work in addition to irrigation are flood control, municipal and industrial water supplies, recreational opportunities, improvement of fish and wildlife habitat, the benefits of multiple-purpose dams and reservoirs, and the low-cost hydroelectric power with a system now that has a capacity of 1,630,000 kilowatts of Federal hydropower in its eastern division.

Reclamation has been a big boost for the West. There is still much to be achieved through unused water supplies and development of sites for hydropower by either private or public sources.

THE MUSKIE WATER POLLUTION BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday, in the course of my remarks on the critical question of air and water pollution, I referred to S. 649, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, sponsored by Senator MUSKIE and others, and reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works. Unfortunately, my brief summary of the bill did not reflect some of the important revisions in the bill, made by the Committee on Public Works.

Because of the importance of this legislation, I wish to summarize the provisions of S. 649, as amended and reported by the Committee on Public Works.

First. The bill sets the purpose of the Water Pollution Control Act "to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution."

Second. Under the bill, an additional Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to supervise water pollution control activities. A new water pollution control administration would be established to administer comprehensive programs for water pollution control, interstate cooperation and uniform law activities, enforcement of abatement, and Federal installation pollution abatement programs.

Third. The legislation would authorize a 4-year, $20-million-a-year grant program for research and the development of improved methods of coping with the problem of combined storm and sanitary sewer systems. Grants would be on a 50–50 matching basis. It would increase sewage treatment plant maximum grants from $600,000 to $1 million for each community, and from $2,400,000 to $4 million for a combined system for several communities. It would authorize an additional 10 percent in the amount of a grant for construction of waste treatment works for projects conforming with a comprehensive plan for a metropolitan area.

Fourth. S. 649 would direct the application of enforcement measures to abate pollution when any person is prevented from marketing shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce as a result of such pollution.

Fifth. The proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary to encourage the development of quality standards on interstate rivers and to set such standards in the absence of standards set by State or interstate agencies consistent with the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act. The discharge of pollution into a classified river lowering the quality of the water below that established by the quality standards would be subject to abatement enforcement under the act. The bill would tighten up on the abatement and control of pollution from Federal installations.

Sixth. The bill establishes a procedure for liaison between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the soap and detergent industry for the development of decomposable detergents and standards of decomposability for such detergents. It would require rules and regulations preventing the importation of detergents not meeting such standards, and would authorize similar rules and regulations preventing the transportation and sale in interstate commerce of detergents not meeting standards of decomposability. The proposed standards would be developed and recommended by a committee composed of industry and Department representatives. The Secretary would not be permitted to issue the standards and regulations until the committee had certified that detergents conforming to the standards are generally available. The bill also provides for congressional review of the problem.

Seventh. Finally, the bill provides for a system of audits for grant funds, and makes the authority and function of the Secretary of Labor, with respect to labor standards, applicable to the act.

Mr. President, I am impressed by the proposed legislation and by the general agreement of the committee on its provisions. The members of both parties who worked to achieve a consensus on this legislation are to be commended for constructive legislation draftsmanship.

BANK MERGERS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, last week the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and I were privileged to attend and address the 62d Annual Convention of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks which met at Williamsburg, Va.

Among the many interesting speeches delivered at the convention was a speech by the Honorable G. Russell Clark, chairman of the board of the Commercial Bank of North America, and formerly superintendent of banks for the State of New York. In his speech, Mr. Clark discussed the Bank Merger Act and the problems which have been raised by the decision in the Philadelphia bank merger case. And in his speech Mr. Clark made several suggestions for handling bank mergers which deserve careful consideration.

He also described graphically the extent to which the decision and the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia bank merger case went in disregarding the purpose and intent and understanding of the Congress in enacting the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

I was much impressed by Mr. Clark's speech, and I believe that it would be helpful to the industry and to the public to make his views available to them.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that Mr. Clark's address at the convention of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

WHO'S IN CHARGE?

I appreciate very much the opportunity to discuss with my former associates in the bank supervisory field, as well as my fellow associate members of NASSB, some of the basic causes for the present disturbances and anxieties which are present today in our business.

It sems to grow increasingly difficult for the average banker to keep abreast of the rapidly changing, and at times contrary, winds of supervisory opinions on a multitude of banking matters. It seems as though we need more anchor and less sail.

We are concerned with supervisory regulations and opinions in many areas including chartering, branching, interest rates, examinations, etc., but one of the most widely discussed is that of the bank merger area. I should like to direct a few thoughts in that direction.

When the Bank Merger Act of 1960 with its seven tests for applicability to bank mergers was enacted, it was claimed, and widely predicted in the publications of the day, that this legislation was the cornerstone on which, at long last, positive direction would be given to bank mergers. You will recall that this act vested authority over mergers in one of three Federal agencies, i.e., Federal Reserve Board, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and Comptroller of the Currency. The jurisdiction over national bank mergers is vested in the Comptroller; State member banks in the Federal Reserve Board, and insured State nonmember banks in the FDIC.

The latter two agencies give their consideration to merger proposals following affirmative action by the respective State banking departments. The Comptroller has sole jurisdiction over national banks and also sits as one of three members of the FDIC, which has brought objection from the NASSB.

At the time of the passage of the Bank Merger Act of 1960, great debates took place as to the posture of the Justice Department in the bank merger field, and it was finally resolved by requiring the Justice Department to submit an advisory opinion on each merger before the Federal bank regulatory agency having approval jurisdiction. Such advisory opinions were also required from

each of the other two bank regulatory agencies.

Substantial pressure was exerted in certain quarters to place the Justice Department in a commanding position on bank merger considerations. In the testimony preceding the legislative sessions, the then Chairman of the FDIC, stated:

"No examination or review by the Department of Justice, or other agency or commission outside the bank supervisory field, of the facts of a merger transaction, can be an adequate substitute for the background, knowledge and current information which presently reposes in the supervisors."

The trend of congressional thinking on this point has been recently reflected in S. 1642, covering amendments to the Securities Act. The Senate in this bill proposes to give full and complete regulatory powers over disclosure and trading in securities of banks to the Federal supervisory agencies as against the Securities and Exchange Commission.

On June 17, 1963, a decision was rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Philadelphia National Bank case which has had the apparent practical effect of removing conclusive judgments on bank mergers from the duly authorized supervisory agencies to the realm of legal decision.

This decision, expressing the views of five members of the Court, holds that section 7 of the Clayton Act applies to all bank mergers. To the mind of the average banker it means that regardless of approvals given by appropriate supervisory agencies, merger proposals involving banks shall be subject to Federal antitrust laws and that such mergers approved by the appropriate bank supervisory agencies are not immune from challenge under such laws.

The distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, who has fully demonstrated over the years a clear and objective view on banking matters, has expressed himself as shocked by the decision, and that it "is one of the most incredible cases of judicial legislation which the Court has handed down." "I was shocked," he said, "both at the result and at the Court's casual disregard for congressional intent and purpose."

In the case at hand, the Court decided that inasmuch as the proposed merger would result in the control, by one bank, of over 30 percent of the commercial bank business conducted in the Philadelphia metropolitan trade area, section 7 would be violated. The merger would have resulted in a bank, the largest in the city of Philadelphia, with 36 percent of the area's total bank assets; 36 percent of deposits; 34 percent of net loans. It would also have resulted in making a national bank the largest bank in the area superseding the present largest bank—a State bank. It would also be able to retain this ranking even though all the remaining 39 banks in the area were to merge into the State bank.

By way of comparison, in the New York area a merger of the first and third largest banks would produce a lower percentage of all New York City bank resources than the merger discussed here would represent of all bank resources in the city of Philadelphia.

It should be mentioned here that two of the remaining Justices dissented on the ground that section 7 did not apply to bank mergers. Another agreed in part with the dissenters.

The ninth Justice did not participate in the decision.

Furnishing a partial background to this decision is the historical fact that, prior to the institution of this case, the Justice Department had taken antitrust action in only one other case—a case which was subsequently settled during the course of litigation.

To complete the background of the case in the lower court it would be helpful to quote from the opinion of the presiding justice:

"Generally, the complaint alleges that commercial banking and several of its integral parts comprise interstate commerce; that commercial banking with its integral parts fills an essential and unique role in the Nation's economy with a combination of services unduplicated by other financial institutions; that existing and potential competition in commercial banking in the Philadelphia area would be substantially and unreasonably lessened; that the merger would substantially and unreasonably increase concentration in banking in the Philadelphia area and that existing and potential competition in the commerce and industry served by commercial banks in the Philadelphia area would be substantially and unreasonably lessened. Parenthetically it may be noted at the outset that the last of these averments has not been seriously presented by the plaintiff and, for all practical purposes, has been abandoned."

From the viewpoint of the layman—and the average banker—the foregoing serves to highlight one outstanding fact: that this decision by the highest court in the land has changed all the ground rules applicable to mergers in the banking field. In one thrust we have been placed in a position where no longer can a banker, contemplating a merger operation, look only at the proposal from the standpoint of long-range economic effect on the community or trade area in which his bank is located. Banks are now in the general position vis-a-vis antitrust statutes of any other corporate entity, inasmuch as the decision applies to all mergers, including mergers between banks. Our previous posture, under which banking has operated for so long a time, has now apparently been dissolved. Under the belief that banking has been for years closely regulated and subject to supervision and controls of governmental bank supervisory agencies, both State and Federal, we felt, perhaps overoptimistically, secure in our belief that further controls were unwarranted and unnecessary. The thoroughness of the Congress in its consideration of Senate bill 1062 in the spring of 1960 indicated crystallized opinion on the question of the agencies of Government which should be charged with responsibility for approval of bank mergers. Senator Fulbright, who with Senators Robertson and Capehart, were sponsors of the bill, said in presenting the bill for vote:

"As it passed the Senate, S. 1062 expressed the view of the Senate, for the third time, that bank mergers should be regulated by the Federal banking agencies on the basis of banking factors and competitive factors and with no single factor being in itself controlling. S. 1062 was a clear statement, for the third time, of the Senate's view that the provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Act should not apply to bank mergers. The amendments to S. 1062 made by the House do not change this aspect of the bill. The House has agreed with the Senate that bank mergers should be controlled by the Federal banking agencies on the basis of both banking factors and competitive factors, and that section 7 of the Clayton Act should continue to be inapplicable to bank mergers."

The Bank Merger Act of 1960 also received the following accolade from the then Senator Johnson of Texas on the day it passed the Senate:

"This bill establishes uniform and clear standards, including both banking and competitive factors, for the consideration of proposed bank mergers. It eliminates a number of gaps in the statutory framework, which now permits many bank mergers to occur with no review by any Federal agency. It provides for a thorough review by the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency, under these comprehensive standards, and with the benefit of any information which may be supplied by the Department of Justice in the report required from them, of the bank mergers by asset acquisitions and other means which are now and will continue to be exempt from the antimerger provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Antitrust Act."

By comparison, in his dissenting opinion, Justice Harlan while saying that section 7 of the Clayton Act did not apply to a bank merger, said with respect to the Bank Merger Act of 1960, "its enactment turns out to be an exorbitant waste of congressional time and energy."

In the hit show, "The King and I," the King sings a lovely song in which he expresses the thought that those who seek to protect him will protect him out of all he owns, and concludes that it is a puzzlement. So it is with the average banker as he views the judicial-legislative-supervisory fog which surrounds his objective merger. He is advised to consult competent counsel and to take advantage of the Antitrust Division's clearance procedure. Does the banker, or his counsel, first consult his primary supervisory agency; the Federal Reserve Board; the FDIC; or the Comptroller following his State supervisor; or does he commit what may be the unpardonable sin of going over their respective heads to the Antitrust Division?

To the layman, therefore, it now appears that the advice which the primary supervisory agency was required to seek from the Department of Justice by the intent of Congress, is now no longer to be categorized as advisory, but rather, in the nature of a warning that if the decision reached by the primary agency is not parallel to that of Justice, then a suit may be forthcoming.

A spokesman for the Division said recently that "assuming that all relevant information regarding a proposed merger has been supplied to us, and as soon as the agency having initial jurisdiction has advised us of its decision, we shall advise such agency and the parties to the proposed merger of any action that the Antitrust Division intends to take regarding the merger." The element of time involved in consideration of a merger is most important to a participating bank, its depositors, its shareholders, and the trade area it serves. It is to be hoped that there will be no undue delay in finalizing opinion on a merger, and if there is no action to be taken by the Division it would not seem unreasonable to expect a prompt statement to that effect. In effect, it appears to place the three bank supervisory agencies in the position of the average State bank supervisor, namely, that it has only the initial veto power and any approval that it may extend may be vitiated by a nonbank governmental agency. The only criteria which Congress apparently delegated to the attention of the Justice Department in mergers was that of the competitive factor, which has now, apparently, contrary to the intent of Congress, been assigned the role of the primary and dominating factor of the seven controlling factors. The traditional banking factors have been relegated to a place of secondary importance.

It is a fair statement, I believe, to say that relatively few bank mergers do not have some elements of lessening of competition; but, conversely, favorable consideration of the banking factors may justify an agency granting approval of a merger even though it may have an adverse effect on competition.

To illustrate the wide range of terminology upon 115 mergers submitted to the Justice Department for comment, as published in the recently released annual report of the

comptroller for 1963, we read the following characterizations of the basis for Justice Department advisory opinions:

"Favorable	0
No adverse effect	12
Not substantially adverse	37
Slightly adverse	3
Adverse effect	26
Significantly adverse	3
Substantially adverse	34
Substantially adverse and serious anticompetitive effect	7
Threat of litigation	1
Total	115"

(NOTE.—Total as shown in the report although it adds to 123.)

On the same merger proposals, the Federal Reserve Board employed the following terminology regarding its advisory opinions:

"Will increase competition	4
May increase competition	7
No adverse effect on competition	33
No serious adverse effect on competition	3
Will have little adverse effect on competition	21
Probably no adverse effect on competition	2
Might have adverse effect on 2 parties	2
Might have adverse effect on competition	6
Will eliminate competition between 2 banks exposing remaining banks to greater competition	11
Will eliminate some competition	12
Will eliminate substantial competition	6
Will have adverse effect on competition	2
Will eliminate present and potential competition	5
Will result in concentration	1
Total	115"

The FDIC was concise, by comparison:

"Enhancement of competition	1
Overall effect on competition would not be unfavorable	102
No effect on competition	2
No adverse effect on competition	1
Appears favorable	1
Effect would be unfavorable	8
Total	115"

The report also reveals that the Comptroller approved during 1962, 110 applications for merger, including 3 emergency decisions, while denying 7, and 1 was withdrawn.

During the same year according to the Annual Report of the Federal Reserve Board, the Board approved 37 and disapproved 5 mergers, consolidations, acquisitions of assets or assumptions of liabilities. This report also reflects that 94 reports on competitive factors were sent to the Comptroller and 38 reports to the FDIC.

Banks are, therefore, in a never-never land as far as mergers are concerned. It appears that the tiniest nuance of judgment on the part of any one of the agencies involved may throw a merger one way or the other. The absence of unanimity as between the governmental agencies involved as to the worthiness of a merger has beclouded the atmosphere and has led to proposals for a single Federal commission to rule on bank matters including mergers. The banker, therefore, finds himself in a most difficult position, not knowing what laws, rules, regulations or interpretation are applicable to his proposals.

We can appropriately characterize the present situation as one where we are confused with promotional interpretations—in other words, interpretations of laws and regulations which tend to favor one group of banks under a supervisor against other groups of banks under other supervisors. This tends to create a great deal of dissatisfaction among those who are left without equalizing privileges and may cause banks to shift from State to national bank basis or vice versa, depending upon the degree of enforcement of sound and conservative banking practice or conversely, the relaxation of the same standards.

To add to your collective confusion, a thought-provoking passage appears in the district court's opinion which may have escaped your attention, and which I quote:

"The court was not impressed with the attempts of the Government to show that banking is of minor importance in the life of a community generally and of almost absolute unimportance in the business life of the community. The Government, in its attempt to establish this contention by testimony that no single particular individual industrial organization has ever entered a particular territory, because of the presence or absence of banking facilities, has ignored the industrial history of the United States. Should one ever speculate as to whether any industry would enter a community without banking facilities, the answer would be completely obvious. Historically, banking facilities have preceded industry in every community."

As bankers, we have been trained in the belief that we are, and have been by practice and tradition cast in the role of service institutions. It comes as somewhat of a shock to learn, particularly in the centennial year of the dual banking system, that, as indicated by the court, a high officer of Government evaluates our services at such a minimal level. It confirms the thought that if Federal authority ever reaches a point where it supersedes and submerges the authority of States over State banks, that will be the point of no return and will mark the demise of the dual banking system.

The greatest deterrent to this trend is the capable and efficient State bank supervisor. In spite of long experience in this field, I am not one who believes that the old way is necessarily the best way to conduct our business, either as bankers or as supervisors. As we have grown as a nation from an essentially agrarian society to the foremost industrial power in the world, the challenges and opportunities for development of our country through our banking system have required the continuing broader development of the public interest objective by bank supervisors. Yours are the standards of judgment by and under which we operate our banks. We can be helped by your awareness of our problems and we may be hindered in our progress and services if you take a position against progressive thinking.

Your appraisal of the needs of a sound and conservative banking system is the fulcrum upon which can tilt the vitality and effects of our efforts. There have been a number of proposals designed to break the logjam which seems to exist in consideration of bank mergers and chartering by supervisory agencies. It seems to me that if criticism of a system is undertaken, then a responsibility exists for suggestions to effect corrections in that system. Accordingly, I submit the following outline of a plan for a more uniform and understandable course to be followed in bank merger applications by supervisory agencies:

1. That bank mergers and charters be first considered by a district committee composed of (a) the superintendent of banks of the State in which the banks seeking to merge are located, (b) the chief national bank examiner of the district, (c) the chief FDIC examiner of the district, (d) the chief Federal Reserve bank examiner of the district. In any case the representative would be the senior official of his agency in the district in which the applicant banks are located.

Approval of a merger would require a three-fourths vote of those participating as above.

If disapproved by the district committee, the application would be terminated. If approved, notice of such approval would be given to the applicant banks and to a Board of Review located, for convenience, in Washington. This Board of Review would be given not more than 30 business days after receipt of such approval of the district committee, to indicate its disapproval of a merger or charter application; otherwise the decision of the district committee would stand. To carry out the intentions of Congress as expressed in the Bank Merger Act, notice of the approval of the district committee would also be furnished to the Justice Department with the provision that the views of the Department on the competitive effects of the merger be furnished to the Board of Review not more than 30 business days after receipt of such notice.

The Board of Review would be composed of the following representatives appointed by their respective boards for a term of 3 years:

1. A member of the Federal Reserve Board.
2. A member of the FDIC Board, assuming that the previous legislative recommendation made in this connection by the NASSB is adopted; namely, that the Comptroller of the Currency should not be a member of the FDIC Board.
3. The Comptroller of the Currency.

Disapproval of a merger would require a two-thirds vote of the Board of Review.

I am aware that many proposals along these lines have been previously made. It is always possible, however, that perhaps from the sum of ideas represented, a gleaning by the proper legislative body of these proposals would produce a pattern which would serve to alleviate the present ferment in our industry.

It has been said that we are the victims of our own shortcomings. Avoidance of public controversy, and indeed, avoidance of contact with our legislative representatives has long been a hallmark of our behavior. We have need for a better field of understanding on the part of both segments. The leaders of our industry as well as our trade associations, acting in concert with the progressive, intelligent State supervisor and legislators can contribute much at the grassroots level of each State to bring about a clearing of the uncertainty that impedes our ability to fully serve the free-enterprise economy which has made this country outstanding on the pages of history.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON BEFORE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SUPERVISORS OF STATE BANKS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, one of the outstanding speeches delivered at the 62d annual convention of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks at Williamsburg, Va., last week was the scholarly and profound address by the eminent Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBERTSON.

The gentleman interjected in his moving prose quotations from the Constitution and by the great architects of our Republic as he traced the development of the dual banking system with our maturity as a nation.

The Senator brought to the convention his many years of experience as a member and chairman of the Senate's Banking and Currency Committee. He spoke also from the knowledge accrued to him through his tenure on the Senate Appropriations Committee. He spoke from

knowledge not only of banking and the affairs of finance but also from a knowledge of history and the affairs of State.

In describing the fledgling years of the dual banking system, the Senator noted:

The strength of the system—its continuance for 100 years in spite of efforts to destroy it—demonstrates that it meets the needs of the country and that it is soundly based on the same principles which lie behind the Constitution of the United States.

Constitutional government is wisely based on recognition of the fact that the governors of a nation are not themselves supreme and cannot act arbitrarily.

The remarks of the Senator from Virginia will be long remembered not only by the Nation's bankers but also by students of constitutional history who have taken cognizance of the interplay of our development as a nation and the development of our banking institutions.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech on the dual banking system by the Senator from Virginia be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DUAL BANKING SYSTEM

I welcome the privilege of speaking on the subject of the dual banking system to the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks on the system's 100th anniversary. It was created, as you well know, by the National Currency Act, later the National Bank Act, in 1863.

Williamsburg is an appropriate place to discuss a system of banking that is derived from the basic principles of federalism (a Union of sovereign States) written into the U.S. Constitution largely by men who had learned their law and their concept of government here in Williamsburg.

State banks and supervisors of State banks, of course, represent one of the two great branches of the system, which grew out of the needs of American commerce and industry. No lawyer or banker or economist sat down and dreamed it up. The First and Second Banks of the United States represented short-lived attempts at a dual banking system. The National Currency Act was not passed to create such a system. It was passed to help sell Government bonds, which would be used to back up new national bank notes. It was expected that the new national bank system would supersede State banks. And when, in 1865, a heavy direct tax was levied on State bank notes, the elimination of State banks was considered to be certain. However, demand deposits soon superseded currency as the principal money supply of the country. The expected death of State banks, like that of Mark Twain, proved to have been slightly exaggerated. State banks flourished, making loans through deposit credit. At the end of 1962 there were 8,907 State banks with deposits of $120 billion, compared with 4,505 national banks with deposits of $143 billion.

The success of the dual banking system has led other financial institutions to copy it. We already have dual Federal and State savings and loan and credit union systems, and the mutual savings bank industry is earnestly seeking legislation to create a dual mutual savings bank system.

The strength of the system—its continuance for 100 years in spite of efforts to destroy it—demonstrates that it meets the needs of the country and that it is soundly based on the same principles which lie behind the Constitution of the United States.

Constitutional government is wisely based on recognition of the fact that the governors of a nation are not themselves supreme and cannot act arbitrarily. They are trustees for the people and are bound by the general rules laid down by the people. Constitutional government must be so devised as to enable the people to give effect to their needs and desires, and it must provide for doing this in an orderly fashion, without permitting passing fancies to upset the foundations of the government, and without unduly restricting changing demands arising from changing circumstances.

Washington, Madison, George Mason, and other Virginians were among those who created the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution they wrote set forth a new system of government. It embodied two basic principles to insure that the Government would in fact be a government of laws and not of men, and would in fact be the servant and not the master of the individual.

The first of these great principles is federalism. Under it the States continued as sovereign entities but became integral and essential parts of the new government.

The second of these great principles is the separation of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, each coordinate with and equal to each of the others but not entirely independent of the others.

James Madison in No. 51 of "The Federalist," described this division of the Central Government into three departments, as using language equally applicable to the separation of powers between the States and the Central Government.

"The great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department," Madison said, "consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others. The provision for defense must in this, as in all other cases, be made commensurate to the danger of attack. Ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place. It may be a reflection on human nature that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: You must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions."

This framework does not necessarily establish an efficient form of government. "The doctrine of the separation of powers," said Mr. Justice Brandeis in Myers versus United States, "was adopted by the Convention of 1787, not to promote efficiency but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was, not to avoid friction, but, by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among three departments, to save the people from autocracy."

The authors of the Constitution firmly rejected all proposals to give the Federal Government broad and sweeping authority to enact legislation or authority to veto State action. Instead of broad and general powers, the Federal Government was given only the specific powers enumerated in the Constitution, and the 9th and 10th amendments were added later in order to leave no doubt on this point.

An organization so constructed can successfully work only when the officials running it exercise good judgment and discretion and restraint. Judge Bynum, of North Carolina, expressed this in *Brown* v. *Turner*, 70 N.C. 93, when he said, "While each (department) should firmly maintain the essential powers belonging to it, it cannot be forgotten that the three coordinate parts constitute one brotherhood, whose common trust requires a mutual toleration of the occupancy of what seems to be a 'common because of vicinage,' bordering the domains of each."

The dual-banking system arises from the same origins and illustrates the same problems as the Constitution. The States have always seen needs for banks as depositories and as lending institutions. The States have chartered banks since well before the adoption of the Constitution. Yet, the Federal Government has always been concerned with monetary matters and, beginning with Hamilton's report on a national bank, has shown increasing interest in banking matters. And the two systems have developed side by side over the years.

Like the U.S. Constitution, the dual-banking system involves a fundamental line of distinction between State banks and Federal banks. But, like the U.S. Constitution also, the Federal functions are shared by three organizations: the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve System, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The Commission on Money and Credit, the Heller Committee, and many other authorities have pointed out inefficiencies in this arrangement. And I think all of us have perceived a great amount of what might be described as "friction." But, however much we may admire efficiency and abhor friction, we know that arbitrary power and autocracy are far worse.

There are many different ways in which our banking system can meet the needs of the community. What is good for Detroit is not necessarily good for Williamsburg, Cheyenne, or Anchorage. A loan on timber tracts in Oregon may be quite different from a loan on a timber tract in Texas. A dairy loan in Wisconsin may be quite different from a dairy loan in Idaho. A liquid investment in Florida may turn out to be a frozen asset in Alaska.

In a country as vast and variegated as ours, diversity and change are the rule, rather than the exception. We should, therefore, not be surprised to find many differences in the laws and regulations and practices of banking in the different parts of the country.

One of the principal sources of variety in our banking system is the organization of banks—unit banks, countrywide branch banking, statewide branch banking, affiliated banks, correspondent banks and bank holding companies. These differences are not always easy to explain. Sometimes there are sound reasons in geography and business practices in a particular State, and at other times only historical or emotional factors can be found to justify a particular State's rules. But we should not be surprised that different branching rules have been established in New York and in Arizona, in Vermont and in California. No one system of bank organization is so demonstrably superior to all others in all parts of the country that one rule must be prescribed for the entire country. On the contrary, it seems to me there is much to be said for a system which permits diversity and experimentation with different forms of bank organization, so long as it is clearly recognized that the form of bank organization is not an end in itself but merely a means to an end, which is providing the best banking service possible to industry, commerce, and the public generally.

Whether or not we agree with the present branching arrangements in our own or another State, and whether or not we feel competent to revise the branching laws of our

own or another State, I think we must not overlook the principle laid down in the McFadden Act in 1927—that the branching arrangements of national banks should follow those prescribed by State law in a particular State. This rule is essential to the transfer of banks from Federal to State or from State to Federal charters. Last year, in reporting such a bill, which became Public Law 87-721, I said, "The existing law as to the retention of branches in cases of conversion, consolidation or merger operates as a deterrent to State banks converting into national banks in certain States, and hence is inconsistent with the dual banking system which contemplates that State banks should be able to convert freely into national banks and vice versa."

The importance to the dual banking system of the ability to convert from one jurisdiction to another also gives strength to the view that national banks and State banks should have substantially the same powers and limitations, with respect to investments, trust powers, and the like. It is not, of course, necessary that these powers and limitations be identical, but if there are any wide discrepancies, conversion from State to national charters or vice versa would not be possible.

The dual banking system can provide adequate facilities for commerce, industry, and the public only if each of its two parts is strong and vigorous. This poses challenges both to the Federal Government and to the States. But, can the Federal Government give needed control and assistance to achieve Federal objectives, without taking over control and responsibility from the State banking authority? Can the States provide responsible and effective State banking systems, able to stand on their own feet without reliance on Federal crutches? I believe they can.

This brings us to consider two major Federal institutions to which many State banks belong—the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Federal Reserve System has been given vast powers to regulate the flow of bank credit and money in order to promote economic growth and stability and is a remarkable combination of Federal, State, and private elements. The Board of Governors, which is generally held to be independent of the executive branch and is usually described as an arm of the Congress, consists of Governors who are given nonrenewable 14-year appointments subject to confirmation by the Senate and who can only be removed for cause. They are in no respect members of any particular administration, but are intended to provide "a fair representation of the financial, agricultural, industrial, and commercial interests, and geographic divisions of the country." The Federal Reserve banks, with stock owned by member banks, have a degree of independence from the Federal Government, and the member banks participate in the election of the presidents and directors of the Federal Reserve banks.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was created in 1933 to make sure that demand deposits would continue to serve as the Nation's principal monetary supply by means of the insurance of individual deposits in the Nation's banks. FDIC has built up a huge reserve fund out of premiums paid by the many insured banks, and it now seems hard to believe that the commitment of the Federal Government to support this insurance will ever be needed. FDIC is given authority to examine and supervise insured nonmember State banks in order to provided additional protection against banking practices which might prejudice a bank's deposits and make it necessary to draw on the insurance reserve.

Your proposal that the same Government agency should have the power to pass on the insurance of deposits in new National as well as new State banks is worthy of consideration.

The duties and powers of the Federal Reserve Board and the FDIC are broad and sweeping. They must be in order to carry out their functions. But neither they nor the State member and insured banks nor the State bank supervisors should ever forget for one moment that the State banks are chartered by the States, and are operated under State laws, and are responsible first and foremost to the officials of the States which created them.

This association was formed more than 60 years ago for the purpose of providing a place for supervisors of State banks to discuss their problems, and to increase the usefulness and efficiency, and to promote the general welfare, of State banks. I understand that the latest step in this program has been the decision of this association to establish a school for the training of State bank examiners. This seems to me a most desirable undertaking. Bank supervision begins with the bank examiner, and in order to carry out fully their responsibilities under the dual banking system, each and every State banking department must have a careful and well-trained and adequate staff of bank examiners. I am sure that the establishment of the association's new school for training examiners will prove to be a great step forward for the dual banking system.

The dual banking system can provide the banking services needed by business and the public only if both parts of the system are strong and effective. We must remember that, while the dual banking system has two parts, it is a single system. Judge Bynum's remarks about the three branches of the Federal Government are applicable to the dual banking system—the National banks and the State banks must firmly maintain the essential powers belonging to each of them, but they must always act together as one brotherhood, with mutual toleration, in order to carry out their common trust. And they must work together for the preservation of American constitutional liberty within the framework of a system of private enterprise.

CUBAN INFORMATION SERVICE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I take the Senate floor to eulogize a victim of American duplicity and indecision.

On September 14 a modest green covered offset publication originating from an address on Ponce de Leon Boulevard in Coral Gables, Fla., printed its 144th and final edition.

The death of this amazing literate fact sheet was viewed with mixed emotions. In Miami, in more than two dozen countries, in myriad newspaper offices and private homes throughout the United States, there was regret and surprise. But there can be no doubt that the death of Carlos Todd's Cuban Information Service elicited a satisfied sigh from the administration, for this unpretentious publication had for nearly 3 years committed the unpardonable sin of telling the Cuban story as seen from inside that miserable island. The facts carried in the Cuban Information Service almost continuously contradicted the hackneyed blandishments of administration spokesmen, which in itself speaks well for the journalistic prowess of Editor Todd.

Carlos Todd, it should be pointed out, brought an excellent set of credentials to Coral Gables with him. He was run out of Cuba and his post as columnist in the Havana Times by no lesser a Communist than Fidel Castro. The "Cult of Fidel" could not stand the searing revelations of Mr. Todd's editorials when it became apparent that Castro's strings were pulled by Moscow and his peoples' revolution was nothing more than a Soviet manipulated guerrilla war.

Mr. Todd was not just a refugee when he landed in Miami. His reputation could have opened the door to any one of a dozen top newspaper positions, but this man sought not a sinecure. He chose instead to combine his fervent desire for a free Cuba with his knowledge of Castro's communism and his broad journalistic background to organize his own branch of the "Pen and the Sword" which may eventually free the sovietized nation. Mr. Todd's efforts created the "Cuban Information Service" which would have seen its third anniversary November 3.

The gentleman is a lecturer of no mean repute. He articulates in impeccable English. He has an analytically perceptive mind which can penetrate morasses of governmental verbiage and graps the saliencies. However, he is not given to extravagant language as his publication revealed. He employed a sardonic sense of humor as he brought the issue of Cuba and the administration's duplicity into sharp focus. But now, partly through the simple facts of economic life and because of the pressure exerted on him by the administration, the "Cuban Information Service" has gone the way of several score other papers whose editors in exile ruffled the wrong Federal feathers.

As an example of the services provided by the "Cuban Information Service," I should like to have two excerpts printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first insertion, from the August 24 issue, could well be called the "Painful Truth About Cuba." It contains revealing statistics, pointing out that Cuba, which the United States hopes will prove an unbearable economic burden on the Soviet Union, is indirectly draining the United States of five times as much as the beachhead is costing Khrushchev.

These figures are attributed to an organization called the "Truth About Cuba Committee." However, I am informed that in round numbers they are quite accurate.

The first portion of the table, "Yearly Cost of Cuba's Communism to the United States," is broken down into roughly eight divisions which puts the total annual cost of Cuban communism in U.S. taxpayers' dollars at $2,057,250,000.

Other data reveals that the loss of U.S. trade with Cuba amounts to $450 million annually and that all in all Cuba, operating with impunity only 90 miles from the United States, is a far greater burden in dollars than it is in rubles.

I should like also to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks Mr. Todd's final letter from the editor, dated September 14, in which he recalls that:

> The Russians, during the October 1962 crisis, demonstrated that they were completely unwilling to escalate any conflict over Cuba into nuclear war. Yet, after snatching defeat from the jaws of victory then, spines have not stiffened in Washington where Cuba is concerned.

Although the Cuban Information Service is no more, I am pleased to announce that the activities of Mr. Carlos Todd will not cease. His prose will soon emanate from a friendly European country and will continue to provide inspiration and information to all Cubans fighting underground and in exile awaiting the day when sanity and the Monroe Doctrine will supplant the New Frontier and its doctrine of retreat.

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

THIS PAINFUL TRUTH IS REVEALED BY MIAMI'S "TRUTH ABOUT CUBA COMMITTEE"

YEARLY COST OF CUBA'S COMMUNISM TO THE UNITED STATES

U.S. citizens' losses deducted in taxes prorated 4 years, $125 million.

U.S. Government's property losses prorated 4 years, $25 million.

Yearly tax loss in Cuban trade, $25 million.

Cost to U.S. taxpayers in increased sugar prices yearly, $784 million.

Half of yearly cost of Alliance for Progress, $1 billion.[1]

MAINTAINING CUBAN REFUGEES, YEARLY

Bay of Pigs invasion, $40 million.

Prisoners' ransom, $53 million.

Prorated over 4 years—annually, $23,250,000.

Total yearly cost of Cuban communism to U.S. taxpayers, $2,057,250,000.

Loss of U.S. trade with Cuba amounts to $450 million, annually. Loss in production payrolls is incalculable. Money cannot buy the tremendous loss in prestige in the hemisphere.

It is estimated that the Russians spend $400 million a year to support their Cuban colony. It is costing the United States over five times as much. Bear this in mind the next time anyone claims that the way to get rid of communism in Cuba is to make it too expensive to maintain. Too expensive for whom?

A LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

This Cuban Information Service published its first issue on November 3, 1960. Since that time, we have endeavored, to the best of our ability, to provide our recipients with news of the truth about Communist Cuba and of the rising Red tide that threatens to engulf the Latin American nations.

Editorially, our sole purpose has been to work for the freedom of our country; and, in doing so, to attack anything and anybody who pretended to delay or preclude the day of Cuban liberation.

The CIS was never intended to be a profit-making organization. It was distributed gratis to over 700 newspapers and 1,000 radio and TV stations scattered from Alaska to Patagonia. We sent it free to college and university libraries, members of the faculty, student organizations, the Washington diplomatic corps, some Senators and Congressmen, other governmental figures, labor unions, religious institutions, etc., etc. The CIS found its way to Great Britain, West Germany, Spain, Austria, Italy, the Philippines, France.

It is very difficult to obtain the confidence of people who receive something gratis. Anything that is free, is looked upon with suspicion. Yet in these 3 years, we managed to prove to the press and individuals in over 27 countries that our news sources were sound and the items we published trustworthy. Never once have we wilfully published a falsehood, and a rumor was always classified as a rumor. Our editorial policy, like all editorial policies, was strongly subjective. As far as our resources permitted, we tried to fight for the liberation of our country. We shall never cease to do so.

That this manner of procedure was successful is proven by fat scrapbooks, which contain quotations from this CIS in newspapers throughout the United States and Latin America, sometimes with credit, and sometimes without allusion to the source of the information presented. At all times, our only concern was to get the message across; and, while it is comforting for the ego to obtain a personal mention, the matter of paramount importance was to disseminate information and opinion with or without credit.

As editor of this CIS, I have been personally attacked by the Cuban Communist press on several occasions. The CP Havana daily Hoy and its sister paper, Revolucion, employed the grossest language in referring to my person. I was accused of being a Fascist, a lackey of the imperialists, a reactionary, a counterrevolutionary, a drunken playboy, and—the supreme smear—a homosexual. Havana's weekly Bohemia dedicated an entire article to my activities. Communist newspapers in Latin America lavished insulting prose attacking me personally. But then, I have also been under the fire of the New York Times and the New York Post, as well as the Moscow publication Trud.

It is comforting to know that the comrades spent so much time, effort, paper, and ink to attack me. They rarely engage in a campaign of discreditation unless they feel that a person is doing them some harm, no matter how small.

And now, with this issue, the CIS must cease publication. The reason is very simple: While we have received generous contributions from many individuals who received this service, their vital aid was not enough to balance the goodly number of news media and institutions which received the CIS gratis.

I, personally, cannot continue to work indefinitely without remuneration. Few people can, unless their name happens to be Onassis. Responsibilities to my dependents make it impossible for me to do so. Nevertheless, no matter what I do or where I go, I shall endeavor to contribute what I can to the cause of Cuban freedom.

I wish to thank the many who spontaneously offered financial help; and the many in the United States and in Latin America who, when things looked blackest for our beloved Cuba, wrote letters of encouragement that served to make a man feel that his work was of some use, no matter how small.

I also wish to thank those here, in Maimi—Cubans, and Americans who formerly resided in Cuba—who willingly volunteered their services for the weekly chore of assembling, stapling, folding, stamping, and mailing the CIS. Without their invaluable aid, we should have been hard put to get CIS out in the mails.

This CIS predicted, long before it actually became evident, that Brazil would turn toward communism and that the comrades had heavily infiltrated the government of that country; that Cheddi Jagan and wife Janet began the same process in British Guiana well over 2 years ago; that Juan Bosch is leading the Dominican Republic down the same path to ruin; that Communist terror in Venezuela would intensify following the same plan employed by Castro.

We predict here that this is only the beginning; that all of Latin America will fall into Communist hands, unless the United States takes firm action against the Havana regime of Fidel Castro; and that the Communist conquest of the Southern Hemisphere will become fait accompli in less than 10 years, quite possibly in 5.

The Government and the people of the United States have not yet understood that the Communist offensive in Latin America is an attack on the United States, and not an internal affair between Communists and their opponents in South and Central American countries. The main enemy of communism is here, in this country; and all victories gained by the Reds in the hemisphere are victories against the United States of America.

We fully agree with the "Soliloquy" of Dr. Emilio Nunez Portuondo and feel that there is much to be explained in the strange actions of all Western governments—certainly including the United States—and their reluctance to take one single effective action against Communist Cuba.

The Russians, during the October 1962 crisis, demonstrated that they were completely unwilling to escalate any conflict over Cuba into nuclear war. Yet, after snatching defeat from the jaws of victory then, spines have not stiffened in Washington where Cuba is concerned.

It is, as Dr. Nunez says, all very mysterious. And we ask ourselves, what would the United States have done if Hitler's Nazi legions had established a formidable "Festung Cuba" under American noses, in 1940. Ah, how different matters would have been then.

Those who are more concerned with the welfare of this country than with political victories, those men who represent the real profiles in courage of our day and age, may yet turn the tide of public sentiment and sound the alarm bells of freedom.

For unless the United States of America is willing to accept the responsibilities and the risks attendant to all power, that power will eventually dribble through the hands of the men who enjoy its privileges, but are not willing to fight for its continuance, against a deadly foe who is determined to destroy this country at all costs. "We will bury you," said Nikita Khrushchev. And, by Lenin, unless the inexorable, worldwide advance of communism is halted and rolled back, so they will.

[1] The committee estimates conservatively that at least half the cost of the $2 billion spent annually in the crash program of the Alliance for Progress is due to the existence of Communist Cuba.

RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON AFL-CIO CONVENTION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the 8th annual convention of the Oregon AFL-CIO was recently concluded. This organization, which has been responsible for many progressive and forward-looking programs in the State of Oregon, adopted resolutions putting the organization on record in support of a number of major issues which now confront our country.

One of the resolutions called upon Congress to give prompt and favorable consideration to legislation which would provide hospital insurance coverage to the elderly under the social security system. The resolution points out that some 18 million persons 65 years or over are in need of assistance in securing health care benefits such as those provided by the King-Anderson bill.

I ask consent to include in the RECORD a number of resolutions adopted at the annual convention of the Oregon AFL-CIO.

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

RESOLUTION 13

Whereas the present Kerr-Mills medical assistance program does not meet the needs of the vast majority of the Nation's aged; and

Whereas less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the Nation's citizens age 65 and over receive any medical assistance from the existing program; and

Whereas older people need more medical care than younger people; and

Whereas older people have higher medical costs than younger people; and

Whereas hospital care is expensive and hospital costs are rising; and

Whereas older people are less able to pay for medical care in their retired years; and

Whereas health insurance that is now available to older individuals and that provides reasonable protection is extremely costly; and

Whereas health insurance that is now available to older individuals at moderate cost provides only severely limited protection; and

Whereas there is now before Congress a bill (S. 880 and H.R. 3920) which provides a national program to meet this national problem by providing hospital insurance coverage to 18 million persons over 65 beginning January 1965 and future coverage for present workers and their wives (or widows) when they reach 65: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon AFL–CIO, That we call upon the Congress of the United States to give prompt and favorable consideration to S. 880 and H.R. 3920, in view of the urgency of the conditions above described; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon AFL–CIO urge all affiliated organizations to appoint committees in their local unions for the sole aim and purpose of instituting a letter writing campaign whereby members will be encouraged to write their Congressman expressing support for this legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That such campaign be implemented at once as indications are that this session of Congress may take action on this legislation; and be it finally

Resolved, That the Oregon AFL–CIO reaffirm its support of Anderson-King legislation by officially writing each Oregon State Congressman and Senator, requesting their their support.

Adopted September 20, 1963, Oregon AFL–CIO.

RESOLUTION 26

Whereas the problem of unemployment throughout the United States is continually expanding with a labor force that increases with each passing year and automation that takes its toll by replacing American workers with machines; and

Whereas many of our senior workers are unable to keep up with the pace set by automated industry, thereby being forced into a labor market where there is no place for them; and

Whereas these displaced workers are in most cases under the retirement age as established by our present social security laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Oregon AFL–CIO go on record in favor of reducing the retirement age for men and women under social security from 65 years to 60 years of age with no reduction in present benefits.

Adopted by Oregon AFL–CIO convention, September 20, 1963.

RESOLUTION 39

Whereas when employees are inducted into the postal service certain rights and benefits are explained to them. Among these are hospital plans partly paid for by the Federal Government. They are handed brochures of the various commercial hospital plans, but no mention is made of employee union sponsored plans, except the mention that other plans are available; and

Whereas in all fairness to the new employee he should be offered all of the plans in order to make a wise choice among them as to the one best suited for him and his family; and

Whereas the presentation of only the commercial plan brochures is in fact a recommendation of these plans, and a discrimination against the employee union sponsored plan: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Civil Service Commission be petitioned to issue a ruling that brochures of all hospital plans available to the new employee be given to the new employee at the time of his induction into the postal service, in order that he may choose among them the plan best suited to his needs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our delegation in Congress since it was the Congress that made these benefits available and the intent of the Congress should be carried out in rulings of the Commission entrusted with the implementation of the law approved by the Congress.

Adopted September 20, 1963, by the Oregon AFL–CIO convention.

RESOLUTION 40

Whereas the Fair Labor Standards Act provides that time and one-half shall be paid for work in excess of 40 hours per week or in excess of 8 hours per day by any employer engaged in interstate commerce; and

Whereas there is no escape from this for the employer except for supervisory employees; and

Whereas the Post Office Department does not conform to this act laid down by the U.S. Congress by the device of labeling one-fifth or more of its employees as substitutes, or temporary employees, while at the same time paying part of its supervisory force time and one-half; Therefore be it

Resolved, That all employees of the Post Office Department be paid time and one-half for overtime as defined under the Fair Labor Standards Act; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our delegation in Congress with a request to contact their respective committees in the House and Senate urging enactment of legislation to provide time and one-half for all employees of the postal service, with the exception of supervisory employees.

Adopted September 20, 1963, by the Oregon AFL–CIO convention.

RESOLUTION 54

Whereas the farm labor migrants who come into Oregon to help harvest our crops are the most poorly paid working people in our State and often work and live under substandard conditions; and

Whereas the farm labor migrants are excluded from the protection of the National Labor Relations Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, State Labor Elections Act, and State minimum wage law for women and minors, and are usually excluded from social security, State industrial accident law, State unemployment compensation law, and most public welfare programs; and

Whereas the labor movement must take leadership in assuring farm labor migrants full participation in the American way of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon AFL–CIO support inclusion of farm labor migrants on an equitable basis in social legislation that protects other workers.

Adopted September 20, 1963, by Oregon AFL–CIO convention.

TITO'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on September 24 on the floor of the Senate, I vigorously protested against the proposed visit of Tito to the United States. I reiterate that I do not subscribe to the visit of Tito to our country, knowing that peremptorily after the war for political reasons he put to death Mihailovitch and put to death more than a hundred thousand Croats, Serbs, and Slovenes. He is not the type of man whose character and morality I fit him to be honored by our country and especially not by our President.

Mr. President, similar views are well expressed in a letter I received from Mr. Anton K. Rumpf, regional president for the States of Ohio and Michigan of the Society of the Danube Swabians. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SOCIETY OF THE DANUBE SWABIANS,
Chicago, Ill., October 4, 1963.

The Honorable FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: I wish by means of this letter, to express in my name and this I am also permitted to do in the name of my many friends and countrymen, our complete support on your stand against the visit to this country of the Communist dictator, Josip Broz Tito.

My friends and I, the Danube Schwabians from Yugoslavia and now U.S. citizens, support your stand for the following reasons:

(1) Tito is a tyrant who came to power against the will of the peoples over whom he rules. He has grown in power through the massacre of his political adversaries and potential opponents. Among his many victims are the 200,000 Danube Schwabians murdered in Yugoslavia. Those who remained, he expelled from their homeland and confiscated their property.

(2) Tito's foreign policy is definitely anti-American as is proven in the records of the United Nations. His regime is as Communist as is the one in the Soviet Union, and they share the same endeavor, to bury America.

With the millions of American citizens, we lift our voices against the visit of Tito to the United States. We protest because we consider that his visit is neither in our national interest nor in the interest of the moral and political principles which we advocate as the citizens of this free country.

Please accept our warmest greetings and heartiest wishes.

Respectfully yours,
ANTON K. RUMPF,
Regional President for the States of Ohio and Michigan.

BOSTON VOTE IS KEY TO RACIAL MOVES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, Morris Cunningham, able and perceptive Washington correspondent for the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal, has written a very enlightening column regarding the racial turmoil and a school board election in the city of Boston.

Mr. Cunningham's fine article points up what I have said many times on the floor of the Senate, that the racial problems of the Nation are not confined to the South.

I commend that article to my colleagues of the Senate for their most careful reading and study, and therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

BOSTON VOTE IS KEY TO RACIAL MOVES

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, October 5.—The smashing election victory of a Boston School Board member, who campaigned against transporting pupils to achieve racial integration, has sent a ripple of concern through the ranks of Democratic racial extremists here.

Executive offices and Capitol cloakrooms in Washington buzzed this week with excited comment on the magnitude of the victory scored in the Boston city election by Mrs. Louise Day Hicks.

As chairman of the Boston School Board, Mrs. Hicks has strongly opposed demands that de facto school segregation in Boston be ended by transporting Negro pupils to and from schools outside of their neighborhoods.

Despite sit-ins at the Boston School Board offices, mass marches, public denunciations, and other pressures, Mrs. Hicks has stuck steadfastly to her position.

Integrationists marshaled their forces to defeat her in last week's city election.

But when the returns came in Mrs. Hicks led all 10 other candidates for the school board and collected about 21,000 more than Mayor John F. Collins in the mayor's successful bid for renomination.

Mayor Collins received 57,085 of the about 122,240 votes cast for mayor while Mrs. Hicks swept the school board election with about 88,000 votes.

Viewing the results editorially, the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram, one of Massachusetts better newspapers, said:

"The shock waves are going out from the Boston primary, which was an emphatic victory for the forces of conservatism on the Boston School Committee (board) a personal triumph for its chairman, Mrs. Louise Day Hicks, and a punch in the nose for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People."

One of the issues in the school board election was whether the board would employ a local educator, Deputy School Superintendent William H. Ohrenberger, as school superintendent, or hire the deputy superintendent of the New York City school system for the job. After the election, the local man was employed.

This issue was closely related to the question of transporting pupils since the New York school system has been shifting pupils about in buses for sometime to achieve greater racial balance.

Saying the major issue was ending de facto segregation, the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram continued:

"The NAACP has led a demand that Negro students be transported from inferior schools in Negro districts to schools in other sections. This issue was crystallized in the candidacy of a Negro for the school committee (board).

"What shocked the NAACP and sympathizers with Negro demands for a better break all around was the drubbing the Negro candidate received, and the endorsement given to Mrs. Hicks, in the silk stocking wards, where liberalism is supposed to be entrenched.

"Could Boston, the home of abolition, be called anti-Negro from this day on?"

The Transcript-Telegram said this would be "putting the case too hard."

"Nevertheless," the editorial continued, "the story is plain enough that upper crust liberalism is too often lived in a vacuum. North or South, when love for the underdog is challenged by self-interest, the secure intellectual turns out to be a human being after all."

Washington politicians are now looking to the forthcoming city elections in Philadelphia and Indianapolis, where racial issues also have been raised, for additional readings on what some are calling a revolt of white voters in the North.

If this turns out to be the case, it could carry vast significance in the 1964 Presidential election, particularly in a contest between President Kennedy and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona.

GOVERNMENT BY INTIMIDATION IS EMERGING IN UNITED STATES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, dated October 14, 1963, carries a profoundly revealing article by an able and distinguished Mississippian, the Honorable John Satterfield, who served with wisdom and ability as president of the American Bar Association in 1961–62.

The article is entitled "Government by Intimidation Is Emerging in United States." The learned statement by Mr. Satterfield is a very effective and sound answer to charges by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy that lawyers who disagree with the decision in Brown versus Board of Education and who seek its reversal or a court determination in their clients' own case are professionally irresponsible.

Mr. Satterfield's answer to the Attorney General's charge is able and outstanding and goes to the heart of the questions. I commend it most highly to every Member of the Senate and the House.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BY INTIMIDATION IS EMERGING IN UNITED STATES

(By John Creighton Satterfield)

Only four persons were mentioned in the attack upon lawyers and judges by Attorney General Kennedy in his speech to the Missouri Bar Association at Kansas City last Friday, September 27, 1963. These were "the Governors of two States, a former president of the American Bar Association, and a Federal district judge," all of whom are lawyers. I am the third person named. This attack, however, directly involves many members of the legal profession and many public officials throughout the United States. Ultimately, every citizen of the United States will be affected by the pattern of which this attack is a part. Its purpose is to intimidate all persons, including public officials, lawyers, and judges, who do not bow to the desires of Attorney General Kennedy and of President Kennedy.

On the surface the reason and purpose of these attacks may be obscure. In each incident which gave rise to these attacks, the Attorney General, by the use of overwhelming forces available to him, had already obtained his desires. As a part of the pattern, however, the purpose is clear.

The Attorney General states that the action of each person in each separate situation "smacks of duplicity," is "professionally irresponsible," amounts to "demagoguery," lacks "good faith," that the statements by each are "something less than the truth," and that every time a lawyer represents a client opposing the Attorney General in the field of integration—desegregation—the "client is being victimized," and that such action of an attorney is an "unscrupulous exploitation" of the client.

The slanderous nature of these statements by the Attorney General of the United States is demonstrated by the definition of slander contained in "American Jurisprudence," volume 33, page 39:

"Slander, as now understood, has been defined as the speaking of base and defamatory words which tend to prejudice another in his reputation, office, trade, business, or means of livelihood."

The Attorney General, in his speech, specifically refers to three basic legal principles the spirit of which he alleges is being ignored by those who defend integration suits. These propositions are that it is proper to avail oneself of every legal defense to test the validity and applicability of a rule of law, that a court decision binds only those who are a party to it, and that a court-made rule of law should always be open to reexamination.

The Attorney General has said:

"Often there is room for much discretion and honest disagreement as to when cases are alike or unalike. But clearly, in the matter of desegregation, there can be little or no room for argument in good faith as to when one situation is different—in the legal sense—from another in which the law has been laid down."

This statement by the Attorney General is completely without basis in fact or in law.

The Brown desegregation decision of 1954 has already been distinguished or held inapplicable in a number of cases involving alleged discrimination. Many other cases now pending in this general area of law involve questions so different from the Brown case as to be completely removed from the basic principles outlined therein. If one case can be as broad in its application as the Attorney General would lead us to believe, the citizens of the United States would not be entitled to due process of law and equal protection of the laws.

Of the four persons specifically attacked in the Attorney General's speech, one is referred to as "a Federal district judge who recently overruled the Brown decision on grounds that its findings of fact were erroneous." In the case of Stell versus Board of Education, Judge Frank M. Scarlett found that the effect of segregation upon Negro students in Georgia in 1963, shown by the evidence in that case, differed materially from the facts presented in the Brown case as to the effect of segregation upon Negro students in Kansas in 1954. Substantial differences in facts as between two cases cannot logically be ignored simply for the sake of expediency. The slander of a Federal judge is quite different from constructive criticism of the legal principles involved in a judicial decision.

To those who know the facts, the repeated references by Attorney General Kennedy to "dilatory tactics" are unconvincing. Suits involving integration have been handled expeditiously by the courts. In fact, such cases have repeatedly been advanced upon the dockets and writs requiring integration have been issued by courts of appeal even before the record of the appeal from the district courts has reached the appellate courts.

It is a novel position for an experienced lawyer to take—that, because a decision has been on the books for 9 years, it is bad faith and "unscrupulous exploitation" of a client for a lawyer to urge either that the facts in his case are different or that the earlier case should be differentiated or overruled. Plessy versus Ferguson was repeatedly reaffirmed by the Supreme Court over a period of 56 years. If 15 justices have permitted the Brown case to stand—as is affirmed by the Attorney General—doubtless 50 judges had reaffirmed Plessy versus Ferguson and Gong Lum versus Rice. Yet when the Solicitor General of the United States joined in a brief to have these cases overruled, he was not accused by the Attorney General of the United States—or any other lawyer, so far as I know—of being

guilty of bad faith, of being professionally irresponsible and of victimizing or exploiting his client.

SIT-INS VERSUS THE COURTS

The Attorney General would further have us believe that the reason for demonstrations and sit-ins by Negroes today is the lack of remedy in the courts. Yet he argues that Negroes will ultimately prevail in the courts because the Brown decision covers all of their grievances.

On the other hand, he does not mention that those who oppose many of the aims of Negro leaders have refrained from marches and demonstrations and have put their faith in the courts, hoping that, in the long run, justice for all will prevail. The Attorney General slanders them for so doing. To use the streets in mass demonstrations which, in the words of President Kennedy, "create tensions, and threaten violence—and threaten lives" is laudable. To settle disputes in the courts is to be condemned.

A new type of government is emerging upon the American scene—"government by intimidation" is now about to take the place of "due process of law" and "liberty under the law."

The first step in the pattern is to intimidate all those who oppose the desires of the Federal executive branch of our Government. This intimidation is carried out by public castigation, threats of financial reprisals against public bodies and individuals, and the misuse of the power of the Federal executive branch to command the attention of the public press.

The second step is to extend Federal control over individuals, businesses, and State and local governments far beyond that provided in the Constitution of the United States. This was begun by the issuance of Executive orders in certain particular fields. A limitless expansion of such Executive authority is now being attempted by the new package of legislation introduced in the Congress in June and called, for tactical and public relations purposes, "The Civil Rights Act of 1963."

The third step will be the use of the vast financial power of the United States to strangle every public body, every business, and professional establishment, and every individual daring to act contrary to the wishes of Attorney General Kennedy and the threat of the imposition of Federal fines and imprisonment without trial by jury.

The initial use of the first step in the pattern was in April 1962, when a steel-price increase was announced. The citizens who made the price decisions were accused by the President through nationwide media of being guilty of a wholly unjustified and irresponsible defiance of public interest. He castigated them as a tiny handful of steel executives whose pursuit of private power and profit exceeds their sense of public responsibility, who can show such utter contempt for the interest of 185 million Americans. It was publicly announced that defense contracts might be withheld and that the Federal Government might use its investigative powers to bring about prosecutions for violations of antitrust laws.

Intimidation as a governmental policy has been repeatedly used since that time. The speech of Attorney General Kennedy at Kansas City is a perfect illustration. I have been actively opposing throughout the United States the grasp for Federal power in the Civil Rights Act of 1963 and am doing so at the present time. The others mentioned have opposed the Attorney General. Hence we must be intimidated or defamed.

Why is this legislation so important to the Attorney General? It would grant unlimited powers to the Attorney General and the President and his appointees to withhold Federal funds in every program or activity in which Federal financing is involved directly or indirectly by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise.

The authority is demanded that all contracts in every program shall contain such conditions as the President may prescribe; that there be created a commission—with powers conferred upon it by the President—to take over the supervision of employment, promotion, demotion, and handling of employees of more than 90 percent of the businesses in the United States.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION: DISGUISED

The purpose of this legislation has been disguised by repeated references to public accommodations and Government contractors. These constitute less than 1 percent of the businesses affected. In fact, it would affect every bank which is a member of the Federal Reserve System or insured by the FDIC (Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation), every form of financing affected by Federal insurance or guaranty, all depositors in every bank covered by the FDIC, and all borrowers therefrom. It would draw under Federal executive control almost every farmer in the United States, as it includes every person who receives any sort of financial benefit from every Federal program in the field of agriculture. It would also draw under Federal control practically every retail shop, department store, market, drugstore, gasoline station, restaurant, motion picture house, theater, stadium, hotel, motel and lodging house and in fact every establishment which pays any privilege license or tax to any State or municipality.

It includes uncontrolled authority to call loans, withdraw support of the FDIC and the Federal Reserve Board, and other similar entities, to cancel contracts, to blacklist banks, savings and loan associations, contractors, realtors, farmers, cooperatives, farm organizations, or any other institution or person falling within its classification.

HOW ELECTIONS COULD BE CONTROLLED

Under this proposed act, the Federal Government would obtain control of education through the misuse of every existing Federal financial program, including grants-in-aid, research grants, lunch programs, scholarships, and similar activities. Also, it would constitute the first step toward placing all elections—"general, special or primary elections held solely or in part for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate for public office"—under the absolute control of the Federal Government.

THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the most exciting ventures now going on in this country is the effort of the American people to raise $30 million for the construction of the National Cultural Center. We all look forward to the day when our Nation's Capital will have facilities for the presentation of performers from this country and abroad. On that day, all Americans will rejoice in their cultural showcase and take pride in the fact that the construction was made possible by private contributions.

Today we are particularly indebted to those public-spirited citizens and organizations who are devoting their time and energy in alerting the entire country to the dream of the National Cultural Center and the need for contributions to make this dream a reality. I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks in the RECORD a speech by Edgar M. Bronfman, Chairman of the Seat Endowment Committee of the National Cultural Center, before the American Legion National Convention at Miami Beach, Fla., on September 10, 1963, and a resolution passed by the American Legion in support of the National Cultural Center.

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

CULTURE AND THE STRUGGLE FOR MEN'S MINDS, BY EDGAR M. BRONFMAN, MEMBER OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER BEFORE THE AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL CONVENTION, MIAMI BEACH, FLA.

Mr. National Commander, your eminence, Cardinal Spellman, Governor Bryant and other distinguished guests and delegates to the convention.

Mr. Commander, may I first express my gratitude to you and to the officers and members of the American Legion on behalf of the trustees of the National Cultural Center for the opportunity to appear before you to enlist your support for this great national project.

In this area of continued international tension and crisis between the forces of communism and of freedom, we all must address ourselves to the important responsibility that rests heavily on the shoulders of all Americans. For, as we go, so goes the free world.

This era of tension and crisis has been called the cold war. Actually, this is an oversimplification. It is really many cold wars—military, economic, social, political, and cultural.

While we are busy concentrating on the first four cold wars, and rightly so, we are in grave danger of losing the last—the cultural cold war.

An indication of its importance is revealed in the hearings going on this very week in Washington before a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee studying ways of winning the cultural cold war.

Now, at first glance, it is hard to see music, ballet, opera, and drama as effective weapons in the battle between the operating ideologies of communism and the free world. Let me assure you that these are weapons, and mighty potent ones. The Soviets and their satellites are using them for all their worth.

We are familiar with the tremendous receptions that the Bolshoi Ballet and other Soviet performing artists have received throughout the world. Why do they put so much effort behind culture? The answer is rather simple. Culture is the only international language. It is understood by all people, everywhere.

In the battle for men's minds, now going on, this international language plays a vital role. As an example, just consider the statement that Prime Minister Nehru of India once made to Martha Graham, leading American dancer. He said to Miss Graham, "Your dancing and artistry will do more than all the planes and dollars in gaining understanding of the United States in India."

While American artists have gone abroad and made a creditable showing on behalf of our country, there still is much to be done. For instance, whereas many of the world's leading nations have national theaters and halls in their capitals which serve as showcases for the performing arts, our Capital, Washington, D.C., has nothing comparable.

To show how seriously the Communists take this fifth dimension of the cold war, even in economically hoveled Poland recently, a $40 million cultural center was proudly unveiled.

It was in such a showcase in Moscow that a talented Texan, Van Cliburn, was first discovered. I'm sure that every American was very proud of his feat. But, didn't we all wince a bit at the thought that he had to

go so far from his native land for recognition as an artist; that the Soviet Union, in particular, discovered this talented young American musician. Too many American artists must go abroad for such recognition.

Also, the lack of proper facilities in our Capital has created an erroneous and damaging impression of this country and the fine values for which it stands. When our Nation's seat of government was being planned, George Washington dreamed of it as a cultural as well as a political center of our growing Nation.

But, it wasn't until 1958, when President Eisenhower signed the act establishing a National Cultural Center that this dream began to become reality. In signing the act, President Eisenhower eloquently expressed his hope of one day seeing an American "Mecca, where all could see what America is really capable of showing—not only in her factories, in her productivity, in her great strength, wealth, prosperity—but what she could show in the arts and in those things that appeal to all that is spiritual and esthetic in the senses of man."

President Kennedy in lending his support to the National Cultural Center said: "There has been a growing awareness that the United States will be judged—and its place in history ultimately assessed—not alone by its military or economic power, but by the quality of its civilization."

The Center is nonpartisan, nonpolitical—it is for all Americans.

I am proud and pleased to be a member of the Center's board of trustees, which includes many leading Americans from all walks of life. Therefore, I can speak from firsthand knowledge of the great effort being put behind it.

Congress has provided the land for the Center. However, the buildings will be paid for by all the American people at an estimated cost of $30 million.

The National Cultural Center will contain three separate performing halls—a symphony hall, a theater and an auditorium for opera, ballet and musical comedy. And there will be ample room for future expansion. Here, our country's most outstanding performers will display their talents. Here, celebrated artists from abroad will find the appropriate setting to perform in the Nation's Capital. Here, also, the most promising of our young artists will get the chance for recognition by the American public.

I would like to emphasize the last point. There will be talent competitions in every State. The best talent from the farthest corners of our Nation will be given the opportunity to appear at the National Cultural Center. Radio and television programs will be broadcast from the Center throughout the country. The potential audience of the National Cultural Center is really 180 million Americans. And, as time goes by, quite likely, most of the rest of the world.

All it needs—is to be built. That takes money—$30 million. I'm asking you Legionnaires and all Legion posts throughout the country for your enthusiastic support of this vital idea—the National Cultural Center.

Because you are keenly aware that we must win the cold war on all fronts. Because you are such a strong force of national leadership and in your communities—you can help make the National Cultural Center a living reality, a symbol of our determination to uphold freedom and the total dignity of man.

Here's how you can help. Collectively, the Center will have 6,450 seats, each to be endowed by a gift of $1,000. On the back of each seat, the donor's name will be emblazoned forever. Can you imagine an entire area of American Legion post seats as a symbol of their dedication to winning the struggle for men's minds?

Your contributions would be further expression of the American people's determination to win the cold war on every single front where it is joined.

When the Communists opened the cultural cold war, they thought that they were playing to our weakness. You and I know this is not true. It is up to all of us here and throughout the country to help meet this challenge by supporting with all our hearts the National Cultural Center.

NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Whereas the Congress of the United States has recognized the need for a National Cultural Center; and

Whereas by act of Congress, our Government agreed to provide a suitable site for such an establishment in the Nation's Capital; and

Whereas this act of Congress authorized a nationwide campaign to give all Americans, individually or in organizations, an opportunity to share in the establishment of this cultural showcase; and

Whereas in keeping with the spirit and intent of this act, the President of the United States and Commander in Chief of our armed services, has urged participation in and support of this effort; and

Whereas the Washington Area Committee for the National Cultural Center has invited the cooperation of veterans organizations in the District of Columbia and neighboring Maryland and Virginia, as representative of the 22 million men and women now living who have served in the military and naval forces of our country; and

Whereas members of the Department of the District of Columbia, American Legion, are cognizant of the need for the facilities and services which the National Cultural Center will provide in the Nation's Capital, and are desirous of lending support to any patriotic effort to enhance the strength and prestige of our country, culturally as well as militarily; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the American Legion in national convention assembled in Miami Beach, Fla., September 10–12, 1963, That every effort be made to make this National Cultural Center a reality and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to interested parties and that appropriate steps be taken to bring the National Cultural Center into being.

VIETNAM MUST CHANGE OR FORFEIT AID

(At this point Mr. WALTERS took the chair.)

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, once more, for the sixth time, a Buddhist monk has voiced protest of oppression by the regime of Ngo Dinh Diem in South Vietnam in the most drastic manner possible, by becoming a flaming torch in suicide. No one can deny the depth of conviction which has driven desperate people to such terrible acts in order to draw the world's attention to their plight. These are acts of desperation, and we must face up to the fact that our own position in Vietnam is becoming desperate, too.

For despite the charms and blandishments of Madam Nhu on American television programs, Vietnam's Government can only be described as an oppressive dictatorship in fact if not in name. Madam Nhu herself is quoted in a recent Saturday Evening Post article—placed in the RECORD by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] on September 26—as having said:

All the Buddhists have done for this country is to barbecue a monk.

And she has advocated beating the Buddhists "10 times more."

As "strong man" of the regime, Madam Nhu's husband has recently, since the start of the Buddhist protests, brought the "Special Forces" battalions in Saigon up to some 1,200 men. Their commander, with personal loyalty to Nhu, is a former counterespionage chief. His units include "two groups dressed in civilian clothes, armed with knives, pistols, and grenades for street fighting," according to Stanley Karnow, author of the Post article.

These are only a part of the 7,000 troops stationed in or near the capital, far from the fighting against the Vietcong, troops that have been used in the mass attack of August 21 on Buddhist temples, against demonstrations by the people, against even high school students, who have been arrested by the hundreds. Students, because of their opposition to the regime, are being inducted into the army if they are over 20 years old; if younger, they are being rounded up and sent to "reeducation centers," another name for detention or concentration camps.

The pattern is familiar—the "elite" forces reminiscent of Nazi storm troopers, the intolerance of any word of criticism, the use of a proclaimed Communist threat as an excuse for Fascist methods. Mr. President, this regime does not represent the people of Vietnam and does not care about the people.

Dr. Erich Wulff, a German psychiatrist who was in Vietnam to establish a new psychiatric program at the University of Hue, was an eyewitness of the May 8 attack by armored cars with 37-millimeter guns, in which shots were fired into a crowd assembled at the radio station to hear an address by a Buddhist leader who had been banned from the air. Dr. Wulff was a speaker last week at a luncheon in Washington attended by several members of Senate office staffs. He showed photographs of the bodies, riddled and bloody, of some of the seven children and one woman who were killed in that unprovoked assault on defenseless people.

Mr. President, those armored cars bore the insignia of U.S. aid, clasped hands under stars on a blue field with the red stripes of a shield below. The common people of Vietnam may not be able to read, but they can understand those signs. They do not know that those machines, and the trucks which carry students away to arrest, have gone out of our control into the hands of the dynastic Ngo Dinh family's minions. To them, this is the sign of the United States. We are accomplices in repression, tearing down the very democracy that we profess, by our aid, to be building up. This abuse of our aid must be stopped, and stopped without delay.

Dr. Wulff further observes, in an article which Senator CHURCH inserted in the RECORD on September 11, that there

is disillusionment and discontent among even the regular army officers, who are being distracted by the country's internal condition from their task of fighting the Communists of Ho Chi Minh. He quotes a young captain as saying:

Just what are we fighting for anyway? For Diem and his family? If the physical and spiritual terror here gets much worse, there will be nothing to choose between us and the North.

Dr. Wulff continues:

His opinion is shared by many younger officers of the middle grades. As for the recruits, I myself saw 10 truckloads of troops, sent out against a crowd of students in Hue, signaling encouragement to them. The regime stabilized the situation in Hue only by flying in military police from Danang and part of the presidential guard from Saigon. In critical situations the government can apparently rely only on special troops.

Mr. President, those special troops—the 1,200-man force of Colonel Tung—according to uncontradicted reports are receiving pay of $250,000 per month—$3 million a year—from our own Government. Why, I ask? We must withdraw from any degree of complicity in antidemocratic tyranny of this sort.

Even Madam Nhu's own father, the resigned Ambassador to the United States, said in an interview only the past Sunday that Diem and his family—

have become the strongest roadblock to victory because they have misused American aid to suppress their own people instead of using the aid to unite the people in the fight against the Communists.

In his remarks this week, Dr. Wulff, a dedicated medical man, not a politician, but a civilian observer who happened to be on the scene, related that he had seen in the course of his duties in Hue about 50 political prisoners, of whom there are reportedly at least 30,000 today, including hundreds of Buddhists priests and students whose crime was making honest protest. Of the 50, Dr. Wulff found only 2 who were Communist guerrillas. Others were peasants who had made political remarks about leaders in their own areas. Some had been in prison for 1 to 2 years, without even knowing why.

The most severe local oppression occurs in the inland areas, out of sight of the Americans in Saigon. The result is that most of those who are sympathizers with the Vietcong, who have been brought into cooperating with them in the Mekong Delta and elsewhere, are not Communists. Communists have increased their hard-core regulars from 18,000 to more than 25,000 in the past year. And they are gaining their converts, not by the attractiveness of their program, but by the hatred of oppressed people for their own corrupted and tyrannical government—a government which we are continuing to keep in power.

"Saigon is now a city of suspicion," says a former high officer of the Diem regime, the holder of a Columbia University doctorate in political science, a man who resigned his post in protest against the Buddhist oppression. He added:

Modest houses of American officials are under surveillance. Telephone lines are tapped. The Times of Vietnam daily accuses the United States of being "imperialistic" or worse.

This paper, incidentally, is the one which reputedly serves as the mouthpiece for Madam Nhu and her husband.

Our own Nation has become involved with the affairs of this country on the other side of the world because we stand for freedom and for the rights of people. We sent our aid there to help the people, not to help Diem maintain power by disregarding scheduled elections and turning his presidency into a tyrannical dictatorship. Yet the picture I have painted is one which shows us to his own oppressed people as an accomplice in oppression. Our 15,000 troops there, our 100 dead, our $500 million in aid this year—$1½ million a day—were not intended for these antidemocratic purposes. This great effort is being diverted to dictatorial disregard of the people. The fight against the Vietcong is halfhearted. The image of the United States is being trampled in the mud within view of the whole of southeast Asia, not to mention the rest of the world.

Mr. President, I wish to paint you another picture of American aid in that part of the world. I want to tell you the story of a common, ordinary Indiana dirt farmer, from Steuben County, who has been pouring out his life, and even $7,000 of his own funds, for the past 3 years in warm, human aid to needy people far up in the frontier area of Laos. It is the story of a man who has become a legend among the Meo tribesmen, a man who has lived peaceably on the frontier where territory has changed hands to the Communists and back again, who has had to jump up from sleep at a sudden warning and plunge into the jungle five times in 1 year to escape Communist guerrillas, a man who has for many months had a price of $25,000 on his head, offered by the Pathet Lao, and yet who has won the love of the primitive people he serves, so that he is in no danger of being turned in for that most tempting reward.

That man is Edgar Buell, known as "Pop" Buell, or to the natives as "Tan Pop." In Meo "Tan" means "Mister," and "Pop" means "sent from above."

At 50, "Pop" Buell is an old man by native standards in a land where 35 is a ripe age to attain. He has been in Laos since June 1960—at first as a $60-a-month volunteer with the International Voluntary Service; but now he is with our Government's Agency for International Development. He has just been home to Indiana, where his father has been seriously ill. He also reported in Washington. He returned to Laos just the other day.

I cite "Tan Pop," or Edgar Buell, as an inspiring example of the kind of aid we really should be emphasizing—the same sort of thing we are doing with the Peace Corps and through the Alliance for Progress, the kind of activity which does not feed communism by turning people away from us, but turns them from communism because they find ours the better way. But it takes a different point of view from that of the military leadership which sees the whole struggle in terms of armored cars, machineguns, and snipers.

Edgar Buell speaks Meo, Lao, and Thai. Ninety percent of his time has been spent behind enemy lines, helping the wandering bands of tribesmen to find new village sites, to organize air drops of rice and other essentials, to bring them seeds, and help them raise crops under the nose of the enemy. Sometimes walking for days, sometimes flying in tiny planes, he has organized and personally kept going a $1,500,000 relief program for the Meo tribesmen in the midst of the Communists—a total figure, let it be noted, amounting to no more than 1 day's cost of our aid to Vietnam. He has started 29 schools for these people where there were none before. Although without medical training himself, he has delivered some 30 babies, and has given practical medical treatment to hundreds. He has brightened the lives of thousands of children with gifts of candy; and soon he will be receiving shipments—which will total 25,000 rubber balls and 50,000 balloons—being made for him voluntarily by rubber workers in a Sandusky, Ohio, union who are giving up their coffee breaks to do the job with company cooperation. His work in the Rural Development Branch of AID has been vital to the lives of the 50,000 to 60,000 Meo tribesmen who have been driven from their mountain homes by Communist Pathet Lao soldiers.

But, rather than tell more about this man, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the end of my remarks, an article about him. It is entitled "An American Hero," and was published last year in the Saturday Evening Post, and has been reprinted by AID.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, here is a contrast which is running through our divided policy in many parts of the world—military support to prop up tyrannical dictatorships, nullifying the good we are doing through AID, the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, and our assistance to United Nations agencies for people. On the one hand, we present our true face as humanitarians; on the other side, we show the U.S. insignia on the vehicle of oppression against Buddhists and students. In Latin America, we stand idly by, for lack of a positive policy, and watch military juntas take over the Dominican Republic, Honduras, and other democratic states, through dictatorial methods. Then we recognize the dictators, and we are once more in collaboration with the very thing we say we are fighting.

This inconsistency in foreign policy must stop. On Friday, I issued a state-

ment on the Latin American situation. In it, I said:

Withholding of aid funds and expressing diplomatic displeasure are not enough.

A hemispheric police force under the direction of the Organization of American States must be set up. The President should direct our OAS delegates to take the lead in the setting up of such a force, which should be equipped to move rapidly to protect popular, democratic governments against military takeovers.

In short, we must do more than talk. This is precisely the case in Vietnam. We have talked, but we have not acted. We have said to Madam Nhu, to President Diem, and to their cohorts, "If you are not good children, we may take away your candy." But like the indulgent parent whose child knows the talk is only threat, and who can therefore get away with any degree of bad behavior, we get the answer, "All right, I'll be good"—but with action quite the opposite. We have come to be known as a paper tiger, and the teeth of a paper tiger never bit anyone. It is time we not only bared our teeth, but used them.

I am one of the cosponsors of the resolution of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], Senate Resolution 196, now before the Committee on Foreign Relations. That resolution declares:

It is the sense of the Senate that unless the Government of South Vietnam abandons policies of repression against its own people and makes a determined and effective effort to regain their support, military and economic assistance to that Government should not be continued.

We desperately need foreign aid of the kind typified by the man whom the natives call Tan Pop, "Mr. Sent From Above"; but we need just as desperately to stop tearing down all the good we do with these programs and people by supporting governments which oppress their own ordinary citizens.

The Vietnam resolution needs not only to be passed, it also needs to be implemented in the foreign policy of our Nation, with firmness and with the kind of discipline which alone prevents juvenile delinquency. If the Diem regime will not use our money for promotion of democratic ends, why should we continue to coddle its leaders as we are doing? We started out in Vietnam to put down the threat of communism; but what good will it do to eliminate communism, only to replace it with repressive dictatorship?

The time has come to give the paper tiger some teeth. We have the ability and the power to withdraw at least a portion of our aid, in order to help persuade Diem and Madam Nhu and their Government to commence to toe the democratic line, for the welfare of all their people. We need action, not just threats. Let us withdraw, or perhaps place in escrow, depending upon a change for the better, at least a portion of our aid, perhaps 20 percent. If we are to be the adoptive uncle to Vietnam or to any other country, let us exert our right to discipline. That is the only way we can perform our true function for democracy in the world.

EXHIBIT 1

AN AMERICAN HERO—THE EXCLUSIVE STORY OF HOW AN AMERICAN FARMER HAS DEVOTED HIS LIFE TO A ONE-MAN CRUSADE FOR FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY IN WAR-TORN, COMMUNIST-INFILTRATED LAOS

(By Don A. Schanche)

PART 1

Edgar Buell was squatting, native style, on a dusty path which bordered a worked-out opium field high in the mountains of northern Laos. He is a little runt of a man, and except for his thinning hair and heavy-rimmed spectacles you could mistake him for one of the 200,000 Meo tribesmen who inhabit those jungle-sheathed mountains. His skin is weathered from a lifetime on an Indiana farm and darkened from 2 years of baking in the tropical sunshine of Laos. His khaki trousers were spotted with the dirt of daylong hikes up mountain trails to the Meo villages we had visited that week, and he was shirtless, warming his bared torso in the afternoon sun.

Buell was discussing the economics of opium with two Meo village leaders, who listened attentively, almost rapturously. He spoke in a mixed vocabulary of tribal Meo and Lao, the national language of Laos. If you listened closely, you could almost hear northern Indiana colloquialisms buried in the strange monosyllabic words.

Opium, the only exportable cash crop raised in Laos, is a poor crop for the Meo, Buell explained. Harvesting it is hard, painstaking work. Even though the Meo grow the best opium in the world, the farmer's reward for the stuff is abysmally low; a batch that might sell for $100,000 if smuggled into New York brings the Meo farmer about $1. In Buell's easygoing but forthright lecture to the tribesmen, there was no hint of moral considerations. The evils of opium's misuse in a civilized Western society would be inexplicable to the primitive Meo. Buell stuck to crop economics. Sweet potatoes, he said, would grow beautifully in the rich earth of the hills. They would bring more money, and besides, the farmers and their families could eat them.

As the Meo village leaders nodded in thoughtful agreement, Buell looked up at me. "Americans ought to know," he said, "that diplomacy ain't all white shirts, nice pants and money running out of your pockets. More of us have got to get down with the people. That's where you can do some good for them and for America."

Edgar Buell rarely has occasion to wear a white shirt and nice pants, and when money runs out of his pockets, it is more often his own, earned in years of work raising corn and soybeans on an Indiana farm, than it is Uncle Sam's. The 49-year-old retired farmer is one of that woefully small group of Americans overseas who were extolled by Eugene Burdick and William Lederer in their misnamed book "The Ugly American," whose hero was not ugly, but splendid. These are the Americans who volunteer to go to remote corners of the world where they can use a lifetime of practical experience in helping the miserable people our leaders euphemistically call the "less fortunate" or "underdeveloped."

Buell went to Laos in June 1960 as a $60-a-month volunteer, an agricultural adviser for International Voluntary Service, a private Peace Corps which contracts the services of its volunteers to various U.S. aid programs abroad. He took this step after a deep personal tragedy, the death of his wife. In the vernacular of northeastern Indiana, and the farm where he spent most of his life, Buell explained what propelled him to Laos. "It ain't so complicated. Maloreen and I was a team. When that one good horse got off the wagon, I couldn't go on alone back home. But here, I don't know why, I can go alone."

As his words indicate, he is a gentle man, tempered by a life that has been both hard and good. Physically he is wiry and tough, hardened by 2 years of climbing up and down the mountains of Laos. If a word could describe his features, that word would be "homely"; it is a warm kind of homeliness, underlined by alert, curious eyes, that draws other men to Edgar Buell and inspires confidence in people less fortunate than himself.

The Meo people with whom Buell works are among the least fortunate people in the world. Fortune has not smiled on them at all. Even without the recent war, which has torn them from their land, they live at the absolute bedrock of human existence. Their farmland is mostly vertical, climbing up the sides of rugged mountains and cleared by slashing and burning the tangled jungle which chokes it. After a few years of growing hill rice, opium, and vegetables in one spot, they pick up their meager possessions and move to another mountain to repeat the process. They live in grass-thatched, bamboo-walled huts. Virtually everything they have is handmade, mostly from bamboo.

A Meo woman is lucky if she survives childbirth. She is luckier still if half of the children she bears survive childhood. And she can count her blessings if she or her husband lives to be more than 35 years of age. If she knows Edgar Buell or the legend of Edgar Buell which is passed from mouth to mouth and village to village in northern Laos, she probably thinks of him as some kind of god. To the Meo, he is.

Pop means sent from above

Buell's name in Meo, the flattering sobriquet of which he is more proud than any award or honor he has received, has a godlike meaning. The Meo call him Tan Pop. Tan means "mister." Pop, in Meo, means "sent from above." To fellow Americans in Laos he is simply Pop Buell, with no spiritual overtones. But the legend of Pop Buell is passed around with awe in the American community too. Already Buell's efforts have eclipsed the record of Dr. Tom Dooley, the young St. Louis physician who established two jungle hospitals in Laos before he died in 1961.

"Sometimes Pop puts the rest of us to shame," said one of the men he works for. "He has more courage, more commonsense and more human compassion than any other man I have known."

Pop Buell's job is an emotionally and physically crushing one, on which hang the lives of 50,000 to 60,000 harassed Meo tribesmen who have been driven from their mountain homes by Communist Pathet Lao soldiers bent on conquering all of Laos. Most of these Meo refugees wander the hills or settle in temporary villages in Xieng Khouang Province, bordering the famed Plaine des Jarres where one of the principal battles of the Laotian civil war was fought. They are surrounded by hostile Communist and so-called neutralist forces who are allied in battle against the royal government. Every day the noose of enemy troops closes a little tighter.

The warlike cease-fire in Laos

If you read the news of southeast Asia regularly, you probably have the impression that there has been a cease-fire in Laos, that the country has been in a more or less quiescent state pending the negotiation of a more permanent peace based on formation of a neutral, coalition government. The impression is misleading, particularly in Xieng Khouang Province. For many months, long before the recent heavy fighting, there has been war every day. Men have been killed.

Villages have been burned. People, mostly the uncomprehending but bitterly angry Meo, are tortured. Pop remembers the horrifying ordeal of one village which he visited just after the Pathet Lao had sacked it.

"They wanted to set an example," he explained. The memory of it made him wince. "So they took one of the wives of the village Nhi Khon (leader) and stood her up in front of everybody. One of the Communist soldiers took his gun and shot off one of her breasts and then the other. Then they left her there to die."

Pop and I saw another "example" while visiting some wounded Meo in a neat little hospital run by Filipino volunteers in Vientiane, the administrative capital of Laos. He was a boy about 9 years old, perhaps 10, although he was small and frail. Mercifully he was unconscious. He had been hit with shotgun pellets. The entire right side of his body was peppered with ugly little wounds. "His father was a village leader," Pop sighed. "When the Pathet Lao came, they shot the boy as an example. To the Meo, sons are more precious than anything." The boy died a few days later.

To Pop Buell, the oppressed Meo people are his people, their villages his villages. He spends most of his time living with them in beleaguered Xieng Khouang Province, in the middle of the closing enemy noose. He has learned their language, as well as Lao and Thai, which he also must use. He eats their food, sleeps in their huts, doctors their sick, counsels their elders and keeps flowing the relief supplies on which they depend. He works at the very end of the chain of U.S. aid.

Recently Mr. Pop was elevated from his low-paid volunteer status to a higher paying post as an employee of the Agency for International Development, the Government Agency which administers American economic aid abroad. He works for a branch of AID called Rural Development which, in peaceful countries, assists in the construction of rural roads, trains rural craftsmen and helps to improve agricultural conditions. In Laos the war has paralyzed virtually all these AID functions. Instead, American AID workers have had thrust upon them thousands of war refugees who need help to stay alive. More than half of these refugees are Meo tribesmen who depend on Pop Buell for sustenance.

Because of the war, it has been more than a year since these Meo refugees have been able to stop in one place long enough to plant and harvest rice, their basic food. Normally in a war-torn country such refugees would be herded into huge camps where they could be fed and clothed until they could return to their homes. But the Meo, a fiercely independent people, will not leave their beloved mountains, even though the hills are surrounded and shot through with Communist agents. Instead they wander in bands of up to 2,000 people, looking for places to settle. It is Pop's job to find these wandering bands, help them locate new village sites, and organize air drops of rice and other essentials until they can get on their feet.

To do this he spends 90 percent of his time living behind enemy lines. Sometimes, while trudging along hidden jungle pathways in the roadless, uncharted mountains, he comes upon villages never before visited by a white man. The lithe, jungle-toughened people he meets on these trails may be friend or enemy; Pop has no way of knowing. Any night while sleeping in a bamboo-and-thatch hut in the hills he may have to jump up and plunge into the jungle to escape the Pathet Lao. Pop has learned to sleep with his clothes on. "It saves time," he says.

Pursued by Reds before dawn

In the past year he has had to make such predawn escapes five times. The most recent was 3 months ago. Pop was asleep in a Meo hut when a scout burst through the low doorway and awakened him.

"Pathet Lao are just down the hill," the scout whispered.

He had barely spoken when the Communists opened fire. Pop rushed from hut to hut in the village, rounding up women and children. While a platoon of village guards—some of them firing flintlock muskets—held off the enemy attack. Pop hoisted a child onto his back and joined the villagers on a trek down a path on the other side of the hill. They spent all the next day hidden in the jungle valley below, then climbed back up to the plundered village that night.

"It's surprising how well you can see to walk on those trails in the moonlight," Pop says.

On another occasion, fleeing from a Pathet Lao attack, Pop walked for 18 hours with a baby on his back. It was the rainy season and the trails were slippery with greaselike mud. Some of the paths were almost vertical, and descending was less a matter of walking than of skiing.

"It wasn't so bad," he says. "When you get in a situation like that, you do what you have to. Anybody would."

In spite of his seemingly casual attitude, Buell worries about possible capture. Twice in the past year powerful Radio Hanoi, the Communist propaganda voice which broadcasts from North Vietnam to all of southeast Asia, has mentioned the "notorious, warmongering American imperialist, Tan Pop." Buell has heard that the Communists have offered a $25,000 reward for his capture. He suspects that many of the villages in which he works have been infiltrated by enemy agents.

"Of course I worry about it," he says. "If I didn't there'd be something wrong with me, wouldnt there? But I love these Meo people and I know that damned near every one of them loves me. I have to put all my faith in them because when I am up there with them I have very little contact with anybody else."

Pop's only contact with the outside world is a tiny walkie-talkie radio with which he can converse with the American-piloted drop planes which occasionally fly in with relief supplies. Sometimes a Helio-Courier, a big-winged, light plane capable of landing and taking off on 300-foot strips, drops onto a dirt runway hewn from a mountainside by the Meo. When they are available, Pop uses these planes to lift him from village to village. Otherwise he walks.

The week I spent with Pop Buell in the mountains of Xieng Khouang began with a hair raising Helio-Courier flight through the mist-shrouded mountains. We had been in Vientiane for almost a week, waiting for the fog to lift from the mountains so we could get in to the village of Lang Tien, about 2 days' walk from the enemy-held Plaine des Jarres. When the fog thinned a little we took off. Our pilot, Bob Smith, boosted the little plane to 7,000 feet to avoid ground fire as we flew over Pathet Lao territory.

"You get shot at every time you fly over here," Pop explained. "I came back in an airplane once that picked up 17 bullet holes in the wings. Amazing they didn't hit anything that mattered."

Smith, a civilian pilot working for Air America, the subsidiary of Civil Air Transport which flies most of the civil and military airdrop missions in Laos, cut his altitude to duck under the clouds which hugged the mountaintops of Xieng Khouang. From that moment on it was like a roller-coaster ride through a coal mine. Smith's view of the mountains was limited to massive shadows which lurked in the mist ahead of us. But flying on a combination of instinct and intimate knowledge of territory he had covered many times before, he snaked the little plane through narrow passes that left little more than 30 feet of maneuvering room on each wingtip, and across mountain plateaus from which trees rose so high I thought they would brush our undercarriage.

Bouncing landing in Lang Tien

Suddenly Pop pointed toward a cluster of thatch-roofed huts nestled near a short dirt strip. Smith flipped the light plane into a steep turn, and a minute later we were bouncing along the uneven runway.

"These pilots make a lot of money," Pop said, "sometimes $3,000 to $5,000 a month if they fly a lot. But they ain't got a very long life expectancy. You got to take your hat off to them. They earn every cent they make."

I looked at Buell in wonderment. His own job involves more hazard and uncertainty than the work of the highly paid pilots, however great their courage.

"It ain't the money or the hazards that matter," Pop explained. "If it was I would have quit long ago. I don't have to work. I just want to get it across to as many people as I can that America is a good place and Americans are good people. At the same time I think I'm doing these people some good."

How much good he is doing was immediately apparent. Lang Tien, more an area than a village, is a cluster of hillside communities overlooking a small plateau inside the ring of mountains. All told, 5,000 people live in the area. Most of them are Meo refugees, but about 1,000 are Lao Thung, another of the many ethnic groups which inhabit Laos. The Lao Thung are friendly but tend to be lazy and more careless about cleanliness than the Meo. Many years ago they were slaves, and both Lao and Meo still tend to consider them as such. When anything is passed out, the Lao Thung are the last to get a share, and it is rarely a fair share.

From America, provisions by parachute

That afternoon a C-46, bearing salt, tools and 50 sacks of rice, made a low pass over the plateau and dropped its cargo for the refugees. As the free-falling rice sacks and the parachute-borne tools dropped, Pop talked to the Nhi Khon of the village.

"These supplies do not just drop out of the sky," he said in his mixed Meo and Lao. "They come from America because the Americans want to help you. The supplies are given to the Laotian Government, and the Laotian Government gives them to me to bring to you. They are for all of you and each man must get his fair share. We consider a man a man, whether he is a Meo or a Lao Thung. He must get the same share."

The Nhi Khon, a progressive leader who probably did not require the lecture, nodded in agreement and withheld distribution of the supplies until representatives of the Lao Thung village arrived to claim an equal share.

That night we were invited to the same Lao Thung village for a celebration honoring Tan Pop. After a long trek along a starlit jungle trail, we climbed the ladderlike stairway into the hut of the village chief. Proudly he boasted that he was 70 years old and had seven wives and 30 children. A half dozen children under 5 attested to his vigor.

The Nhi Khon of Lang Tien, who accompanied us, wryly explained the mountaineer's polygamy. "In this country, blankets are very dear," the Nhi Khon said, "so we have many wives to keep us warm." For himself, said the Nhi Khon, he had only two.

Inside the hut, dimly lighted by flaming rags dipped in animal fat, we squatted around an earthenware urn filled to within an inch of the brim with a fermented rice mash. Protruding from the urn were long, thin bamboo rods, hollowed to serve as straws. From these we sipped the sickly sweet rice wine while the Nhi Khon, taking a cue from Tan Pop, lectured the Lao Thung

chief on the importance of planting garden seed and not relying entirely on the Americans to provide for his people.

"If you do not plant the seeds and care for the gardens," said the Nhi Khon, "you may end up picking rocks instead of food from your fields. You cannot eat rocks."

Earlier Pop had opened dozens of cans of seeds—lettuce, cabbage, bean and several other vegetables—and explained to the Nhi Khon that greens were important to the diet. Now the Nhi Khon was carrying the message to the Lao Thung, as he would carry it next day to the other villages around the plateau. Pop knew that the message would be more effective if it came from the Nhi Khon than if he delivered it himself, because the Nhi Khon would be there to see that the garden work was done.

"Working with these people is the same as working with my own people back in Steuben County, Ind.," he explained. "You got to take it slow and easy. Ain't it the same? You don't just barge in and tell somebody you're helping him. You take it easy, and you help him to help himself. That way it means something to him and it sticks with him."

The tribesmen's conversation shifted to politics, and I asked Pop to translate for me.

"They're talking about the war," he said. "There's a lot they don't understand. You've got to realize that the whole world, for these people, is no bigger than the distance they can walk. But they know more than you'd think they would."

The Nhi Khon was talking now, obviously with great feeling, explaining something to Pop. I could see the wizened little Indiana farmer's face grow taut with emotion as he turned to translate the Nhi Khon's remarks to me.

"I'll try to give you this exactly the way he said it to me," said Pop. "Here it is: 'Before the trouble came, the Meo people did not need help. When the trouble came, we heard about the Thing.' (He's got a picture of the United States and the United Nations all wrapped up in one big, good ball which he calls the Thing.) 'Until the Others (North Vietnamese Communists) came, we could have beaten the Pathet Lao with our muskets and crossbows. But we kept on fighting them and we thought we were fighting for the Thing. We were told that the Thing would come to help us. But so far the Thing has not been much help. Now we wonder if the Thing will move us to another country where we can live in peace. Will it?' "

An unanswered question

Pop paused and I saw that a tear was running down one of his cheeks. "You answer him," he said quietly. "I can't. That's what I thought the Thing was for too."

Knowing U.S. policy in Laos, the drive for a neutral coalition government which seems certain in the long run to hand the entire country and the Meo as well over to the Communists, I couldn't answer him either.

During the 6 days that followed, we visited a half-dozen more villages, some by foot, some by air. In each of them, Edgar Buell, retired Indiana farmer of meager education but great natural intelligence and wisdom, was welcomed as Tan Pop, the near god. In each village Pop made it a point, almost upon arrival, to walk to every hut and either step in or peer in to utter a few words of encouragement to the wives, tending their cooking fires on the hard dirt floors.

"I've still got enough American in me to show a lot of respect for motherhood," he explained. "Besides, they ain't got a very good life. A few kind words does them a lot of good."

As we made the rounds through the village of Sam Thong, about a day's walk from Lang Tien, a sobbing woman ran out of a hut from which burst sounds of wailing and the clanging cymbals of the village medicine man. Inside we could see the wasted body of her husband. He had died of tuberculosis that morning. The grieving widow fell into Pop's arms and sobbed on his shoulder. From the look of mixed grief and hope in her tear-filled eyes, I guessed she thought there was a chance Edgar Buell could bring the man back to life. He patted her in that awkward way of a man who can do nothing, and we moved on.

But Pop can and does help the sick. Although he has no medical training, 2 years' working largely on his own in Laos have given him a cram course in medical problems that would horrify most Americans. His first case was a native woman who was on the verge of a miscarriage. At the time, before the battle of the Plaine des Jarres, Pop and another IVS volunteer were manning a lonely station at Lhat Houang, not far from Xieng Khouang. They had a radio with which they could call any or all of the other American detachments in Laos. Stumped by the problem but unwilling to abandon the woman to the ineffective treatment of a medicine man, Pop got on the radio and called Mary Jane St. Marie, an American IVS nurse.

Step by step, Mary Jane explained the process of miscarriage to the Indiana farmer. "He wouldn't understand medical terms," Mary Jane said, "so I gave it to him in good, basic farm language."

At the end of the conversation, in which she also told Pop how to deliver a baby, and what to do to try to prevent miscarriage, other radio operators in remote regions of Laos broke in. "Thanks, Mary Jane, and you too, Pop," said one of them. "I think I've got a case like that up here and I've been wondering what to do about it."

As it turned out, Pop managed to prevent the miscarriage. The baby was born a few months later. Pop and I visited the mother and her healthy 18-month-old son last April. He picked the child up and said, "Little boy, you make it all seem worthwhile."

Buell the makeshift physician

Although he says that he has lost count, Pop estimates he has delivered about 30 babies since that first case. Whenever he goes into the mountains, he carries a well-stocked medicine kit for treatment of minor infections and ailments, but it usually runs dry before his village-hopping tour is over. In one village a man who had accidentally rammed a sharpened bamboo stake into his eyebrow, opening a gaping wound, came to us for help. Pop grabbed my only bottle of whisky and poured it on the slash. "Ain't got any disinfectant, but this will do," he chuckled as he closed and dressed the wound.

In each of the villages Pop was constantly surrounded by small children. At our first stop I saw why. From his battered suitcase he drew a huge bag of hard candy. He made sure that each child in each village got at least one piece.

The children had another reason for being drawn to the little American. All of them recognize him as the man who brought education to the Meo. In years past there were no schools in the Meo villages. Tucked away in the remote mountains, the Meo were too hard to reach, and the Laotians thought them unworthy of education anyway. When Pop began working with the mountain people, he immediately sought to correct the tragic oversight. As a graduate of a one-room country school in Steuben County, Ind., he had little awe for the complexities of modern education. But American officials in Vientiane did. When he tried to get backing from them, he was told that schooling the Meo would be impossible. There were no qualified teachers. "Hell," said Pop, "who needs qualified teachers? All I wanted to do was teach them to read and write."

No school bell needed here

In each refugee village, Pop knew, there were a few tribesmen who had gone for a year or two to Laotian schools and could read and write the language. Without bothering further to establish formal U.S. educational aid to the Meo, Pop told leaders in each village to build a schoolhouse. Then he scrounged writing pads, pencils, and chalk from everyone in Vientiane who owed him a favor. In villages where an educated Meo was available, Pop put him to work as a schoolteacher. Then he spoke to the Laotian Government's Minister of Health and Social Welfare, a man named Touby Lyfoung, who is a Meo himself and is often called King of the Meo. Touby provided the missing teachers. At present Pop's school system includes 29 1-room, dirt-floored schools. Belatedly the Americans now offer Pop all the support he needs.

"Sure, the Communists will take over these schools one of these days, but I don't think the people will forget who put them there in the first place," Pop says. "They might get only 6 months of schooling before the Communists come, but I don't care. There's no telling what they might pick up in 6 months, and it's sure better than nothing. These kids come to learn. They don't need no school bell. They're in there when the teacher arrives."

There is much more to say about Pop Buell: about the love and fulfillment and tragedy of his life in America; about how he came to Laos; about his heroic efforts there, often under enemy fire and in the face of unbelievable hardships. Some of these adventures I will recount in a further report next week. But for now, listen to one more remark from Pop Buell in Laos. On our last day in the mountains of Xieng Khouang, as we were waiting for a plane to take us back to Vientiane, I asked Pop why he stayed on, knowing that unless the United States changes its policy in Laos the Communists are bound to take over.

"You've got to have something to keep you going," he replied. "The Communists probably will take over soon. But everything turns in time, and it will turn again here someday. It may be 10 years or 50 years, but when that day comes these people are still going to remember Tan Pop. That's the only thing that keeps me going. No man is big enough or brave enough to work like this without some kind of purpose. I'm sowing seeds that, by God, someday is going to grow."

PART 2

At dawn one morning last April I was stumbling sleepily down a jungle path behind enemy lines in the mountains of northern Laos. Walking jauntily ahead of me, humming what sounded like "When the Saints Go Marching In," was Edgar Buell, the retired Indiana farmer whose work has made the difference between life and starvation for 50,000 to 60,000 primitive Meo tribesmen. Ignoring his happy mood, I mumbled something about the long days we had been putting in; up at dawn, a 4- to 6-mile hike on an empty stomach, time out to care for the sick in remote mountain villages, visits to village gardens and opium fields, and interminable nighttime conferences with village leaders.

"Most folks look on 8 hours as a good day's work," said Buell, smiling. "I was always of the opinion that I ought to do a little bit extra after I've done my day's work. It's that little bit that sells America."

Buell has done more than a little bit extra. Since moving to Laos 2 years ago he has organized and personally kept going a $1,500,000 relief program for the benefit of the thousands of Meo refugees who have been driven from their land by Communist Pathet Lao soldiers. Although he has the active

and hearty support of the Laotian Government, the U.S. Agency for International Development for which he works, and many friendly Americans, Laotians, Thais and Filipinos, the job of getting the supplies to the homeless, hungry Meo has been largely his alone. To accomplish it he spends most of his time living with the Meo under primitive and dangerous conditions. He has been shot at, run out of villages by attacking Communist troops, and exposed to a variety of diseases which run the gamut from amebic dysentery to leprosy. Radio Hanoi, the powerful Communist propaganda voice of southeast Asia, has twice broadcast a lookout for him, and he has been told that the Communists have offered a $25,000 reward for his capture.

A legendary figure

To the Meo people, among whom he has become a legendary figure, Buell is known as Tan Pop, which translates as "Mister Sent From Above." It is a godlike name for someone the Meo consider a godlike man, and with good reason. Since the fall of the famed Plaine des Jarres a year and a half ago, when Mister Pop was first swept into the maelstrom of war in Laos, he has performed tasks which to the Meo, and to many Americans as well, seemed superhuman.

At times the job has been not only risky but expensive too. Buell, working as a $60-a-month volunteer, was stationed at the village of Lhat Houang along with another International Voluntary Service adviser named Dick Bowman, now with the Peace Corps in Washington. They had two helpers, a young multilingual Meo named Chung, and an equally adept Chinese boy named Tsieng. In late 1960, war around the Laotian administrative capital of Vientiane, and in the city of Vientiane itself, had totally disrupted the U.S. mission there, so that Buell's isolated outpost was left without supplies.

They refused to flee

Normally an American caught on such a limb would call for a last-ditch evacuation plane and get out. But Pop and Bowman decided to stay. They were busy training carpenters to build a dormitory for a school at Lhat Houang, giving agricultural advice and helping to care for the sick in smaller villages in the area. But without a weekly supply plane to bring food and other essentials, they had no means of support.

After searching around, Pop found a place in the nearby town of Xieng Khouang where he could cash his personal checks on the Edon State Bank of Edon, Ohio, just across the border from Pop's home farm in Steuben County, Ind. For 2 months Buell personally financed the U.S. aid program in Xieng Khouang Province, drawing from his own retirement fund in the Edon Bank.

"I don't know exactly how much I spent in those 2 months," he says, "but counting that and other things I've bought to give to the Meo people, I've used up about $7,000 of my own money out here. I don't expect to get any of it back, but neither do I expect to spend any more. I can't afford it."

Although Pop and Bowman felt secure, it was a tenuous kind of security. The area was thoroughly covered by Communist Pathet Lao guerrilla forces, and they often came uncomfortably close. One night, after administering penicillin to a child suffering pneumonia in a village about 15 miles from Lhat Houang, Pop and Chung were returning by Jeep to their quarters. Suddenly a barrage of small-arms fire erupted from the thick jungle beside the crude road.

"They kept it up for about 2 minutes," Pop recalls, "but the best they could do was blow out one tire of the Jeep. They was either lousy shots or they was just trying to scare us. Anyway, we walked the rest of the way home."

The Plaine des Jarres fell on New Year's Eve, 1960, and with it went Lhat Houang. Three days before, Pop, whose medical training consisted of nothing more than the delivery of calves on his Indiana farm, was called to attend a native woman in labor. By that time, with the instruction of an American nurse who also worked for IVS, he had presided over several deliveries, so he was not alarmed. When he arrived in the village he found the woman dead. She had been in labor for 28 hours. But listening with a stethoscope, he could hear the baby's heartbeat.

"I got the baby out and dipped her in cold water, then warm water, like they did me when I was born. She was breathing OK, but she died later and I felt terrible. Losing a mother and a baby like that, I thought those people would never trust me again. I laid up all night worrying about it and wondering what I could have done. The next morning some of the men from the village come to my door, and for a minute I thought they was after me. But they had come to invite me to a breakfast in my honor, because they knew I had tried."

On New Year's Eve he was returning with Chung from the funeral of the mother and child when he met Dick Bowman and Tsieng, heading hell-bent for the Plaine des Jarres airport. Enemy troops were closing in, they said, and the evacuation plane was waiting for them.

"Hell," said Pop, "I got to go to Lhat Houang and get my clothes." With Chung beside him, Pop raced to his house in Lhat Houang. As they entered the front yard they saw dozens of enemy soldiers in the back. Turning around, they raced away in a hail of bullets. A few hours later they took off in an evacuation plane. As they looked down, they could see enemy troops digging gun emplacements at the end of the runway.

John Tobler, then director of the U.S. aid program in Laos, wrote Pop a commendation, the highest award he could give a volunteer worker. "In the face of great personal danger * * * your effective and intelligent handling of an extremely difficult situation materially contributed not only to the achievement of project objectives but also to the effective strengthening of the U.S. position."

Pop lost 30 pounds

During that period Pop's weight dropped from 135 to 105 pounds. He was exhausted. But after a brief recuperation in Bangkok he plunged into the urgent new job of saving the Meo refugees. Pop began the dangerous and wearing task of rounding up wandering bands of refugees, settling them in new villages behind enemy lines, and organizing air drops of rice and other supplies to keep them alive. Having learned the Lao language in order to work more effectively at Lhat Houang, he began studying Meo so that he would not have to take an interpreter on his long treks through the mountains. Pop now speaks Lao, Meo, and Thai, none of them perfectly, but all well enough to get along without help.

"Now Tan Pop has traveled much and is known by all of my people," says Lao Health Minister Touby, himself a Meo. "He is the only man who can go to them and find out their needs."

Like a Johnny Appleseed of democracy, Mister Pop wanders from village to village in the mountains distributing garden seeds and other supplies to help the resettled Meo get back on their feet.

"I try to give them things that they can do something with themselves," he says. "Their main diet is rice, and I have to give them all of that because the Communists haven't let them stay in one place long enough to harvest a rice crop, so U.S. aid has to airdrop all of that to them. But for the rest of the stuff, like vegetable gardens, I just help them to help themselves. It's just like back home. When you sell a man something, hope that he makes a profit on it when he sells. That way he'll be back for more."

The ancient age of 49

During the week that I accompanied Pop Buell on a tour of mountain villages, I began to understand his near-divine status with the Meo. One reason is his age. At 49, which is barely middle-aged by American standards, he is an ancient to the Meo. They cannot understand how a grandfather can be ramrod straight and tough enough to climb mountain trails night and day with even the most stalwart tribesmen. Another reason is his almost limitless self-control.

"I get mad as hell sometimes," Pop says, "but I figure if I'm going to get along with them I've got to hold it back, so I do. And I never cuss, either to them or at them. I don't care if a man don't speak your language, he knows when you're cussing and it hurts him."

As we sat down to dinner in the hut of a village chief one night, Pop looked up from the strange variety of food on the table and told our host that his food was very good. It was the same, Pop said, as the food we eat in America. The only similarity I could see was that some of it was cooked. On the table before us were intestines of water buffalo, a plate of raw pork blood, a variety of pale broths, some unidentifiable vegetables and a murky bottle of Nom Saly, a 2-week-old corn whisky which tastes as if it contains used innersoles. While Pop ate with gusto and I tried to imitate him, the chief happily repeated Pop's praise to some other villagers. He was proud that his food was like that in America.

In countless little ways Pop has made himself one of the Meo, and they welcome him as such. Other Americans would take cases of C-rations to supplement a not-always-palatable native diet; Pop never brings so much as a can of beans. "Just as soon as I opened a can," he explains, "I'd be setting myself apart from the people, and it just wouldn't be the same anymore." His only concessions to civilized living are frequent baths in mountain streams. "I'm trying to teach these people to stay clean because dirt causes a lot of the disease up here."

The Meo people know that theirs is not a safe and placid country. Many of them have been shot, some of them tortured, and almost all of the refugees have been chased by Communist troops. The fact that an American would live their life and share their peril has made a deep impression and has created a bond that is far stronger than if Pop had been born among the Meo.

To them he seems fearless—"But I got just as big a yellow streak as any other man," he says. Among Pop's first acts when he arrives in a village is to inquire about escape trails in case the Pathet Lao come. "If things get too hot, I want to know which way to run."

We were talking about the possibilities of capture one night when Pop looked up at me. "If you ever hear that I'm missing out here, just don't give up on me. In a year and a half I've learned this country pretty well. I know these people and I know they'll take care of me. It might take me 6 months, but any time it's necessary I know that I can walk out of these mountains all the way to Thailand without getting caught. You just cross your fingers and wait. I'll show up in better shape than I was when I left."

Before he came to Laos in June, 1960, Pop Buell had a rewarding but sometimes hard life in Indiana. His mother and father, Clara and Elson Buell, were farmers in Steuben County, and they helped all five of their sons, and their daughters as well, to become farmers. The elder Mrs. Buell, now 72, and her husband, 76, are still somewhat puzzled over the impulse that took their son to faraway Laos. "I just hope he takes care of himself," says Mrs. Buell. "When he was little,

I had to make him a bright red sunbonnet so we wouldn't lose him in the cornfield. But he was capable. Even when he was just 5 years old he was a good onion weeder."

"The reason Edgar Buell can get along so well over there in Laos," says Merritt Boyer, one of his former high school teachers and a longtime friend, "is this: From the time he was a little devil on up, when his dad told him to do something, he did it regardless of how hard it was. If he didn't have any tools to do the job with, he found a way to do it anyway."

Will Rogers' young disciple

As a youngster Pop Buell was active in the Future Farmers of America. When he was 16 he won a free trip to an FFA convention in St. Louis. There, for keeping the best dairy records, he won another prize: a week with a dozen other boys on the Will Rogers ranch at Claremore, Okla. For years thereafter he emulated the great humorist, and today he still shows traces of Roger's influence in his healthy disdain for stuffiness and Government red tape. "I read everything Will Rogers ever wrote," says Pop, "and when he was on the radio I listened to every broadcast. I rate my favorite Americans like this: Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Abraham Lincoln, and Will Rogers. I have to put a Republican in that group, but hell, Lincoln was a rural boy and he was everything every other American ought to aspire to be."

As Democrats in an overwhelmingly Republican section of Indiana, the Buells were well-known, if politically isolated. When Paul V. McNutt ran for Governor in 1932, the silver-haired politician came into Steuben County on a stumping tour. Edgar Buell, as the leading young Democrat in a county otherwise barren of McNutt supporters, was given the job of introducing the would-be Governor at an outdoor hoedown and barbecue.

"Some of us got to drinking before the speechmaking and things was getting pretty wild," Buell recalls, "but somehow I managed to get up and make an introduction speech.

"Five minutes later I couldn't remember what I said, but after Mr. McNutt got through talking he came up to me and thanked me for the nice introduction. Then he looked at me real straight and said, 'Mr. Buell, just remember. Always be an adult.' I never forgot that."

All of the Buells were, and still are, known for their unbending honesty; Edgar was no exception. But in 1936, after marrying his high school sweetheart and starting to carve out a meager life on a partially arable farm, he decided to break the pattern. It was December. With Christmas coming, the newlywed Buells had no money for presents. Edgar decided to go to the bank in Edon and borrow $50. "I'll tell them it's for a new calf," he said to his wife, Mattie Lorene. "They'd never let me have the money for Christmas presents, but they'll give it to me for a calf."

"You never lied before, Edgar," said his wife, "and nothing good can come from lying now, even if it is for Christmas."

Buell blurts the truth

Undeterred, Buell went to the bank. Art Mauerhan, now executive vice president of the Edon State Bank, remembers the awkward young farmer stammering as if he couldn't decide what to say. Finally Edgar blurted:

"Mr. Mauerhan, I come in here to tell you I needed $50 for a new calf, but that ain't true. I need to borrow the money so we can have Christmas."

He got the $50 and a top credit rating, which still stands at the Edon Bank.

Home with his wife, whose name Edgar and everyone else contracted to "Maloreen," Christmas plans progressed happily until the two suddenly thought of a tenant farmer, Rollie Fraley, who lived with his wife and six children in a small shack on one corner of their farm. The Fraleys, who had just migrated to Indiana from Kentucky, were dirt-poor. They planned to have no Christmas at all. With half of their $50, Edgar and Maloreen played Santa Claus to the Fraley children.

Every Christmas after that bleak one, Edgar Buell dressed up in a Santa Claus suit and brought toys to country children who otherwise would have received none. By 1957 the list of children swelled to include dozens whose parents also bought them presents but who waited for Santa Claus nonetheless. All over Steuben County today you can find children and adults who remember Uncle Edgar's words each Christmas: "May the good Lord be just a little good to you."

The early years on the farm were hard ones. Although the Buells had two healthy children, Howard and Harriet, Maloreen suffered complications after the birth of the second child and was bedridden for months. "They had to have a hired girl," recalls Forrest, "and poor Edgar didn't have any money to pay her. But he had a good vegetable garden. Every Saturday before it was time to pay the girl, Edgar would pile a truck full of produce and drive all over the area peddling it. When he got up enough money, he would come home and give the girl her wages."

When the war came, Buell was naturally draft exempt as a farmer. "He had enough land and livestock to keep three men out of the Army," said a neighbor. He also had a number of extracurricular jobs, among them the assistant chairmanship of the county alcoholic beverage board and a post on the Agriculture Department's Corn Loan Board. Technically, a draft-exempt farmer was not supposed to do other work, and someone complained about Edgar's extra jobs. "To hell with them," Edgar said, and went to the draft board to ask for induction. He failed his physical examination because of poor eyesight. Determined to go anyway, he got new glasses. A few months later he was a corporal in the horse cavalry, helping to train recruits at Fort Riley, Kans. He did not get overseas. At war's end he was a supply sergeant at Fort Knox.

The war years and postwar years were good ones for agriculture, and Buell's farm grew and prospered. From a start of 142 partially arable acres, his holding expanded to a productive 249-acre farm. Together with Maloreen he poked into every civic activity in the county that was open to them. While Edgar worked with 4-H clubs and coached Little League baseball, Maloreen looked far and wide for people who needed a helping hand. "If she heard about a sick old lady who needed her house redecorated," says an old friend, Mrs. Jesse Ketzenberger, "she'd drop her own work and go over and hang the lady's wallpaper herself. I wouldn't run down Edgar, but Maloreen was twice the person he is, and he would be the first to agree."

Love in another wrapper

"The marriage was a perfect one," says Edgar, "but we used to argue. Anybody who says he don't argue with his wife is either lying or there's something wrong with him." Not surprisingly, the argument usually concerned how to raise Howard and Harriet. Edgar, accustomed to the Spartan ways of his own father, bridled at Maloreen's easy-going way with the children. "I thought she was too lenient," he says, "but after a while I learned she was right. She just put her love out different than I was used to. She just wrapped them up in it." (Today Buell's 25-year-old son Howard, whose wife Bonnie expects a child this summer, operates his father's farm. Harriet, now 24, has one son and expects another child soon. Her husband, Wesley Gettys, teaches high school in Somerset, Ohio.)

In 1958 tragedy struck. Maloreen developed a mysterious malady which doctors were unable to diagnose. For 6 months she grew weaker. Hospitalized in Fort Wayne, about 40 miles from the Buell farm in Steuben County, she appeared to be improving. Every night Pop would drive down to Fort Wayne to sit with her until she fell asleep. One night after he had been in her room only a short while, Maloreen looked up at Edgar and said, "I'm sleepy. You'd better go home now."

"She usually wanted me to stay until 9 o'clock, and it was only 7," Buell recalls.

As Buell said good night from the hospital room door, Maloreen smiled and called, "Goodby, Edgar."

"She never said 'goodby' to me before," he recalls.

By the time Edgar had driven the 40 miles to Steuben County, the doctor had telephoned. Maloreen was dead.

Buell tried to go it alone on the farm. Howard was away for a 2-year tour in the Army. Harriet was working in Columbus, Ohio. It was a dismal life. Oversolicitous friends and relatives kept popping in. And a few widows began calling regularly, with obvious designs.

One day a former Alcoholic Beverage Board colleague drove into the farmyard and showed Edgar an advertisement for International Voluntary Service in a farm magazine. IVS needed experienced farmers, preferably college graduates, to lead its young volunteers overseas. For a year he corresponded with IVS headquarters in Washington, sending applications, character references and pleas that the college requirements be waived in his case. "Finally I squeezed my whole life down into a two-page letter and they accepted me," he says. Howard was back from the Army and had married Bonnie. He was eager to take over his father's farm. "I was ready to retire from farming anyway," says Pop, "so I turned it all over to Howard." A month later, Buell was in Laos, a country whose name he had never heard before.

In a way, he treats Laos just as if it were Steuben County, only bigger. Like farmers everywhere, his favorite offduty pastime is "ging visiting." He calls on Health Minister Touby, an exalted Lao-Government figure, with the same simple, straightforward approach he would make to Jake Fifer, who lives down the road a piece from Pop's farm in Indiana. Col. Vang Phao, the onetime French Army sergeant who leads a tough and well-trained force of Meo guerillas in north Laos, shares the same camaraderie with the Indiana farmer as do Pop's brothers back on the farm. When the two sit in the courtyard of Vang Phao's house, swinging their crossed legs and laughing at each other's sallies, it sounds almost as if they were a pair of Indiana farmers gossiping about a neighbor's new silo. You can almost hear them utter an occasional "by golly," in Meo.

To the relief of Vang Phao and everyone else with whom Pop works, he has signed up for another 2 years in Laos. "I couldn't leave these people now," he says. Tragically events in Laos since my visit may force Pop to leave them. At this writing, Communist troops have swept the Royal Government out of most of northwest Laos, and the effect of the move on the rest of the country is still uncertain. Pop and his beloved Meo tribesmen are in the northeast and thus were not directly involved in the recent Laos battles. But further Communist victories could so isolate the Meo that Pop would have to get out. Even if a solution is found in the much-sought coalition of neutrals, Communists, and the Royal Government, most Americans on the scene predict that within a few months the Communists would control all of

Laos. It is unlikely that they would want Mister Pop around "selling America." Thus Buell's heroic efforts may be frustrated. But, as he told me one day in the mountains, "I'm sowing seeds that, by God, someday is going to grow."

The most effective American

Other Americans also are sowing the seeds of democracy overseas but in many travels to almost every part of the world I have never seen one who did it so effectively as Mister Pop. I told him one day that men with such a combination of simplicity, intelligence, and guts are rare. He was embarrassed. "I ain't unusual," he said. If you look around I think you will find at least one Edgar Buell in every rural county in America."

When I left Mister Pop in Laos, he was getting his garden seeds and supplies ready for a 10-day trek through mountains which, theoretically at least, are held by Communist forces. Pilots had reported seeing large bands of Meo refugees wandering the jungle trails in the area, and Pop was on his way to find them and help them if he could. He had never been in the area before and had no way of knowing whether his reception would be friendly or final. Just as I began writing this report, I received a letter from him, written from a tiny village which he described as being "real close to the enemy."

"For the first time since I can remember," he wrote, "I came off from Vientiane without my medicine kit.

"Was greeted here by a family who were the victims of a hand grenade, a sad sight. I got two young girls patched up by using what we had here, and put the father in the Helio-Courier and sent him to O.B. (the Operation Brotherhood hospital run by Filipino volunteers under sponsorship of the Manila and Vientiane junior chambers of commerce). The worst one (of the girls) I took to a house, washed and bandaged, and put her to sleep. A little boy is not too bad. If the girl is still alive and if a Helio can get in here, she will go to O.B. tomorrow.

"I have just ate again and am about ready for bed. Was you ever deep in the jungle at night, locusts chattering, plus some kind of hunting bird, a mortar shell (exploding) now and then, plus cold and dark? That is this place tonight. I believe I will leave my shoes on."

MORE RIGHT THAN RATIONAL

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, H. L. Hunt's "Life Line" considers it a remarkable and sinister coincidence that Senator NEUBERGER "spoke very strongly against the 'Life Line' program and other patriotic anti-Communist endeavors," a scant 3 years after "a manifesto of 81 Communist parties, issued in Moscow in 1960, called for a concerted drive against anticommunism all over the world."

I may be naive, Mr. President, but I confess that opposition by Communists to anticommunism hardly strikes me as a startling phenomenon. "Life Line" evidently considers me a good deal worse than naive. The implication, of course, is that Senator NEUBERGER is a Communist, a party to the "international anti-freedom conspiracy."

Though "Life Line" treads a careful path of innuendo, implication, and false analogy, it is left to the individual letter-writer usually anonymous to fill in the blank spaces. One public-spirited citizen wrote:

You Jews run true to form, you attack everything American—along with the Communists—to promote the destruction of America and the final takeover.

You don't like the DAR because you never could be eligible. Your ancestors probably got here about 1900, after the Christians built this country.

And a friendly postcard:

If you are so strong for the commies, why don't (you) get yourself a passport and move over there. You are against everything that scents against these birds and the word "patriotism" is a nausea to your nostrils. * * * Why don't you get next to yourself and take a course in "Americanism" it might illiminate (sic) your soul, if you have one.

Another anonymous stalwart called it "most unfortunate"—though I suspect he really meant to say "fortunate":

That you have exposed your role in the international conspiracy to undermine the U.S. Government in the Jewish drive for international socialism.

One more thing, Mr. President. I have apparently been shrinking perceptibly in the last few months. Indeed, I seem to have undergone a metamorphosis which has quite undone a lady from Grosse Pointe, Mich., who wrote—

Believe me, you look mighty small in the press, and smaller still to those who once thought you a gentleman.

While I find these insights into my character, lineage and loyalty interesting, I think it would be profitable to review the provocation which apparently elicited this concerted venom.

Several months ago, I expressed my growing concern with the use by nominally apolitical, "educational," or "religious" organizations of their tax-exempt status as a shelter for essentially political activities. If I may be permitted to say so, this was not a notably radical proposition. It happens to be against the law. Congress, since 1934, has expressly prohibited any organization from claiming tax-exempt status while any "substantial part of its activities" is "carrying on propaganda."

I cited the Life Line radio broadcasts as a noteworthy illustration. I also cited the wildly intemperate resolutions of the DAR, principally because the Senate was at that time contemplating printing the DAR report as a Senate document, adding, in terms of Federal subsidization, insult to injury.

It is true that I disagree with some of the resolutions of the DAR, such as the one which stated:

The Domestic Peace Corps would delay the entrance of the youth of this Nation into the field of free enterprise.

Another of the resolutions with which I disagree states that——

Congress is tarred with the brush of "progressive encroachment upon the constitutional rights of the several States of the Union with serious impairment of their vested rights, liberties, and control of their institutions."

Another resolution of the DAR with which I do not agree is—

The Federal courts are "usurping the rights and powers of the legislatures of the several States."

I also disagree with the DAR resolution that the administration—

Through "subservience" to the United Nations has "permitted communism to become entrenched 90 miles off our shore in Cuba."

There are other resolutions with which I disagree, but I do not disagree with the DAR's right to pass the resolutions. I only disagree with their tax supported status.

Evidently, the precise nature of my objections was not entirely clear, at least to Life Line. Life Line accused me of trying to silence the "voice of freedom." I said:

The Constitution guarantees freedom of speech, thankfully, but it does not guarantee that political propaganda shall be subsidized by tax concessions. * * * It is no doubt true that in a given instance the line between education and political propaganda is a difficult one to draw. Whatever the reasons I think it is incumbent upon the tax service to terminate, and with more than deliberate speed, the fraudulent use of the "educational" exemption as a tax haven for partisan political propaganda. And I intend to use every resource at my command to see that this is done. Not, let me repeat, for the purpose of silencing political activity, but merely for the purposes of eliminating the tax-exemption subsidy.

Life Line also accused me of questioning the activities of the DAR because "it has passed resolutions on public policy with which she herself does not agree." I said:

I have concentrated upon the propaganda activities of the extreme rightwing. There is no question that the same standards must apply to tax-exemption abuses by leftwing organizations. But to those who ask me why I concentrate my fire upon the extreme right, I answer that the flood of material which inundates my office daily, rarely, if ever, comes from the left.

Nonetheless, there will undoubtedly be abuses by groups displaying all colors of political persuasion. And it should follow, without comment, that any reforms instituted must be applied without regard to the ideological position of the offender.

Perhaps I may be forgiven if I find it difficult to translate my remarks into an exposé of my "role in the international conspiracy." On the other hand, perhaps there was a defect in the language of my remarks. This particular speech must have been very confusing, for the very next day the president general of the DAR indicated that she had not understood me at all. She wrote:

So far as the term "politicking" is concerned, I am surprised at its use and am at something of a loss to know just what is meant inasmuch as the national society maintains no lobby at National, State, or local government levels, contributes to no political party or candidates in any way, initiates no legislation, and does not—as do a number of organizations—even in its own internal setup have any legislative chairmen. Yes, the DAR, being interested in the preservation and maintenance of our constitutional Republic, does urge its members as individual good American citizens to be informed and to exercise the privilege of the franchise and vote, but how one votes is entirely up to the individual.

The term "politicking" was hers, not mine, but it is generally what I had in mind.

Let me try again. Several days ago I received from a member of the DAR in

good standing a copy of a bulletin apparently circulated to all members by the National Defense Committee of the DAR, stating in part:

TEST BAN TREATY—STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN

A test ban treaty has been regarded by its proponents as a first and necessary step to complete and total disarmament. This ratification of the treaty must be considered as implied approval of "complete and total disarmament" with all of the consequent dangers to America—including loss of sovereignty and the ability to defend ourselves.

A very practical reason for opposing a test ban treaty is the risk that tactical training for troops in handling and firing nuclear weapons would all but be ruled out.

The great danger of this treaty is that the United States may be mousetrapped into unilateral disarmament, while the Soviet Union makes itself invincible. Instead of being a victory for the administration, as it is now represented, it may well turn out to be a great catastrophe for all of America.

In view of the Soviet Union's entrenched position in Cuba and their long record of broken promises, it is incredible that such a treaty should be even contemplated. If you agree with the above, it is urgent that as individuals you immediately contact your Senators by letter or telegraph opposing this test ban treaty. Today the press reports hearings are being held and that the treaty may be voted on by the Senate this week.

During the past several weeks, Sane, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, has similarly been circulating a bulletin to its members and friends stating in part:

NOW IT'S UP TO THE SENATE, AND YOU

A test ban treaty will put an end to widespread radioactive fallout from nuclear testing. Present and future generations will be spared additional reproductive damage and bone cancer. Little can be done about what has already occurred.

The spread of nuclear weapons and their development by new nations will be slowed, reducing the chances of nuclear war.

But most important—the world will have taken the first step to end the suicidal nuclear arms race.

By ratifying the treaty, the Senate can make clear the will of the American people to seek a just and lasting peace under honorable and safeguarded agreements.

Write three letters and write them now. One each to your Senators, and one to President Kennedy, indicating in your own words, your support for the test ban agreement.

Mr. President, men and women of good will are surely to be found in the camps of those who oppose as well as those who support ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty. The DAR speaks for the partisans of one camp. Sane speaks for many of the partisans of the other. But Sane must rely upon taxable dollars to finance its activities, while the DAR enjoys tax exemption. Yet it is the express policy of Congress that the Treasury shall be neutral in national political debates.

I believe that steps must be taken to insure the future neutrality of the Treasury, and I am hopeful that under the firm hand of Commissioner Caplin, of the Internal Revenue Service, this anomaly will not long continue. This is, and was, my point. It does not, I take it, constitute treason.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTHERN LAKE STATES REGION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a Northern Lake States Regional Land and People Conference was held in Duluth, Minn., on September 24 and 25.

The conference was sponsored by the Department of Agriculture. Some 1,200 local leaders from the 81 counties in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, which make up the region, participated in the conference. Secretary Freeman, State officials, and several of us from the congressional delegations of the three States also took part in the meeting.

The main purpose of the conference was to hear and consider the judgment of leaders in the Northern Lake States region on how to coordinate the efforts of all groups, government and private, for the development of the area.

There were panel discussions on area problems from the local viewpoint. A Governors' panel reviewed the problems and opportunities from the State level.

Four evening workshops were held on the following subjects:

First. The multiple-use management of the resources of the region;

Second. Development of local initiative for action and coordination between related groups and locations;

Third. Solving land ownership and governmental structure problems;

Fourth. The place of outdoor recreation in the development of the region.

At the close of the conference, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman addressed the group. He summarized the findings of the conference and outlined the work ahead. I believe his remarks will be of interest to all as an example of how coordinated efforts can help people meet community and regional problems and provide new opportunities.

I ask unanimous consent that the address given by Secretary Freeman at the closing session of the land and people conference at the Hotel Duluth be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE JOB AHEAD

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at closing session of Land and People Conference, Northern Great Lakes Region, at the Hotel Duluth, Duluth, Minn., September 25, 1963.)

I am greatly encouraged by the events of the past 2 days. They suggest that the work we have done here is only the beginning of a grassroots effort to build for the economic expansion and growth of the Northern Lake States region.

This conference has been constantly in my thoughts for over a year. It really began during an airplane flight near the Jay Cooke State park outside Chisholm early in 1962. We were looking at part of the Superior National Forest and I realized as we flew over the parks and forests—and the farms, cities and lakes—that there were few places in the world to equal this region. On trips all over this country and abroad over the past 2 years, I've seen many beautiful places, but none of them begins to match the outdoor resources here. I've always felt the Northern Lake States region is one of the most beautiful in the world. But, on that inspection flight, I suddenly realized that even I—who knew it so well—had underestimated the beauty * * * and the potential of this region for development of outdoor recreation. The promise of this region, I saw, extends not just to the people who live here, but to all Americans.

At that moment, I decided to ask the Forest Service to begin preparing a report on resources and recreation in this area, looking toward a conference of State and local people to begin planning for an organized development effort. You have the report—which I commend to you highly—and now we are nearing the end of the beginning.

We have heard from many distinguished people—public servants, educators, businessmen, bankers, executives, workers, and housewives—who pledge their support to plan together to develop the resources of this region.

We have heard President Kennedy call for the full employment of these abundant resources as a means of achieving full employment of people. And we are challenged by his willingness to commit the full resources of the Federal Government to the task we undertake.

We have heard from Governor Rolvaag, our host, and from Governor Reynolds, of Wisconsin, and from Mr. Conboy, who represents Governor Romney, of Michigan. They have made it clear that we can build on a foundation of solid beginnings in resource development.

We knew before we came here of the problems and needs of this three-State region. Over 9 percent of a work force of 560,000 persons is unemployed today. The estimates for this winter forecast an unemployment rate of as high as 20 percent. I know the problems of northern Minnesota intimately, and have felt them deeply. As Governor, there was no problem that concerned me more, nor any that received more attention. We built highways, and the high bridge. We invested heavily in higher educaton to expand the university branch at Duluth and to strengthen the junior colleges. State parks were expanded. The port of Duluth was built, giving Minnesota an ocean seaport. Commercial peat operations began in volume. Conditions would be worse without these efforts, but they serve only to emphasize there is still much to be done.

Those unemployment statistics are not just numbers, but people who want jobs, who want to work and cannot because there is no place where they can find employment. We must not rest until there is a job for everyone. It will not be easy, but we are resolved, regardless of the difficulties, to reach that goal.

This region over the years has taken it on the chin in many ways. Historically it has been a supplier of raw materials, and those resources have been depleted through exploitation so rapidly that the cries of "unlimited supplies of timber and iron ore" are cynical in retrospect. The Lake States region is located far from the population centers, and the roads necessary for easy access have been difficult to obtain.

But the people are tough and determined, and this makes the challenge that much more worth the effort. This region is richly endowed with resources. Its timber, though once despoiled for short-term gain by shortsighted people, now covers four-fifths of its land area. There are 27,000 lakes and over 3,000 trout streams—over 3 million acres of water surface—for those who seek outdoor recreation. This region serves a potential market of 50 million outdoor recreation seekers. Its mineral resources, of which the richest have been stripped and mined away, are being unlocked by science and technology. These advances already have created new jobs, and soon will bring thousands more. The people of this region

are well educated, for they have always placed a high premium on schools and colleges.

These facts have all been described in detail in the "Resources and Recreation" report which compiles research data that has been developed in a number of Federal and State resource studies. Each of you have a copy of this report, and I urge you to study it and use it when you return home.

The report provides a resource catalog as well as a guide to development opportunities which are available through multiple-use conservation techniques. President Kennedy last night indicated that multiple use means full employment of resources, for when resources interact one on the other, their uses multiply to a sum greater than the individual total. Applied to the job ahead, this concept can produce an explosion of opportunity.

Now, judging from what I have heard this morning, you have prepared an ambitious blueprint. But I think each of us know that the job ahead will be difficult, and that the results of the work we do here will not produce jobs tomorrow. If we have the will to put this blueprint into action, it can begin building for jobs and prosperity.

The report purposefully does not suggest how the people of this region should develop the resources they possess, for that is the job of this conference to outline and the task which the people themselves must undertake. Let me emphasize one thing, however.

The report makes clear that of all the resources it catalogs, there is one that stands out over all others—and that is water. No other area in the United States has anything to compare with the water resources of this area. As we seek to develop growth opportunities, we need to keep constantly in mind that we should lead from strength—and the strength of this region is water resources and the multiple uses that can be made of the lakes and streams that stretch out in magnificant abundance.

Recreation is paramount among these uses. I am convinced, on the basis of long and careful observation, that recreation development is the fuse that will set off a great economic boom in the Lake States in the years ahead. That fuse already has been lit, and it should receive concentrated attention in the years immediately ahead. We often spend our time looking for another model T, or radio, or television industry to fuel the next boom cycle. We tend to overlook the trends in public taste which forecast change. Outdoor recreation is a strong, developing trend, and this region should prepare for it. I venture to predict that by 1980, recreation will be the mainstay of the Lake States economy—and it will be a healthy economy. It could happen sooner, and, if it does, then I will be happy to say I was wrong.

It will come when better transportation—highways and airport facilities—becomes available. This, too, has long been a dream of mine, to have a transportation net that draws this area into the center of our population mass. The Mackinac Straits Bridge and the High Bridge between Duluth and Superior are part of it. The four-lane lakeshore highway along Lake Superior is another. It includes the Grand Rounds of Superior, which now is completed so that a motorist can drive on good highways completely around Lake Superior. The completion of the Trans-Canadian Highway helps draw the east-west line of a target sight, and the work now progressing on the Mississippi River Parkway is beginning to fill in the north-south line of the sight. The Northern Great Lakes region is the target on which this sight is focused. One of the current problems in speeding this development is the lack of recognition given recreation as in justifying highway construction. It should have equal weight given other factors which reflect conditions of another era.

I do not, in my enthusiasm, mean to downgrade the economic stimulus which will come as we apply multiple use conservation to timber, mining, or agriculture. Each of these will be developed to a much greater extent. But the big target is water and the recreation potential it holds.

I am impressed by the clear, practical recommendations which the four panels have presented here this morning. They suggest additional research and cataloging of resources is needed. They meet head on the difficult questions of land adjustment, tax policies, and adequate public and private investment. They recognize, as Senator GAYLORD NELSON stressed, last Monday, the need for an organizational structure to coordinate actions on a regional basis. I believe they rightly emphasize that the need is not for more new Government agencies, but for more effective coordination of existing public and private resources.

The first workshop on multiple use management has recommended that a thorough water resource inventory be made. It will provide the basis for careful planning of our water resource uses through zoning and pollution control. We only need to look elsewhere in the Nation to see the exploding demand for water resources.

The panel also urged that land use patterns should encourage agricultural uses for land where suitable, but it noted many of the problems in the region today can be traced to early land speculation which encouraged farming on land better suited to other uses. The first workshop also recommended greater research and development activities in the use of timber and wood.

They suggested further that a multiple use management policy affecting all lands in the region be planned and coordinated by the individual States, and that research management in this area be done in cooperation with the Federal Government.

As the resource report indicates, the potential from multiple use conservation principles on private lands is substantial. Farms adjacent to National or State forests can develop vacation facilities utilizing nearby trials for hiking and horseback riding. Farmland near lakes or streams can earn, as some are doing now, as much from vacation cabins and campgrounds as from crops.

The second workshop on developing local initiative and coordinating local programs has made a number of sensible proposals. It has suggested that the county board of commissioners should be more closely associated with the local rural areas development groups, primarily to tie organized local efforts to develop new jobs into the established legal framework. These groups should involve private citizens very strongly, including those with timber, mining, utilities, cooperative, and labor interests.

The workshop recognized that a better understanding of the nature of the region's problems is needed, together with an educational program which will encourage greater local initiative and action.

The third workshop on land ownership and governmental structure accepted a most difficult assignment in an area where controversy can be found under the nearest rock. They recommended a reimbursement system through which State and local agencies owning land in an area would reimburse the local tax body. Payments would be based on an acceptable evaluation procedure.

This workshop also urged that zoning laws, which generally are adequate, be used more effectively; and suggested that exchanges of land in areas where Federal, State, and private lands are intermingled should be carried out to create larger, easier to manage blocks under the same ownership.

The fourth workshop on outdoor recreation emphasized the need for an immediate recreation inventory in each State, and suggested that it be carried out in cooperation with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The members also expressed concern over the lack of coordination between public and private recreation development, and suggested that some means be found to coordinate these activities to prevent overdevelopment and harmful competition.

This workshop also recommended that promotional efforts to encourage tourist visits should be coordinated on a regional basis. This has never been an easy task, even within States. But the time has come to realize that by creating a bigger pie, the pieces get bigger. The panel also recognized that the number of suitable airports in the region should be increased, and that other forms of transportation should be improved. They emphasized again the need for high speed entrance highways to carry people to the area from metropolitan centers.

I think you can all be proud of the work you have done in these workshops. Your recommendations, which tell you what needs to be done, are specific, practical, and realistic.

These recommendations make it clear that you believe the work of economic development must be done in the local community and the individual State, and I heartily agree. The role which has been assigned to the Federal Government, outside the responsibilities on land it holds in public trust, is primarily to advise and to provide technical and financial assistance when it is asked. There is much in these recommendations for the State governments to consider and to chew on—primarily that it is up to the States to serve as a center to stimulate local action and to coordinate programs between local communities.

It also is clear that something more than individual State action and something in addition to Federal coordination is needed. The problems reach across State boundaries, and therefore, as President Kennedy said, the response of the State government must also reach across State borders.

The President has expressed his willingness, his desire, to sit down with all three States when they have developed a coordinated plan for regional action. I would urge you, in looking at the job ahead, to call very soon a land and people conference in each State and, later, in your own area. When you have developed local and State plans for resource development, then bring together the proposals for public and private actions at a regional meeting.

The Federal agencies represented here will be glad to assist in the planning where you desire; we will be prepared to give technical assistance where you desire; and we will provide financial aid wherever it is possible. You, however, must take the lead and make the important decisions.

I cannot forecast, nor can you, the final form of the regional organization which will evolve. But I can indicate to you now some of the programs which will be available for your use.

One of the most important will be rural areas development. Many of you have some experience with RAD already, but I doubt if many of you are aware of what it is possible to achieve when it is vigorously applied locally.

We began this program in the Department of Agriculture in 1961. In 1962 with the passage of the Food and Agriculture Act the Congress strengthened it enormously. In the past 2 years we have helped local people encourage industry to move into rural areas, creating an estimated 52,000 new jobs—primarily in the commercial and industrial field. We have provided technical advice and financial services that helped more than 10,000 farmers develop income-producing recreation facilities on their land. We expect to provide assistance to at least 9,000 more before July 1964. In addition, some 2,800 farmers in 34 States have agreed

to divert 140,000 excess cropland acres to other more productive uses.

The accelerated public works program already has created more than 216,000 man-months of employment in our rural areas, in addition to long-range benefits that come from developing our natural resources and protecting our lands from flood. In this region alone, over 1,700 jobs were created last winter in the national forests under this program.

These are just a few of the direct job-creating activities. We have authority for low-cost 30-year loans to finance rural renewal and resource conservation development projects. The small watershed program has been expanded to include development of public recreation areas and extra water storage capacity for future municipal and industrial use. Sponsors of 42 watershed projects are planning recreation areas in projects now approved.

In the past 2½ years, we have advanced more funds for rural housing than in the previous 11 years of the program's existence. These housing loans since 1961 have created 85,000 man-years of employment and have added, in terms of impact, almost $2 billion to the rural economy. They create a growing demand for lumber, for plumbing, heating and electrical equipment, for concrete, masonry, millwork, plaster and paint. And the furniture store also benefits.

This program has strengthened the rural economy. Business on Main Street is improved. Deposits in country banks in most farming areas have jumped 8 percent since 1960.

But the most important result today cannot be measured in economic terms alone. There are rural areas development groups organized now in two out of every three counties in the Nation. Over 65,000 people—local people—are actively working on problems of area development, creating new jobs, improved services and developing natural resources.

This is a program of promise to the future of this region, both in terms of what you are doing here and what will take place under your leadership when you return home. And it is but one tool which you can use to build for the conditions of growth.

I have the greatest confidence that the future of this region is bright. Our society is changing under the pressures of automation, mechanization and the advances of science. While we attempt to catch up with these changes, the backlash—immediate and painful—sometimes seems stronger than the progress underway. But these changes which are going on throughout our economy can if we will it and work at it, mean a new dimension in the level of living for all people. It will enable more people with more money and more leisure to enjoy the rewards of our great outdoors—an essential ingredient to a meaningful life.

I think we had better get ready for them here, for they will be coming as surely as night becomes day.

DEDICATION OF CALHOUN BEACH MANOR, A RETIREMENT HOME FOR OLDER CITIZENS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on September 15 I had the privilege of attending the dedication of the Calhoun Beach Manor, a retirement home for older citizens.

I congratulate the board of directors of the United Church Homes and the staff for the excellent facilities provided, and more particularly on the fine spirit which motivates the efforts of all those responsible for establishing and maintaining Calhoun Manor.

The dedication address was given by Dr. Roy G. Francis, professor of sociology and statistics at the University of Minnesota. In his address Dr. Francis spoke of the changing needs of the aged and of the response required from citizens and institutions to enable them to live in dignity. I ask unanimous consent that the dedicatory address of Dr. Francis be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE ADDED YEARS—A NEW DIMENSION TO CHURCH SERVICE

(By Roy G. Francis)

This evening, we have a happy obligation to fulfill. Let us to it joyfully, for this is not a somber occasion. The mood should be like that at Easter: serious, yet with the foreknowledge that good news is ours. Being serious does not mean being grim. Let us, then, acknowledge this cheerfully, anticipating a genuinely happy mood.

I am afraid that to too many people, the presence of religious symbols acts like the proverbial wet blanket. We too often feel that we cannot laugh in church, and the sudden appearance of a minister stifles spontaneity. I am reminded of a little boy who did not know the minister was visiting his mother. Happily he charged in, bearing with him a rather shabby rat, dangling from his grimy fist by its tail. "Don't worry about this old rat, mom," he exclaimed, "it's dead. We whacked it, and thumped it, and slammed it, until—" and then he saw the minister—" until God called it home."

As I said, we are not here for any morbid reason. It is not a mausoleum which we are dedicating tonight. It is not one of those sad nursing homes—those stainless steel halfway houses between retirement and death. Nor is it a poor farm. No structure that brings fear into youthful hearts is here involved. Indeed, it is precisely because none of these concepts describes this venture that we feel restrained to ask why, in God's name, we are here. What business is it of the church to involve itself in surroundings such as this? Are we not, somehow, obligated to the indigent?

We ask these questions as though the church has no concern for those who are not destitute. We ask these questions as though material success contains no threat to man's fulfillment of his divine obligations.

The cold, if not dull, statistical information regarding the aged is hardly news. Not only has the life expectancy of the average person increased some 20 years during the last 50 or so years, the percent of our population which is 65 or older continues to increase dramatically. Regardless of the changes in the birth rates we may experience, this segment of our population will continue to increase for the rest of this century.

These demographic changes carry with them fairly enormous consequences. Thomas Jefferson was able to write, "Here I am, 35, an old man—and what have I done?" Who, tonight, would claim that anyone is old at 35? Men and women past 70 are reluctant to admit they are old, though somewhere after reaching 72 they will confess that they have aged a bit.

Our aged are today's Pilgrims. No other generation has succeeded in living as long as has our current crop of elder people. And therein lies the problem.

We have no sensible traditions to guide us. All of our images and fears of being old are derived from inadequate experience. The image of the aged person as being wise and respectful comes essentially from rural areas of a bygone day. The aged person a hundred years or more ago could know most of what there was to know; it was gained by experience. But today, we are creating so much knowledge every year that no one can accumulate a great deal of it. More importantly, in the past, the aged person was rare; few could aspire for old age. After all, "the good die young," and the cemeteries were full of headboards to prove it. It was an Irishman who wondered where the bad guys were buried since the epitaphs implied that all of the dead had been truly wonderful people.

For the first time in the history of man, we have the prospect of both spouses surviving some 10 or 15 years after their youngest child is married. This is the age of grandparents—and we don't know what to do with them.

Historically, in a farming area, in which the average age at death for the male was around 50 years, a young farmer about 25 or so could expect to inherit the farm in just a few years because at that time his own father was close to the age when most had already gone. Today, a farmer of 50 can expect to farm for another 15 years and still have several years of retirement. In the past, the son who was to inherit the farm could well be expected to take care of his parents their few remaining years. There was a certain profit in doing so. The farm boy today is in a dramatically different situation. At age 25, he can scarcely wait for his father to die: he would be over 40 when he could inherit the farm. And the urban man is in a situation even more different—few indeed are those who expect to inherit any property. One's inheritance today is primarily in the form of the best education one's parents could afford—and, frequently, ill afford.

Thus, when we were building up the notion that the children should physically take care of their aged parents, there were two justifying factors present both of which are absent today that made such a demand sensible. First, the "quid pro quo" of material inheritance is largely lacking today; and, second, the age at death has changed so markedly that the situations must be considered to be completely different. The image of the child taking care of his parents is virtually meaningless today. We will return to this point shortly.

For the landless, and the propertyless, the picture I have sketched of some vague historical past never existed at all. Compared with the landed gentry, the town's poor had even less of a claim to life. Through epidemics, accidents, poor diets, and general ignorance, many people were protected from suffering through prolonged old age. The need for a rationalized system for caring for the aged poor is a modern one. In the days when charity was a personal thing; when people knew those whom they helped; when charity was an obligation; even then, there was a pitiful secular structure for the impoverished aged.

We have never liked to witness poverty, and absolutely abhor the sight of the death of the impoverished. We have long ago developed strategies to round up the aged poor and get them out of sight. These places we called "poor farms." I suppose that, at least to a generation ago, the poor farm was an institution more feared than jail. The poor farm was the final admission of failure. The next step was Potter's Field and the unmarked grave where the return to dust was hastened by unslacked lime. This was the ultimate shame. Pitiful insurance programs to insure proper burial are still common among the poor in many regions of our country today.

I remember the shocked conversations of the adults in my hometown when an aged couple had to go to the "county home"—even that euphemism did not improve the image much—their tones were more hushed then than when they talked of a forced marriage of some young girl. The community shared in the shame of those poor people.

It meant that we, too, had failed. We were unable to do our personal charity. In a short time, however, it all passed: out of sight and out of mind is a shrewd empirical observation.

Experiences of this kind color our image of what being aged is all about. We can understand the need to help the indigent. We are willing to support, by legislation, homes for the needy aged. We are even willing to indulge in some sort of minimal medical care. Public nursing homes for those without families: this we understand, this we support. Not old, grimy buildings like the county poor farms. But parking lots for the tired poor, just the same.

How many young, aggressive, and successful adults give their time and understanding to these helpless poor? How many find out what life or death is like in these institutions we are creating today? Who knows whether the home provides TV and tranquilizers as the strategies of control? And who cares, as long as we can feel that we've done something?

As I said, this sort of home we can understand; but we are bugged by doing something nice for the elderly. We often cannot understand why anyone, especially a church, should find it necessary to create something like we have here in Calhoun Beach Manor. This is not a poorfarm; we wouldn't mind being here ourselves. But the old question comes to haunt us again: isn't the problem really a family problem even today? Ought not the family, the children of the aged, provide as they used to?

It doesn't always make sense to make such a demand.

Let us understand that today's children are highly mobile. With which child ought the aged parent live? Those who did not move? Which child should be burdened with the sight of the parents becoming increasingly helpless and about to die? Which set of grandchildren must be subjected to the strain of accommodating to a senile relative? Or ought the family accept the parent as long as the oldster can contribute and then seek relief when the burden is great? Should the parent be shunted around from child to child? Must the parent be made to feel that he is a burden? Has he no right for independence? Must we impose a way of life onto the parent: should he be made to feel that he is imposing, upsetting, destroying the lives of his children and grandchildren? Is this the reward for growing old? Is this what we mean by love? Do you, may I ask, wish to impose yourself and your troubles on your children when you grow old? Do you feel that your children owe this to you, because of all that you have done for them: or did you care for them because you loved them?

We in the middle class find it easy to help the indigent. But we strangely will do nothing for another member of the middle class unless his middle class standing is destroyed. Let us imagine a rather common situation: Imagine a person who has by hard work, sacrifice, and service, achieved marginal middle class standing. There must be millions of them in the United States today. He would like to give something to his children: a college training, perhaps medical training. Suddenly, he is forced to make difficult choices: take care of his aged parents with little help from his less successful brothers or sisters; educate his children through college; live without some of those things we associate with a middle class style of life. In short, if he is to provide both for his parents and educate his children, he must leave the middle class and return to that lower level of living he had worked so hard to leave.

If we are sincerely concerned with maintaining an open class system in America; if we mean it when we say that achievement ought to be rewarded, and not punished, then we must be willing to protect the achievement of the kind of young men and women I've just described. The doctrine that the child with any means at all must care for his parents implies that many will be economically punished because they dared to try to succeed. It is time, I think, that the middle class person begin to think of strategies to protect those values which guide and determine his life.

What I am suggesting can, in no sensible way, be taken to imply a lessened concern for the indigent aged. In no way am I suggesting that the social problems for the impoverished elderly person should be weakened. I am unconcerned whether a person is impoverished because of being a spendthrift, or of illness, or of any reason: the dignity we owe our fellow man is sufficient to require our continued efforts to improve the last years of our destitute.

But I am adamant in insisting that care for the biological needs of man is insufficient. The concept of the dignity of man does not exclude those of the middle class.

Man, as a creature created in the image of his God, is himself a creative being. His capacity for creativity ought not be stifled, just because he has reached some mysterious birthday. Forced by rules and sometimes ill health from being economically productive, he is thereby forced to leave the creative experiences of the work-a-day world. He is deprived of the social reality of being one of a group.

The modern urban world is one in which organization is needed to solve problems. Few are so affluent or so powerful as to be able to go it alone. Moreover, there is something positive to be said about functioning in a group, more than the old cliche "there is safety in numbers." It is a well-known sociological fact that significant reinforcement or validation of a social identity comes only from others. Sharing experiences—problems as well as successes—builds relationship which endure.

The sad part of contemporary aging is that the older person is pushed out of most of his social sets in the process. He is forced out of work; his place on civic committees is taken by younger, more energetic men and women. He faces problems quite different from his younger acquaintances. His is not the problem of PTA, of securing the promotion, of the numerous things the young men on the upward climb are caught up in. Frequently, his interests are quite opposite that of his younger friends.

More importantly, he relates to death in a way the younger person does not. His string is running out. Out of 100 who reach 65, half will die within 15 years. Of those who reach 75, over half will die within 10 years. The younger person can still afford to escape serious concern with the end of life. The fact of retirement presages the end.

Physiological changes take place. Sins of the past are heaped on the remaining years: improper care of the body ultimately claims its reward. The need for medical services increases with each passing year.

The need for a social experience is also increased, since his life-time work associations are also gone. His is still a 24-hour day. To force a person to spend it in idleness, in contemplation of things passed, or in unnecessary concern for the end soon to arrive is a punishment only the criminal waiting execution is forced to endure. It is hardly right to have this be the reward for growing old. The older person needs an opportunity to be kept mentally active. He needs opportunities to be creative, to express himself in tangible ways.

Thus it is that a group solution to the problem of aging is sensible. It makes good sense for people with like problems and interests to be together. They can assist each other in securing a happy identity for the remaining years of their lives. No longer need they feel unwanted, that their lives are an intrusion upon the happiness of others. In a group they can work out techniques by which they can individually contribute to the group itself, with a reasonable expectancy of having that contribution appreciated and respected.

Moreover, as their medical needs increase, it is actuarily sound to proceed on a group basis. The strategy of averaging costs makes sense; competent help can be secured, and sensibly administered. There is little need for an obstetrician in such a home as this: the services can be designed to fit the special needs of the population served.

There are some who object to this tendency to combine retirement facilities and nursing services. Any charge that it is forcing those in good health to support those in bad health is statistically unsound; the day will most likely come when they, too, will need help.

It is sometimes said that the high death rates, alluded to earlier, have a morbid effect. From the perspective of middle age, this may be true. We in the middle ages are afraid to die. We dislike talking about it. It sort of ruins the conversation—kills it, you might say. We would feel depressed were we surrounded by the passing of our friends. But, as I said earlier, older people view the end of life differently than do we who have yet to achieve or fail in our goals. In or out of a retirement home, the older person is fully aware of others' passing. Experiencing this in a world shared by others similarly placed not only makes it easier to accept the fact of death, but by "role taking," the elder person is enabled to prepare for his own moment of passing.

Then, too, if we continue to separate the retirement facilities from the nursing services, we are essentially saying to our old folks, "there will come a day when you must go away—and die among strangers." This we cannot bring ourselves to say.

But still the question lurks: Why the church?

Fundamentally, because secular society has failed. The only success which the secular society has given has been a small effort to meet the biological needs of the elderly. This has been a small effort to meet the biological needs of the elderly. This has only been haphazardly done. It has done virtually nothing for the social needs of our senior citizens.

The real reason we cannot trust the secular world is that its measure of man is necessarily a material one: how large a note can be delivered? How much money can be extracted? These are the questions of interest to the secular society. From a materialistic standard of interest, the aged find themselves subject to vacillating images in recent times. During the great depression—remember the Townsend plan?—the hue and cry was to retire them because they had done their stint: and they held jobs young people needed. During World War II, and again during the fifties, we needed them for our labor force—and praised them for their skills, their patience, their loyalty. Not too long ago, some politicians were suggesting we lower the voting age because there were too many old people, giving the vote an alleged conservative look. Today, in an economic world increasingly automated, and soon to be assaulted by the postwar baby boom rushing into the labor market, we find the oldster untrainable for new jobs—and, presumably, deserving retirement. We have recently reduced the age at which a person can obtain social security benefits—thereby removing him from the labor market earlier than before.

The fate of the aged ought not be left to the whims of such a mechanism. We cannot trust a part of the world that measures man as a material thing: the elderly are bound to be found wanting.

We need an institution that is relentless in its faith in the dignity of man. We cannot endure one run by a frightened little bureaucrat, nor one who regards the aged solely in terms of possible profit. We ought not coin gold from an old man's sorrow.

We need an institution which derives its justification for being in the premise that man, everywhere and at all ages, is the child of his Creator and therefore deserves the best that society can offer.

The church is such an institution.

Or ought to be.

For if it is not, then it is we who make up that institution who have failed.

Therefore, if our aged are to be helped to create a world in which they can continue a dignified social life, in creative activity, we must require of our church that it explicitly accept the responsibility for seeing that this is possible.

There are enormous ramifications of this charge. There is still much to be done. But fear of difficulty must not deter us from our obligation.

We dare not fail.

We can turn to no one else.

So, you see, it is not the Calhoun Beach Manor which is being dedicated this evening. It is we, we who are given the charge and the opportunity. We must dedicate ourselves to the implications and the demands of this responsibility. We must dedicate ourselves to this form of witness, a witness which will enable our elders to continue their witness to the meaning of the Gospel. In this we are not alone. The rock on which our faith rests will not fail us now.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

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

YOUNG FARM LEADERS FROM LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES GREETED BY PRESIDENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 59 young farm leaders from Latin American countries who have just completed 6 months of community level training in 25 rural communities in the United States were greeted by President Kennedy today in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Eleven of the group had their on-the-farm training in rural communities of Minnesota.

Each member of the group has elected responsibilities in the regional and national campesino or cooperative farm organizations in Chile, Peru, Bolivia, and Venezuela. They were brought to the United States under the sponsorship of the National Farmers Union through a contract with the Agency for International Development as an Alliance for Progress project. This program represents the first direct tie between the campesino leadership in these four South American countries and rural farm community leaders and programs in the United States.

The young Latin American farm leaders were presented to the President by James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union; Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and John Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

President Kennedy emphasized the importance of agriculture in developing countries, and saluted the project as an indication of close ties between farm people of North and South America.

The farm leadership participants who trained in Minnesota and the names of the farm families with whom they have spent the last 6 months, included:

Bolivia: Luis Salazar, on the farm of Edward Ackman, Lake Lillian. Benjamin Romero, on the farm of Gene Blake, Adams.

Chile: Sergio Tejos, on the farm of Ellis Anderson, Clara City. Tulio Vesperinas, on the farm of Axel Larson, Montevideo.

Peru: Guillermo Renteria, on the farm of Archie Bjornberg. Emilio Rojas, on the farm of Winston Peterson, Kerkhoven. Jaime Villar, on the farm of Leif Fostervold, Atwater.

Venezuela: Antonio Centeno, on the farm of Warren Lowe, Faribault. Pastor Gonzalez, on the farm of Rudy Clohn, Garfield. Angel Moreno, on the farm of Richard Stowe, Dundas. Thomas Rebolledo, on the farm of Henry Jantzen, Parkers Prairie.

THE LARGER SIGNIFICANCE OF THE INDICTMENT OF A MARYLAND PHYSICIAN ON CHARGES OF FRAUDULENT TEST REPORTS ON NEW DRUGS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday I commented in the Senate on the announcement of Thursday, October 3, 1963, by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, of the indictment of a Maryland physician on the charge of submitting false clinical test reports on five new drugs.

Attorney General Kennedy stated that a Federal grand jury in the District of Columbia had returned the indictment following an 11-month investigation by the Food and Drug Administration.

The Nation is gratified that law enforcement arms have acted on these exceedingly serious charges.

If the charges are proven in the court case which will follow, the doctor's crime will be shown to be a terrible breach of the highest principles of the medical profession and of the laws of the land.

Under our tradition of justice, an individual is, of course, innocent until he is proven guilty. I will not, therefore, comment on this particular physician. His fate is now in the hands of the law.

CRIMINAL INDICTMENT PART OF A LARGER NONCRIMINAL PATTERN

I do, however, want to comment on what I regard as some of the larger implications of this indictment.

The indictment should not be thought of as if it had occurred in a vacuum.

It is, unfortunately, part and parcel of a larger pattern which has prevailed in recent years.

It is a pattern in which not one, but several, physicians and non-M.D.'s have been suspected of filing fraudulent test reports.

How, it may be asked, did these alleged cheats ever expect to get away with it?

VARIOUS FACTORS WERE EXPECTED TO PREVENT DETECTION

The answer is, they probably expected to escape undetected because of a number of factors.

One was the fact that the Food and Drug Administration has been so seriously overburdened with masses of new drug applications that faulty submissions could and did slip by.

Mr. President, the Food and Drug Administration, regrettably, has been understaffed for the many duties that it is called upon to perform. I have urged time after time that the Food and Drug Administration be given the personnel required to meet its obligations under the Food and Drug Act. We need to upgrade the Food and Drug Administration, to provide more professional talent, particularly in the Bureau of Medicine, so that this fine organization, which is entrusted with protecting the public health so far as food and drugs are concerned, can better do its job.

No less than 3,000 new drug applications on drugs intended for human use alone flooded FDA in 7 years, not to mention 6,000 supplements to new drug applications. A mere handful of overworked FDA medical reviewers has been available to try to screen this "flood" of applications.

TOO FEW TRAINED TESTERS

A second factor was that FDA, the drug industry and the healing arts professions have watched relatively passively while the shortage of trained clinical testers grew more and more acute.

The result has been that often standards of drug testing have alarmingly deteriorated. This is not a mere personal opinion of mine; it is the conclusion of some of America's greatest testing experts, as expressed in article after article in professional journals.

MEDICAL PROFESSION HAS DEPLORED "TESTIMONIALS"

Drug tests have been conducted without the slightest scientific controls. "Clinical evidence," according to FDA physicians like Frances Kelsey, has often consisted of mere testimonials: "I gave this drug to my patient. He seemed to improve."

Often, little or no real scientific proof has been offered—merely statements of personal conclusions, empty testimonials. These testimonials sometimes were almost as bad as the type that the greatest medical journals of the land had deplored in previous years. We should recall the long and inspiring battle of medical journals in years gone by against so-called "miraculous cures" by what were called patent medicines, which were allegedly "proven" only by laymen's testimonials in glowing advertisements.

Today, in a scientific era, FDA has had a right to expect and demand scientific evidence on new drugs, by controlled clinical trials, for example. Unfortunately, FDA did not get such evidence in many cases.

THE PARADOX OF SUPERB AND OF MEDIOCRE TESTING

U.S. drug testing thus became more and more paradoxical.

On the one hand, superb testing—conscientious, thorough, brilliant—often was conducted by drug companies of unimpeachable reputation on many outstanding drugs.

On the other hand, mediocre and substandard testing was often conducted on good, bad, or indifferent drugs. Both types of testing seemed to be approved by FDA.

When some unscrupulous individuals saw and heard that FDA was allowing drugs to be approved without real scientific evidence, it was almost inevitable that such individuals might figure on "making a fast buck." Their trick was to concoct testimonials on "skeleton" evidence or out of whole cloth. This is what may have occurred in the Maryland case.

The roots of the case were laid in an age of often slipshod testing where a philosophy of "anything goes" has too often prevailed. It should, therefore, come as no surprise that some few individuals—even those who took the Hippocratic oath—may have violated all that their great profession has sought to attain.

I do not presume to offer final interpretations on this subject. FDA investigations are still underway.

But I do offer these tentative and personal observations in the hope they will encourage America's healing arts to deal now with the situation.

Our medical and allied professions are the greatest in the world. Drug testing is fundamentally their responsibility.

Professional standards are their responsibility.

No one, I believe, is more shocked by the Maryland case than the 99 out of 100 American physicians who are honest and law abiding and of U.S. drug companies whose hard-earned reputations of integrity are their greatest asset.

Yesterday I commented at some length on the implications of the indictment which I have mentioned today. One of my duties is to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations. Our subcommittee has been checking into the organizational structure and administrative effectiveness of the Food and Drug Administration under the Food and Drug Act, as amended. The subcommittee has made recommendations.

All I can say now is that the new drugs which are coming on the market must be subjected to the most careful testing to protect the public health. We must be assured of the professional competence of those who do the testing, and we must make certain that every precaution and protection is made available to assure that the testing procedure is carried out according to the law and according to the highest of standards.

My statement today is designed to emphasize the importance of effective enforcement of the health protection features such as research and adequate drug testing in our Food and Drug Act.

POSSIBLE SALE OF WHEAT TO SOVIET UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment on a bulletin which just came over the press wires.

From time to time I have taken the Senate floor to urge a change in policy on the part of our Government relating to the sale of our vast stocks of surplus wheat, which impose a terrific financial burden upon the taxpayer because of the very high storage and handling costs. I have urged that the wheat stocks be made available not only to our friends and allies and to the non-Communist countries but also, at least at the present time, for cash or gold to the Soviet Union and the eastern European countries.

I am fully aware that my recommendation and position are highly controversial. I know it can be said this could strengthen the Soviet Union, that the Soviet Union and the Communist countries could use the wheat for military or foreign policy purposes and objectives.

There is a severe food shortage in the Soviet Union. Moreover, there have been crop failures in several other countries of eastern Europe. This is not a matter of conjecture. It is well known. One does not have to go to the FBI or the CIA to find out about it. One can go to the Weather Bureau or any one of the many international organizations which keep records and make accountings of crop conditions, shipments, food products, and raw materials. One can check with the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, or can check under the terms of the International Wheat Agreement, of which the Soviet Union is a member.

I have said on the floor of the Senate, and outside this Chamber, that not only did the Soviet Union want to buy some wheat, not only was it buying wheat from our stanch ally and friend to the north, Canada, but other countries were in the market with cash for wheat. I mentioned three—Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria; and I could add a fourth, Poland. There may be others.

Here is the bulletin from Ottawa, by the Associated Press:

> Trade Minister Mitchell Sharp announced today that Communist Bulgaria has agreed to purchase up to 450,000 metric tons of Canadian wheat during the next 3 years.

This is the first of many of this kind of announcement we are going to face.

I repeat what I said before—if the policy of the United States relating to the sale of wheat and other agricultural commodities that are in surplus is one of denying the Communist countries these products in order to weaken them, we ought to insist with our allies that it be a concerted effort. A one-country embargo and boycott cannot be placed against a country the size of the Soviet Union.

I have said repeatedly that our unwillingness to sell wheat directly has promoted a kind of hypocritical, devious situation. We are selling wheat to other countries who in turn resell it to the Soviet Union, or, better for their purposes, process it into flour and sell it to the Soviet Union or other Communist countries in Eastern Europe.

The facts are clear. Canada, which is as good a friend and as stanch an ally as the United States ever has had, or ever will have, openly is selling to Communist countries her stocks of wheat.

I have not been critical of such transactions, because these are decisions for the Canadians to make. The British, the French, the Canadians, the Germans, and the Italians have refused to follow our regulations and policies relating to foodstuffs in sales to the Soviet Union. They have cooperated with respect to strategic materials. The Germans, for example, canceled a large contract with the Soviet Union for the sale of steel pipe, at considerable cost to German manufacturers and the German economy. I commended the Germans in the Senate at the time, and I want to do so again, because it was a courageous act, an act of sacrifice and real cooperation with the United States and its policy relating to the Soviet-bloc countries. But when it comes to foodstuffs, we are the only one of the major agricultural nations that refuses to sell certain food commodities to Soviet-bloc countries.

We sell all kinds of food commodities that are not within the Commodity Credit Corporation's activities. We are today selling food commodities to the Soviet Union when those food commodities are not price supported or in surplus.

The argument is over the fact that when we sell wheat or cotton, such sales must be subsidized in the export market—not subsidized for the Russians, but subsidized for the Americans—a subsidy to our farmers, not to the Russians.

No matter to whom we sold wheat—if we sold wheat to the Eskimos—we would have to subsidize it, because our domestic wheat price is substantially higher than the world price, and, under the International Wheat Agreement, we must meet certain international pricing conditions.

The Soviet Union is a member of the International Wheat Agreement, and comes within the confines and jurisdiction of the Wheat Agreement. So are we.

So the relationship is not new or radical or of an unusual nature. The only thing that is unusual about it is that the greatest capitalistic nation in the world refuses to do business. We apparently are so addicted to storing wheat and stockpiling surpluses that when we have an opportunity to sell, we do not know how to go about it, unless we sell to certain friendly nations.

I repeat, if it is the policy of this Government that no foodstuffs shall be shipped by our allies and ourselves, and if there is no way these food supplies can be obtained by a devious or indirect route; if that policy can be enforced, a legitimate case could be made. Perhaps a moral case could not be made for it, but at least a legal case might be made for the refusal to sell wheat to the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries.

How ridiculous the situation is. It can be described as follows: Any country in

the world can buy wheat from the United States if that country says it is a friend or a non-Communist country or does not belong to the Soviet or Chinese Communist bloc. Any one of those countries that professes to be our friend is at liberty to sell wheat to the very country we refuse to sell to, and it can sell the very same wheat that the Soviet Union could have purchased from the United States.

I have before me information that last year the United States sold 450,000 metric tons of wheat to West Germany. During the same period the West Germans sold 604,000 metric tons of flour to the Communist countries, of which 385,000 metric tons were sold to Red China.

We sold the wheat to Germany. The Germans received subsidized wheat. It was not the Soviet Union that was subsidized. We sold the wheat at the world price with an export subsidy, and the Germans ran it through their flour mills, giving Germans jobs, and permitting the German manufacturers to make a profit. The Germans sold the flour, made out of American wheat, to Communist China.

And yet we have people in this country who say we must not sell any of our wheat to the Russians.

I am of the opinion that since we are attempting to ease some of the tensions of the cold war, one of the ways to talk to the Russians is to talk commerce. People who learn to trade with each other hesitate to fight with each other. One of the surest foundations on which to build up our relationships is on an an economic base that makes sense.

I am not deluding myself. The Soviet Union may have a good crop next year and may not buy anything from us. Traditionally, the Russians export wheat. But the Soviet Union is going to have trouble with her new lands in Siberia, and I will tell the Senate why. I was born and raised in South Dakota, and the prairie lands of South Dakota are similar in many ways to the new lands of Siberia. When a plow is put to an area in which the rainfall is limited, after 5 to 7 years, the subsoil moisture disappears, and, without proper soil conservation and irrigation practices, plus fertilizer, there soon exist the beginnings of a dust bowl.

I lived through the Dust Bowl in the Dakotas. I do not speak of theory. I speak from hard, cruel experience.

Mr. President, the Soviet Union has something that we need—money, gold. I heard on the floor of the Senate today that every time we come face to face with victory, we become afraid of it and retreat from it.

The Soviet Union has a shortage of wheat and has a supply of gold. We have a supply of wheat and a shortage of gold. We are the largest commercial nation in the world. We are facing a balance-of-payments deficit of approximately $3 billion a year. We need gold for our foreign policy objectives. We need gold for our defense overseas. We need it for a host of activities, including the exporting of American capital to help build up non-Communist areas of the world.

The Soviet Union has been able to mine more gold than we have been able to mine. The Soviet Union has gold bullion and has set aside, according to reliable estimates, $1 billion of it, to be used to purchase food. We have the wheat, and it is rotting in the bins. It is costing the taxpayers a fantastic sum of money. Government costs of storage in 3 years will be more than the amount of any export subsidy on the amount of wheat the Soviet Union says it wants to buy from us.

The Russians have gold, and we have a shortage of gold. The Russians have a shortage of wheat, and we have an abundance of wheat. Wheat spoils if it stands too long. Gold does not spoil. We can stockpile gold without deterioration. The price of gold is stable. The price of wheat is unstable. The United States is not going to experience a shortage of wheat if we sell it to the Soviet Union.

The No. 1 problem facing us economically is a deficit in the balance of payments. We happen to be in the fortunate position of having a customer who wants to buy wheat and to pay for it with gold, in cash. We have the supplies with which to meet the demand. However, we also have a kind of political blindness and prejudice that denies us a chance even to indulge ourselves in rational, prudent thought.

Does anyone believe that the Soviet Union will become immeasurably stronger because she buys some wheat from us? Is it not better for the Russians to be buying food instead of guns? Is it not better that she should spend her hard currency on things like wheat, rather than on missiles or tanks or guns?

If we had any sense, we would be trying to sell more food, and have the Russians use their resources of gold, their hard currency, with which to buy consumer goods, so that they would not have the money to spend for hard goods.

We find it so profitable to be anti-Communist—profitable politically, not economically—that we blind ourselves to the opportunities which are available.

I am hopeful that our Government will reverse its present policy. That is why I speak about this in the Senate day after day. I have made up my mind to do something about it. It does not make me politically popular. I am receiving all kinds of mean, nasty letters that accuse me of being a Communist, that accuse me of socialism, that accuse me of undermining the security of our country. I get such letters from the same people who complain about the high cost of government, who complain about our food supluses, who complain about everything. I am of the opinion that food can be a tremendous source of good in the world, if we use it that way.

I do not believe that the Soviet Union is going to overwhelm the United States because it spends half a billion dollars trying to feed its people and uses its money to purchase goods and supplies from the United States.

I do not want the Russian people to think that the American Government is so heartless and so cruel, or so foolish, that if there were a real need for food, as we talk peace and as we talk about better understanding in the world, we would deny those people the right to buy it.

We have normal diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has a trade mission in the United States which is purchasing items regularly. We sell drugs to the Soviet Union; also certain food products, all of which are designed to save people's lives.

If we want to carry out the idea that we ought to deny the Russians food, because if we give the Russians food it will strengthen communism, we ought to deny the Russians medicines.

How long does anyone think the American people, who attend their church or synagogue, would support a policy which states that a man who is dying, and whose life can be saved by penicillin or a mycin drug, will not be helped, because he is a Russian or a Communist, and that we would deny such a man food or medicine?

I do not believe we would do it. Even on the field of battle, when an enemy is shot down, and a medical officer of our military forces finds that man on the field of battle, he is healed if it is possible to heal him. Even the worst criminal in our prison is given medical care and food. People who have murdered their neighbors, who have violated every law of the country and of humanity are provided with food and with medicine.

Apparently a country finds itself in such desperate circumstances that it needs food, and is willing to pay for it. I am one Senator who is willing to sell it.

If we did not make such commotion about it, it might do us some good morally in the world. However, I suppose by the time we do sell the wheat—and I believe we will sell it—we will have insulted everyone who has any sense of social consciousness or any sense of decency, so that people will say it was nothing more or less than a cold-blooded business deal.

I do not care who the man is who is hungry or who the man is who is sick, or what his political ideology is. My religion tells me I should help him. I remember the story of the Good Samaritan. If I can say that my religious convictions and my faith demand of me that I help the needy and feed the hungry and heal the sick, I believe my normal instinct, my sense of decency, and my respect for human beings would indicate that if a man wants to buy food, we should sell it to him. If our country has at least normal or reasonable relationships with a country, we could very well give serious thought and favorable consideration to such an arrangement.

Surely we should do it, as long as we know that the policy that we presently are pursuing is ineffective. It is as ineffective as anything could be. Mark my words, if the Canadians should sell all of their wheat to the Russians—and they could very well do so—they could very well come to us to buy the wheat from us, and then they could sell it to

the Russians. The French had a bad crop this year. The French farmer did not produce a surplus this year. Normally France is an exporting country. Therefore France is buying wheat from the United States to sell to Russia. Of course, it is made into flour first. That permits the French to make a profit. It permits French citizens to profit under such an arrangement. It permits the people who have invested in flour mills to get some return on their investments. I am all for that. I would like to have it tried out on America for a change. I would like to see the flour mills in Minnesota, in Buffalo, N.Y., and in Texas, and in the west coast States of Washington, Oregon, and California, and the flour mills in every other part of our country have a chance to produce flour out of our wheat.

I do not take any special joy in knowing that we will have a bigger surplus this year than we had last year. I do not take any special joy in reading, occasionally, that much of the wheat was destroyed because of rodents or vermin, particularly when I know it could have saved lives, had we had a policy that permitted it, and particularly when I know that certain countries are willing to pay for it.

So I call to the attention of the Senate once again that while we argue and wonder what we ought to do—and this goes for the administration, too—while we wonder whether it is politically feasible and economically desirable to make a sale, our dear, good friends to the North, in Canada, make a sale and sign contracts, and our good friends in Australia make a sale and sign contracts. While Chancellor Adenauer chastises us for even thinking about a sale, for even contemplating a sale, his own people are doing a land office business with the Soviets. I say once again that I do not take issue with the fact that the Germans are doing a lucrative business in foodstuffs that they process, that the American farmer produces, and that the American taxpayer subsidizes. But I believe it would be a good idea if we considered the possibility of a more sensible, reasonable program of our own.

RECESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 9, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate, October 8 (legislative day of October 3), 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Douglas Henderson, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tourism in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I was personally proud and pleased that when the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, so wisely decided to create a small Subcommittee on Tourism within the Banking and Currency Committee that he saw fit to name this particular Representative from California to serve with the gentleman from Florida, Chairman CLAUDE PEPPER, and the gentleman from New Jersey, WILLIAM WIDNALL. I hope it is now well known that the 34th District which I represent is the home of one of the best known tourist attractions in the world—Disneyland. It is also widely known for the Knott's Berry Farm, a longtime tourist attraction of growing size and complexion, and a more recent addition, the Movieland Wax Museum. Orange County, Calif., has also enjoyed for years a wide renown for its beautiful beaches and the colorful and useful Newport-Balboa Harbor.

That such an area should be acutely aware of the economic potential within the fields of tourism and travel is clearly understandable. We know from firsthand and productive experience the economic advantages that come with the development of a product to meet people's demands for recreation and diversion within a society which is at the same time creating frustrating complexities and a scale of income sufficient to finance a short respite from the mundane demands of the daily grind.

Chairman PEPPER has called the tourist industry the "sleeping giant" of our economy; and he has chosen his descriptive phrase well and accurately. The potential for business expansion by encouraging the growth of tourism by both Americans and foreign visitors is truly great.

The President has recently announced a program of intra-America travel under the banner of "See the U.S.A." To prepare for a realization of the expectations of this new program, we must upgrade our travel accommodations, increase the number, the spectrum of choice, and the quality of living accommodations and above all learn how to become better hosts. By doing this for our own citizens we will be automatically building a more attractive product to merchandise abroad. It would be unfortunate if we gave the impression of the "Ugly American" in reverse because we failed to realize how important the role of the good host is in tourism.

The side benefits in the social, economic, and political facets of our lives by the healthy development of this industry of tourism are particularly impressive. Mr. Speaker, we hope to be able to bring to this House in the near future some of the positive fallout that can inure to our betterment from a dynamic, well-planned tourist program.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, Amercans this year are observing the 471st anniversary of the discovery of the Western Hemisphere by Christopher Columbus, the great Italian navigator.

We take great pride in Christopher Columbus, not only for his journey of exploration into uncharted seas, but also for his bravery and his courage associated with his discovery of America. Nearly five centuries have passed since that historic discovery which inaugurated a new era in human affairs. From that day on in 1492, civilization has made great strides forward on the road to human freedom and human achievements.

Columbus is often described as the great dreamer of his day. Surely he must have been dreaming not only of the physical shape of the world, but also of a world at peace and of a happy mankind, living in righteousness and justice. In the perspective of history, we see Columbus as a dedicated and religious man who inspired countless generations and will continue to inspire many generations to come, as long as America remains the symbol of liberty and moral leader of a free world.

On July 18, 1963, I introduced a bill which provides that October 12 of each year be recognized as a legal holiday for the whole Nation and that it is to be known as Columbus Day. I suggested, at that time, that this day be observed as a day of rededication of the American people to strive for the kind of world envisioned by Columbus, a world of peace and justice. I suggested also that it be a day of prayer for peace and a day to honor the achievements of this great Italian discoverer.

On October 12, Columbus Day, we join with our fellow Americans of Italian extraction in paying tribute to Christopher Columbus. We also take the opportunity on this occasion to express our pride and appreciation for the invaluable role which Italian-Americans have played in the growth and the upbuilding of our