service, and we are going to have it. If we can't have it any other way, we know what the alternative will be—Government owned and controlled—nationalization.

There are certain people in this country who would prefer that type of procedure and operation. I am one of those who do not. But I just do not believe that we have yet adequately tackled this problem of the real competitive spirit among modes of transportation to our greatest advantage.

The regulatory agencies which testified on the real controversial subject; that is, the minimum rate requirement, insisted that the problem be met by placing everyone under their jurisdiction. Their suggestion was to provide more regulation rather than to deregulate where possible and depend on competitive forces.

I am not sure with the experience that we have had in discriminations and accompanying advantages and disadvantages to some, that the farmers, the bulk commodity operators, and those who were given such exemption in the past, are going to sit idly by and see themselves brought under regulation.

I can give you an example, the poultry industry. We tried to do something about rolling back the situation 4 or 5 years ago. There was available unregulated transportation in certain of the areas for the transportation of poultry to the market. Yet had we approved the recommendation that the Commission and certain of the modes of transportation urged at that time, the rates in the poultry industry obviously would have been increased. We would have changed the poultry industry from their present locations today because of that.

The kind of transportation needed to haul chickens to the market could be made available without being regulated. We permitted it, and it has operated pretty well since. What was asked of us at that time was to bring them within regulation, which we did not do. Just that slight difference in the cost required under regulation would have completely rearranged the industry. It would not have remained as it is and as it has developed over the last several years.

There is no need for regulation for regulation's sake, and if shipping interests and the public can be protected, and if equality of treatment of the various modes of transportation can be provided with less regulation and greater reliance upon our American competitive system, perhaps our statutes today should be so changed.

This has been urged by the railroads, and in the hearings has been opposed by other modes of transportation. They express fear that this will lead to their being put out of business.

I certainly do not conceive that this will happen, and it will not happen. I just do not think it is sound practice for a government to pursue a course of maintaining a waterways program, of building and providing and maintaining highways for motor carriers, and then pursuing a course where they cannot be used. I certainly have not been working to get navigation on the Ouachita River in my area or on the Arkansas River, through the heart of our State, for the purpose of not utilizing it.

But, if in our consideration of proposed legislation we should be able to give equal opportunity to every mode of transportation to provide service to the public—which is the only reason for their existence—it seems to me at the same time we should provide some kind of opportunity for each community to have a semblance of transportation equality with other communities.

When we are talking of discrimination, we must talk also of discrimination between communities and sections of the country. It seems to me that it is impossible in a great Nation such as ours to continue with a system where there is so much discrimination in some places over others.

During the course of the hearings, I had numerous occasions to take up with various witnesses examples of rates which had come to my attention over past years. It has seemed to me that if the railroads could justify a rate from Greenville, Miss. to New Orleans, as being compensatory, it is just as logical that a similar rate should be applicable within a general area whether or not the community was on the river. For example, it seems logical to me that a similar rate would be compensatory from Jerome, Ark. to New Orleans.

I just do not think it sound policy to say to Greenville that you are entitled to a privilege brought on by the Government of the United States, and that the people of Jackson, Miss., or Marvell, Ark., within the same general area, are not. I think we must be just as interested in developing a policy where Hot Springs, Ark., is given the same treatment as far as rates are concerned as Little Rock and Camden.

Many areas have suffered tremendous setbacks because of rate discrimination which continues in substantial part as a result of the policy of the Government. I, for one, am seeking and listening for suggestions that will mitigate this problem, even though some progress has been made over the years. I think that water carriers and motor carriers and railroad carriers must come to grips with this problem.

So far as I am concerned, I am not going to keep working, appropriating funds and building up opportunities and privileges for one area and let the other area within several miles of it suffer because they do not have the same transportation opportunities.

In this connection, while disappointed with the answers of some industry spokesmen, I was extremely gratified with the testimony of Mr. D. W. Brosnam, president of the Southern Railway, who assured us that his company "is determined to give every inland town the rate advantages now enjoyed by waterway ports"; and by that of Mr. Jervis Landon, Jr., president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, who stated that the B. & O. had exactly the same policy.

It has come to the point where under the principle of regulation there has been so much discrimination against some places over others, that it well may be the time for us to try some further adjustment to see whether this might be corrected.

I want to compliment the President of the United States, his administration, and the Secretary of Commerce for putting up the big challenge which they have issued to the transportation industry, to the regulatory agencies, and to the Congress. This challenge is that of progress in the field of legislation, progress in attaining a regulatory scheme that will meet the requirements of today's and tomorrow's transportation system. I, for one, am ready to try to meet the challenge and see if we can devise some kind of method that would improve and strengthen the soundness of our common carrier situation; and at the same time provide the transportation service to the people who are entitled to have it—for don't ever overlook it—they are going to insist on it—if they can't get it one way, they're going to get it another.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 15, 1963)

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

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, D.D., Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, before whom nations rise and fall, grant us now the grace to be still and to know that Thou art God. Thou art the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob. Thou art, too, the God of Washington, of Lincoln, and of the Unknown Soldier. Hear us, our fathers' God, and bestow wisdom to confront the massive duties of this day.

Grant that minds may be so open to Thy truth, wills so dedicated to the power that hath made and preserved us a nation, that these chosen servants of Thine—and of the people—may be privileged to strengthen all forces of righteousness and justice and good will at home and across all frontiers of race or class or other diversity.

May the decisions of these high hours, then, be made in the light of Thy countenance, and for the good of all Thy children. Grant that what is done here this day may help America build a thoroughfare for freedom across the wilderness of global tension and terror.

So may the words of our mouths, and even the meditations of our hearts, be acceptable in Thy sight, we pray.

In the Name of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 16, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 16, 1963:

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; and

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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.

On October 17, 1963:

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.; 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.

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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7195) to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) to print additional copies of the hearings on the nuclear test ban treaty for the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 7544. An act to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes;

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

H.J. Res. 724. Joint resolution to provide additional housing for the elderly.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a short morning hour, not to exceed 15 minutes, during which resolutions may be submitted, bills may be introduced, and statements not to exceed 3 minutes in length may be made by Senators, and that the morning hour be limited to those.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee was authorized to meet until 1 o'clock during the session of the Senate today, and also to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

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

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

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

The nominations are as follows:

Russell A. Serenberg, Jr., and sundry other persons, for promotion in the U.S. Coast Guard.

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

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, to be Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of general for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of January 1964.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should not wish to see this appointment acted on without noting my personal pleasure to joining in the confirmation. It is a source of particular pride to me, as a former marine—a service which elevated me from the rank of private to the distinction of private first class, a rank which I like to think that I still hold, at least on an honorary basis. The experience as a marine, both at the time and in the years of remaining a marine in retrospect, have meant a great deal to me, in my personal development and in my concepts of the essential place of defense in the enduring structure of the Nation.

Gen. Wallace M. Greene will occupy one of the most honorable and exacting positions in the Government of the United States. It is one that requires the utmost of any man, in character, in self-discipline, and in dedication to the Nation. He succeeds, as Commandant, Gen. David Shoup, who had these characteristics in abundant measure; and he succeeds a long line of illustrious citizens who have served the Nation with great honor and with immense credit to the spirit of the Marine Corps.

In succeeding General Shoup, he succeeds a marines' marine, a man who has brought added distinction to the office which he has occupied for so many years, in his dedication to the corps and to the Nation, in his disciplined response to every responsibility assigned him, he was the personification of the history of the marines. General Shoup is a man who I am sorry to see retire as Commandant of the Marine Corps, and a man whom I hope the Government will use in the years ahead, because of his many abilities, his high patriotism, and his great integrity. I have every confidence that with the appointment of General Greene as Commandant, as successor to General Shoup, the Marine Corps continues in the best possible hands. I congratulate General Greene, and wish him well in his new and towering responsibilities.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it was my privilege to be present during the hearings on the nomination of General Greene to be Commandant of the Marine Corps; and I concur in the remarks of the majority leader about this able soldier. His record is in keeping with the traditions of the Marine Corps and the military service of the United States. I believe he will be an able successor to General Shoup, who has established such a high degree of efficiency in the corps. I am very happy that this body has today acted favorably on this nomination.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I think everyone acquainted with the Congressional Medal of Honor holder who has been the leader of the U.S. Marine Corps is prompted to arise and to salute him when he comes into view. I do not know him well enough to call him what his friends call him—"Uncle David"; but I have the pleasure of knowing him well enough to know that Gen. David Shoup is a great American patriot and a great military leader, supremely qualified for the tasks he has so eminently discharged during the time he has served his country as Commandant of the Marine Corps. And we do salute him as he draws near the conclusion of his tour of duty.

Surely, therefore, all of us must now concur in the sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from Montana

[Mr. MANSFIELD] and the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] when we pay our highest respects to both General Shoup and his successor, General Greene, who has served as General Shoup's assistant; and I am glad to join in extending every good wish for a successful career to General Greene, an outstanding officer, in his new responsibilities as Commandant of the great and gallant Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE SENATOR KEFAUVER, OF TENNESSEE, ON OCTOBER 24

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 216) was read as follows:

Resolved, That on Thursday, October 24, 1963, at 2 o'clock postmeridian, the legislative business of the Senate be suspended to permit the delivery of memorial addresses on the life, character, and public service of Hon. Estes Kefauver, late a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM—PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Local Union No. 15, International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America—UAW, of Detroit, Mich., signed by Ernest C. Dillard, recording secretary, favoring the enactment of the President's civil rights program; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H.R. 641. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling and deferring certain irrigation charges, eliminating certain tracts of non-Indian-owned land under the Wapato Indian irrigation project, Washington, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 563).

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

H.R. 4588. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Mojave B Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, Calif., for defense purposes (Rept. No. 564).

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

S. 1584. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the Newton Water Users' Association, Utah, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 566); and

S. 1687. A bill to approve the January 1963 reclassification of land of the Big Flat unit of the Missoula Valley project, Montana, and to authorize the modification of the repayment contract with the Big Flat Irrigation District (Rept. No. 565).

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

S. 1299. A bill to defer certain operation and maintenance charges of the Eden Valley Irrigation and Drainage District (Rept. No. 567).

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

S. 1243. A bill to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 570).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

H.R. 75. An act to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases (Rept. No. 569).

TRANSPORTATION OF LUMBER—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 568)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 2100) to continue certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber, and I submit a report thereon, together with minority views of Senators BEALL and THURMOND.

I ask that the report be printed, together with the minority views.

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

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2242. A bill for the relief of Livia Sernini (Cucciati); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 2243. A bill for the relief of Clarence C. and Lucy W. Russell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. ERVIN):

S. 2244. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 2245. A bill for the relief of the town of Weare, N.H.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON (by request):

S. 2246. A bill to extend the benefits of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. JORDAN of Idaho):

S. 2247. A bill to require that Irish potatoes sold or shipped in interstate commerce be labeled as to State of origin; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

RESOLUTION

EULOGIES ON THE LATE SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 216) providing for eulogies on the late Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee, which was considered and agreed to.

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

TOWN OF WEARE, N.H.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, on July 25, 1963, the fire company of the town of Weare, N.H., extinguished a forest fire on land under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers. I introduce a bill for the relief of the town, which paid the fire company for these services. Problems affecting local services on Government lands would be eased substantially by the passage of S. 815, now before the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

This bill would cede jurisdiction over such lands back to the States on such questions as service of process, voting rights of residents, personal property taxes, and the duties of local governments. Until this knotted tangle of intergovernmental relations can be untied, claim bills such as the one I am introducing today will be necessary if fairness is to be observed.

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

The bill (S. 2245) for the relief of the town of Weare, N.H., introduced by Mr. McINTYRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LABELING OF IRISH POTATOES SHIPPED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Idaho [Mr.

JORDAN], who is absent, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by him in connection with the bill I am introducing in his behalf.

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

The bill (S. 2247) to require that Irish potatoes sold or shipped in interstate commerce be labeled as to State of origin, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. JORDAN of Idaho), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The statement of Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, presented by Mr. DIRKSEN, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JORDAN OF IDAHO

The bill is of extreme importance to my State of Idaho. Our potatoes are known throughout the whole country as potatoes which are different from all others. Why is this true? Without going into great detail, I will explain as follows: The great potato fields of Idaho are, for the most part, in the Snake River Valley. There the soil is volcanic ash, rich in nitrogen. Until irrigation came to this section of the country, little was grown in this soil. Now, however, this is practically all potato country—Idaho potato country. And it is no fable that a potato of just as high a quality grown anywhere else in the country will not be like an Idaho potato.

When potatoes are planted, which I am sure many of you know, old potatoes are cut up so that each piece has at least one eye. These pieces with the eyes are then planted and the new potato plants will grow from them. You could literally take an Idaho russet, cut it up in pieces—each with an eye—and plant half of the pieces in the potato country in Idaho and the other half of the pieces back here in the East, and the plants that grow from the two different groups of pieces would produce potatoes which would taste differently. That would be true even if all other growing conditions were equal—cultivation, irrigation, and so forth. The substances in the soils would make the difference. A true Idaho potato cannot be grown anywhere but in the type soil that is found in the State of Idaho and in one county in the State of Oregon.

We in Idaho have capitalized on this one fact. Our success in past years with growing and merchandising Idaho russet potatoes has been the envy of all potato producing areas. We have, through untiring efforts and the expenditure of innumerable dollars, produced and sold a quality potato, a premium potato, and a different potato—and it is known as an Idaho potato. Because of our belief in the quality of the potato we produce and market, we have consistently opposed legislation to provide acreage allotment controls for potatoes; we have consistently refused to sacrifice quality for quantity; and we have consistently put our faith in the demands and the preference of the consumer for a quality product.

But, although it has been the people of Idaho who have invested their time, money, and efforts into building up the reputation of the quality Idaho potato, people in other areas many times have benefited just as much from Idaho's efforts. That is because they in other areas sell their potatoes as "Idaho potatoes" when they are not.

Often this is the case. When you have a quality product, inferior imitations soon enter the market place. Some even lend greater credulity and strength to the quality product. But such has not been the case so far as the Idaho potato is concerned. In this situation, competition and imitation have taken the form of misrepresentations and fraud; and as a consequence, the Idaho potato market has suffered.

It is impossible to enter any market in this country today to buy an Idaho potato and be certain that you are getting an Idaho potato—even though the bag may be clearly marked, "Idaho," or, "grown in Idaho." Housewives do not like this; I do not like this; and most definitely the people of Idaho do not like this.

In the past years it has become common practice to put inferior potatoes grown elsewhere into plastic bags clearly marked that the potatoes were grown in Idaho. That increases the profit margin of the potatoes being sold. Some producer somewhere else in the country, by deceit and fraud, is reaping part of the benefits brought about by the hard work and the devotion to quality of the potato growers in the State of Idaho. In addition, such a misrepresentation has a twofold effect on my State's tubers—it degrades the high quality of our potatoes, and it cuts appreciably into the sales of our potatoes.

There are now laws on the statute books which do make some attempt to prohibit this misrepresentation. But for every bag, every potato that is found to be mislabeled, hundreds, even thousands more go undetected.

At the request of the Idaho potato industry, I gladly join in sponsoring with the senior Senator from Idaho this bill which will effectively outlaw such reprehensible practices. The purpose of the bill is simple: It requires only that all potatoes be labeled as to the State of origin. It is hoped that such labeling will totally eliminate any and all misrepresentations to the buying public.

This bill has the endorsement of the entire potato industry of Idaho, and has been thoroughly examined and approved by the Idaho Potato and Onion Commission. It is a bill which has been the subject of many meetings and of every possible consideration. Frankly, it also has the endorsement of most of the other major potato-producing States, for it is equally important to them that the potato industry as a whole should not fall into disrepute with the consuming public.

Since a new crop of quality Idaho potatoes will soon be harvested, it is my hope that this bill will receive the earliest possible consideration.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 17, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 123) to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of "Senate Procedure" and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT SUPPORTS CASTRO GOVERNMENT SUIT IN INCREDIBLE BRIEF

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the difficulty in pursuing effective economic measures against the Castro regime is illustrated in a unique manner by a brief recently filed in the Supreme Court by the Department of Justice.

In this brief, the Department of Justice joins on the side of a Castro-owned bank in Cuba, the Banco Nacional, to defeat the claims of a U.S. company for the proceeds from the sale of sugar seized by the Castro regime without the payment of any compensation to the original American owners of the sugar.

It is conceded that the seizure of the sugar by the Castro regime, like its other nationalization decrees against American-owned property, violated international law. Nevertheless, the Department of Justice, joined by a minor official of the Department of State, has filed a brief urging the Supreme Court to overturn two lower court decisions dismissing the claim of the Cuban bank.

Stripped of legal technicalities, what is happening in this case is that the U.S. Government has joined a Castro agency in a Federal court action to block payment to an American firm for the value of the American-owned sugar unlawfully seized by the Castro regime. That is exactly the state of facts.

I am sure that this will strike many as an incredible situation. When reports of this case first came to my attention I was certain that the situation had been exaggerated, if not misunderstood, and asked the Solicitor General to send me a copy of the brief. That brief, to my utter dismay, fully confirmed the allegations with respect to the position of the Department of Justice.

It is my consistent practice to refrain from commenting on the merits of cases in litigation and I do not intend to discuss the merits of the dispute involved in this case. But the United States is not a party to the suit and its action in this litigation from the point of view of our international relations certainly is an appropriate subject for public comment and consideration.

Mr. President, I still cannot bring myself to believe that responsible officials of the Department of State are aware of the position taken by the Government lawyers in this suit and I am encouraged by the fact that the highest ranking State Department official whose name appears on the brief is merely an Assistant Legal Adviser for Economic Affairs. Indeed there are indications in the brief that even the Department's Legal Adviser opposed any intervention by the United States in the litigation and the U.S. Court of Appeals, in upholding a dismissal of the Banco Nacional's complaint, appears to have relied on the Legal Adviser's position in reaching the decision that the Castro government's action violated international law.

There have been encouraging signs in recent months of determined U.S. efforts to bring effective economic pressures against the Castro regime, such as I have proposed on many occasions. Yet the brief in this case actually suggests that one general consideration for refraining from striking down the Castro government's nationalization decree under principles of international law is that it would "prove seriously offensive to, and injure relations with, the acting foreign state." How any official of our Government at this stage in history can suggest such a rationale for upholding Castro's discriminatory and retaliatory measures against Americans with property interest in Cuba defies understanding. Certainly such statements cannot be squared with our avowed determination to isolate Castro politically and eco-

nomically from the rest of the Western Hemisphere.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, until it is conclusively shown to the contrary, I shall construe this brief as an unfortunate bureaucratic error reflecting not a change in U.S. policy but the difficulties of coordinating policy in the executive branch. However, this experience should lead to new steps by the Department of State to make certain that every affected agency of the Government adheres to the State Department's foreign policy views in carrying out its responsibilities.

I am hopeful, that this matter will be reviewed by the Secretary of State now that attention has been called to the Government's brief. The Solicitor General is a man of considerable legal ability, but certainly, the foreign policy considerations involved in dealing with such claims by the Castro government should be determined by the Secretary of State and not by the Department of Justice.

TITO

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, through the years a great deal of our taxpayers' money has gone to Tito's Yugoslavia. Many Americans wonder why we have given such aid and how it has been used.

The facts are that from 1946 to 1951 total economic aid to Yugoslavia was $298 million. There was no military aid. At that time conditions were desperate within Yugoslavia, as they were elsewhere in war-torn Europe. American assistance was given to prevent starvation, disease and disaster. During those years Harry S. Truman was President of the United States.

However, during President Eisenhower's administration, surprisingly enough, under his so-called mutual security program, from 1953 to 1960 we Americans paid out economic aid to Yugoslavia amounting to $899 million. We also paid out in those years military aid amounting to $647 million. This total is startling.

Mr. President, I am pleased that under President Kennedy we are truthfully terming the program "foreign assistance" and not disguising it as "mutual security," as was done during the Eisenhower administration.

The total appropriation throughout the Kennedy administration for the years to date is $230 million in economic assistance to Yugoslavia. No military assistance whatsoever has been given. This is a great reduction from the military and economic handout of the Eisenhower years. However, it is quite likely that for the coming year strong protests will be heard in the Congress against any further economic assistance to Tito. Of course, there will be similar opposition to any military aid whatever, if any is contemplated, and, Mr. President, I do not believe that any will be contemplated.

We have given aid to Tito and his nation largely for the reason, I believe, that, in the words of John Gunther, in his great book "Inside Europe Today," "Tito's Yugoslavia is not a Soviet satellite. Tito is a nationalist Communist." Nevertheless, we should let him go his own way to communism. Whatever the prefix—nationalist Communist, Soviet Communist, Chinese Communist—the end result would be somewhat the same.

THE PROPOSED TAX REDUCTION

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, for some time we have heard constant urging from the administration that passage of its tax bill be accelerated, moved at the present session of Congress, and, if possible, completed in the present calendar year. We have heard constantly that such action would stimulate the economy, and that over a period of time additional revenue would be brought in.

A number of us have felt that although the tax bill is something that everyone in the United States urgently needs in order to promote the economy and in order to give some relief from the high cost of living, nevertheless, the cut must be restricted by a voluntary or statutory restriction on Federal spending. That theory has been based upon the fact that we cannot spend ourselves rich. We cannot continue to pile up deficits as we have been doing and as we are now planning to do for the next 4 fiscal years.

Recently I received a letter from a constituent whom I do not know well, but of whom I know. I thought that the letter so graphically pictured what the average citizen believes about Federal Government spending and taxes, that it would be worth while to comment on the letter for the benefit of all my colleagues.

A portion of the letter is worth reading. The portion is as follows:

> Now, at the cost of many hundreds of hours of hard physical labor, the house has been brought up to the neighborhood standard, the mortgage no longer exists and the improvements were paid for, cash on the barrelhead. Real estate taxes maintain our housing; our other expenses are normal. We need a better car; our 1951 model is not to be trusted out of town. The business truck is a 1952 model. Our gripe is this: from one quarterly payment to another, we make no gain or so little that we feel we're making no headway. I realize we've spent cash—good hard money—on improvements, but we strongly feel it's time our Federal Government learned to economize. We want to save some money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Presiding Officer. I continue to read:

> No one begrudges the necessary governmental expenses, but the waste is appalling to people who have to figure constantly—would it be better to spend $10 this way or that. Darn few of us are going hungry, but few of us are able to do much but maintain, much less build for the future. What in the world can we do about it? Has it reached the point where control has left our hands? We hear "the Government has decided"—"Washington announced" and "they are going to give us the money to—" and then I rebel. That's our money, sent to Washington, where a good big chunk is bitten out, and the rest allotted here and there. It's like spending the baby's silver dollars and stuffing his mouth with candy so he won't cry. Isn't there some way to make the people conscious of what they are paying for the services they get? We need a good press agent on our side.

Mr. President, because I believe the letter is so outstanding I would much appreciate having unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD at this point.

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

ARVADA, COLO.,
September 13, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR DOMINICK: I met Mrs. Dominick and you at a coffee given at Mrs. Roger Benjamin's when you were running for the House of Representatives. I remember talking very briefly with Mrs. Dominick about housing and the climate around Washington, because we have lived in Falls Church. I must say that the group of us at Mrs. Benjamin's were very much "taken" with both of you. Evidently we weren't alone, looking back at the way your two campaigns have worked out.

My husband is in business for himself, as a general contractor; he says he's a glorified wood butcher. Our concern and the reason for this letter is to ask if there is any relief in sight, as far as income taxes are concerned. We do not pay our taxes as a salaried employee does, as you know. Ours are paid quarterly and it hurts every time. The withholding device that employers must use leaves the great majority of people with no conception of the percentage of their money they never see. Arvada is being called Denver's bedroom, you know, and this pattern is so strong; a small equity scraped together for a house, large payments which, of course, go mostly for interest, a car payment becaues public transportation is poor out this way and people prefer to drive anyway, a second jalopy so Mother can haul the kids to the pool and the groceries home, utilities paid, and then squeeze from paycheck to paycheck to buy the groceries, clothing and odd bits of fluff that make life worth living. If they miss one paycheck it's a tragedy, too, and they're forced to borrow more, and they may lose the house. They are never able to build up a cushion for emergencies.

And that's the point of this letter—neither are we. Before we bought a house we took into consideration my husbands's special capabilities and bought an old rundown house in a convenient neighborhood. We paid $7,500 for it, gave the realtor $4,000 and arranged a mortgage for the balance. Now, at the cost of many hundreds of hours of hard physical labor, the house has been brought up to the neighborhood standard, the mortgage no longer exists and the improvements were paid for, cash on the barrelhead. Real estate taxes maintain our housing; our other expenses are normal. We need a better car; our 1951 model is not to be trusted out of town. The business truck is a 1952 model. Our gripe is this: from one quarterly payment to another, we make no gain or so little that we feel we're making no headway. I realize we've spent cash—good hard money—on improvements, but we strongly feel it's time our Federal Government learned to economize. We want to save some money. No one begrudges the necessary governmental expenses, but the waste is appalling to people who have to figure constantly—would it be better to

spend $10 this way or that. Darn few of us are going hungry, but few of us are able to do much but maintain, much less build for the future. What in the world can we do about it? Has it reached the point where control has left our hands? We hear "the Government has decided"—"Washington announced" and "they are going to give us the money to—" and then I rebel. That's our money, sent to Washington, where a good big chunk is bitten out, and the rest allotted here and there. It's like spending the baby's silver dollars and stuffing his mouth with candy so he won't cry. Isn't there some way to make the people concious of what they are paying for the services they get? We need a good press agent on our side.

Well, that's enough steam let off for today. We haven't had a vacation for some time and won't until we can pay cash for a different car—I won't say new car. Someday we'd like to go to Sweden and see where my grandparents came from—our Vice President and his family made it—why can't we? I may have to work in the laundry or wait tables all the way over and back, but what do you bet we do it? My mother is 70 and in Seattle, and it makes me mad that it would have to be an emergency before we could go out to see her.

I'm going to call someone today and volunteer my services for the next election.

Sincerely,

HELENE C. RIX
Mrs. Robert W. Rix.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, during the course of the 20th century we have witnessed triumph after triumph scored by the common man in his great march toward equality, dignity, justice, and respect.

He has been in the forefront of sweeping economic and political revolutions the world over. His status as an individual has changed. His institutions have been altered and new ones created.

Our own Nation has been swept along by the force of this movement for equal status, and today we are witnessing an upheaval of profound proportions in America.

These are times in which the Nation and Congress are deeply committed to a full review of our practices and laws affecting our fellow citizens of many different races, guaranteeing all Americans their birthright to equal job opportunity, equal access to public facilities, equal voting rights, equal rights to be educated, equal rights to decent housing.

These are times in which the Nation and Congress should move to wipe out racial barriers against citizens of other lands written into our immigration laws and policies.

These are times in which every American should rededicate himself to the principle on which our Republic was founded, that all men are created equal, and are indeed equal in the eyes of the law which guarantees:

The right to be secure in our persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures;

The right to be protected against double jeopardy, and the right to protection against being deprived of life, liberty, and property without due process of law;

The right to a speedy trial, the right to trial by jury, and the right to counsel.

The distinguished president of the University of Hawaii, Dr. Thomas Hale Hamilton, recently read a very brilliant, learned, and philosophically oriented paper to the Club 15 of Honolulu, an organization of outstanding community leaders.

In his paper Dr. Hamilton rightly points out:

> We [Americans] have certainly achieved substantial progress toward the 19th century concept of equality before the law, equality of access to the suffrage, and equality of opportunity. And, while the distinctively American interpretation of the doctrine never postulated absolute economic equality, it has always been recognized that the presence of great economic imbalance is not conducive to the health of a democratic society.

At the same time, Dr. Hamilton raises a very timely question for all Americans to ponder. He says:

> As a great force interested in the common man, in the development of the common good based upon a fundamental recognition of the equality of all, we seem in the eyes of many to have grown old and tired, unable or unwilling to make the doctrine work in our own land and, therefore, setting small example. Is it possible that we have become too sophisticated, in the bad sense of that term, for our own good?

In assaying the full range of America's role in the common man's drive for equality, Dr. Hamilton concludes, and I agree, that the Nation's intellectual leaders have a vital function. He writes:

> Perhaps the time has come for scholars to reexamine the doctrine of equality in terms that are meaningful in these times. And more effective action might well be taken to assure that our domestic actions square with our premises.

We will have to recognize the inherently moral validity of the ideal of equality, and we will have to be willing to practice it. These, as Dr. Hamilton points out, are a "necessary precondition to the exercise of ideological leadership in a troubled world."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a condensation of the paper by Dr. Thomas Hale Hamilton, entitled "Is America Too Smug for Equality?" published in the September 25, 1963, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

IS AMERICA TOO SMUG FOR EQUALITY?

(By Dr. Thomas Hale Hamilton)

The doctrine of equality is in many ways a difficult one to defend because, at the observable level, it is so patently untrue. Men are not very much alike, and certainly are not equal in size, in intelligence, in comeliness, in wit, or in grace. To the empiricist, inequality appears to be a more substantial doctrine than its opposite number.

For this reason, one is not too surprised, in reading the literature of the early periods of our development, by the pronouncements of those who totally reject the doctrine of equality.

The Boston jurist, Judge Peter Thacher, was voicing the thoughts of many of his contemporaries when he said, "The diversity of poverty and riches is the order of Providence. Why are not all the flowers of the field equally beautiful and fragrant? Why are not all the fruits of the earth equally rich and wholesome? And why towers the oak in grandeur to heaven, while the shrub at its base is trodded under feet?"

The difficulty, of course, is that, while a democratic society cannot live without the doctrine of equality, rational man has difficulty living with it. If the political process is to accord the same rights to individuals, then logic demands that it rationalize an element of sameness which will justify the according of equal rights.

Similarly, if justice is the equal treatment of equals, one must discover a shared characteristic among men sufficiently plausible to provide an intellectual base to substantiate a minimum of identical treatment.

It is, of course, true that over the years the doctrine of equality has been a most difficult one with which we as a society have had to cope. The fact that it is a necessary presupposition to our way of life irritates many of us even when we refuse to recognize the source of our irritation.

Without question, it created something of a program for the Fathers of our Nation. The switch in emphasis from the Declaration of Independence to the Federal Constitution constitutes a long journey even though but 13 years in point of time.

As T. V. Smith has pointed out, "Equality as a group claim to be made good against a foreign and opposing group is one problem; equality as a principle of reconstruction within the group, quite another."

Over the past 100 years we have seen advanced various arguments, both old and new, as to the validity of the statement of human equality.

It has not been uncommon to support the doctrine of equality on the basis of a belief in man's immortal soul. This belief, in effect, renders all men equal in the eyes of God.

However, metaphysical equality need have no very direct political or social implications. That is to say, it is perfectly consistent within this precept to foster the grossest social and political inequality in this world by relegating the requirements of equality to the next. The feudalism of the Middle Ages clearly demonstrates how easily these apparent paradoxes can be reconciled.

That men possess a basic similarity has also been testified to by those who defend the doctrine of equality through a theory of uniqueness. Men are equal because they belong to a species which is unique.

This argument has had at least two facets. There are those who would defend the doctrine on the basis of man's unique rationality. While originally a Stoic position, this approach has also been adopted by later philosophers, notably Kant, who held that the uniqueness of the species primarily rests in the fact that men are moral beings and therefore infinite.

In their infinity lies their uniqueness and in their uniqueness lies their claim to equality.

The utilitarians also had to come to grips with this doctrine and did so by resorting to psychology, asserting that all men share a common susceptibility to the pleasure-pain principle and, therefore, each must count for one and no more than one.

Undoubtedly the most significant 19th century view relating to the concept of equality, and the position which ultimately attracted the greatest number of adherents was that which postulated that equality was not a fact but an ideal; that, while it could not be empirically demonstrated that all men were naturally equal in any respect, they ought to be treated as if they were, particularly in three connections: before the law, in access to the suffrage, and in social opportunity.

The 20th century, too, has introduced a new approach (although it contains old elements) in what might be called the pragmatic functional. In essence, this view sug-

gests that since the results are better if men are treated as though they were equal, it is therefore true that they are.

This position has been well summarized by T. V. Smith in the following terms:

"The truth of any assertion regarding dynamic individuals depends partly upon the results of the assertion itself.

"The claim that individuals are equal is true if it functions truly; and this will be determined by the efficiency with which the claim promotes the major good of the situation that motivates the claim.

"This looking to the fruits of the claim for its truth value is here called functional equality. We have already seen some reasons, and shall yet see more, for believing that even in early America those who used the term 'equality' had vaguely glimpsed the fact that its truth value lay ahead, in the consequences of their asserting it."

RATIONAL UNIQUENESS

I am sure that you recognize that I have not done what I set out to do (nor did I really hope to) which was to establish to the satisfaction of all the truth of the proposition that men are equal in some distinct way. This does not disappoint me, for in the nature of the matter which we are discussing, approximate proof is all that can be expected.

I would suggest, however, particularly when one combines the theory of rational uniqueness with that of functional equality, that the concept of equality has been sufficiently established as to warrant acting upon it.

But, in assuming the truth of the doctrine, we have yet to consider its usefulness as a principle of social reconstruction.

In this regard, one can either be very proud or very unhappy with the record which our young society has made. To be optimistic for a moment, we have certainly achieved substantial progress toward the 19th century concept of equality before the law, equality of access to the suffrage, and equality of opportunity.

And, while the distinctively American interpretation of the doctrine never postulated absolute economic equality, it has always been recognized that the presence of great economic imbalance is not conducive to the health of a democratic society.

In this connection, over time, it would appear that we have markedly enlarged our middle income groups and decreased, proportionately, the groups at both extremes.

But, having said this, we should immediately point out that in many parts of the Nation, affecting large numbers of our citizens, we have not achieved equality before the law or equality in access to suffrage or equality of opportunity. Our failure in this regard, while largely concentrated in the southern United States, is still, to some degree, prevalent in all sections of the Nation, and this is especially true of our failure to provide equal opportunity to learn.

In spite of these caveats, there are many who maintain that we nevertheless have made great progress. This is partially true, of course, but I would guess that it is less than convincing in some quarters of the globe.

Under the force of dynamic change, notably in the so-called underdeveloped nations, there is, perhaps unfortunately, little concern for historical perspective. The extent of our progress, as measured against the closed, hierarchical society of the early 18th century, is less impressive to those nations than the fact that in contemporary America there are still great gaps between our ideals and our performance.

While we have an inherent and controlling obligation to remove the existing semblance of inequality in our society, we certainly could justify doing so simply in terms of the impact this would have on our image throughout the world.

REVOLUTIONARY SYMBOLS

I think we must become deeply concerned about one notable characteristic of the social change that has taken place since World War II. In the 19th century, as new democratic governments came into being in nations previously governed by tyranny, the symbols which frequently moved indigenous leaders to act—which, in effect, sparked the change—were those that had been developed in revolutionary America by our own founding fathers.

In what might be called the underdeveloped nations of that period the Declaration of Independence was a moving force, consciously referred to as a great doctrine which outlined the nature of democratic government.

But this, I think, has not been true in the 20th century, and certainly not since World War II. The revolutions of our day have been moved, I believe, more by Marxist ideology, whether explicitly or implicitly, than by the ideology of the United States.

As a great force interested in the common man, in the development of the common good based upon a fundamental recognition of the equality of all, we seem in the eyes of many to have grown old and tired, unable or unwilling to make the doctrine work in our own land and, therefore, setting small example.

On the contrary, our diplomacy has, from time to time, placed us uncomfortably on the side of those who seem to stand in opposition to the very values which we purport to hold.

While the causes of this shift are many and complex, I should like to suggest one. Is it possible that we have become too sophisticated, in the bad sense of that term, for our own good?

In this connection, I should like to quote from an excellent syllabus which was developed for a seminar on the American political tradition held some 3 years ago.

The author of this syllabus observes that "the analysis of politics has turned in a direction completely alien, to all appearances, to that of the early American past. Instead of the terms 'rights,' 'equality,' 'law,' 'freedom,' we find 'influence,' 'power,' 'elite,' 'legitimacy,' 'class.' "

These latter terms I would contend, whatever may be their analytical value—and I recognize it is considerable—are not the terms that incite men in devotion to a cause.

Is it possible that our social sciences have become too descriptive, too reluctant to deal with values? Is our ideology less effective in the contemporary world than it was in the 19th century because, relatively speaking, we have devoted less and less attention to it while the Marxists have devoted more and more to theirs?

Of course, in a free society and within a tradition of academic freedom it is important that we not attempt to marshal the forces of scholarship ostensibly to serve a national purpose. This, to my mind, would mark the end of free scholarship.

RETURN TO VALUES

But I cannot help but wish that more of our young social scientists would once again turn their energies to the normative rather than the descriptive, to the value system by which we live, not only in terms of trying to analyze its logic, its consistency, its origin, but also with regard to its implications for action and the techniques by which action can effectively implement values.

Quoting again from the syllabus, "It is plain, however, that piety is not a sufficient ground for sustaining the American political tradition in the present world." An approach which stops solely with an abstract concern for values will be of little help.

The question is, I think, of considerable importance. I recognize in some of our younger social scientists a kind of developing lack of interest in anyone who is concerned with things which cannot be measured in fairly traditional terms. When I expressed to one of these men, not so many years ago, my admiration for some of the insights of Thorstein Veblen, I was told that Veblen was, by modern standards, a plumber.

Perhaps so, but at least he did not refuse to deal with important problems simply because they were difficult of measurement.

(Perhaps the time has come for scholars to reexamine the doctrine of equality in terms that are meaningful in these times. And more effective action might well be taken to assure that our domestic actions square with our premises. But, most difficult of all, he concludes, we must convince ourselves and others that, if men are equal, their equality can no more properly be limited by national boundaries and ideologies than by condition of color or religious convictions. Such an approach will mean, I believe, extraordinary changes not only in national policy, but in the law which governs international conduct.)

It is an approach that may make very uncomfortable those of us who now hold ourselves, in Orwell's phrase, "more equal than others," but a recognition of the validity of the proposition and a willingness to act on it is, I am sure, a necessary condition to the exercise of ideological leadership in a troubled world.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in connection with the march of the American Negro common man toward equality, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin recently pointed to an intriguing theory advanced by the well-known and highly esteemed American semanticist, Dr. S. I. Hayakawa.

Dr. Hayakawa's theory postulates a correlation between our television commercials and the American Negro revolution.

The Star-Bulletin editorial, appearing in the edition of October 8, 1963, reads in relevant part:

DR. HAYAKAWA RIDES AGAIN

Television's commercials, which have been kicked from pillar to post by almost everybody, may yet be acclaimed in history as the mainspring of the biggest domestic event of our time, the Negro revolution.

That's the probability that now arises from the latest public comments by Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, the San Francisco State College professor, who's very well known in Hawaii and whose activities range from a high place among America's semanticists to a hero's role among those who are fighting the numbers battle against California's Bell Telephone System.

Dr. Hayakawa believes that the seeds of the Negro demands for greater equality in all phases of American life were sown by television commercials, where the big message is friendliness and equal treatment of all, both in the commercials as presented and in what Semanticist Hayawaka terms the "meta-message," which means simply the message between the lines.

Dr. Hayakawa told the American Psychological Association meeting in Philadelphia: "The televeision set says, to white and Negro alike, always in the friendliest tones, 'You are an American. You are entitled to eat, drink, and wear what other Americans eat, drink and wear. You are a member of our national community of Americans.' That is the meta message that comes to us night and day from the friendly announcers."

This message, Dr. Hayakawa says, has been felt most by Negro teenagers, who then go

out and discover that the Nation's isn't willing to live up to it.

"It is deeply significant," he points out, "that young people are at the heart of the current racial demonstrations."

Many TV programs themselves, aside from the commercials, want Americans to see themselves as people who won't let themselves be pushed around (as in the westerns). Dr. Hayakawa says that Negro young people "have learned that lesson, and will be pushed around no longer."

His analysis has the ring of plausibility. There certainly is some truth in it, even if TV commercials aren't as influential in the Negro revolution as he thinks.

Mr. President, Dr. Hayakawa, always one to provoke us into thinking, has given us a new slant on our civil rights crisis. I believe it is an idea worthy of our consideration.

PASSING OF WILLIAM R. CASTLE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, yesterday a final farewell was paid to a prominent son of Hawaii—William R. Castle, who served as Under Secretary of State and Ambassador to Japan during the Hoover administration. Death had claimed this distinguished diplomat here in Washington last Sunday, October 13.

Often referred to as the "diplomatic troubleshooter for President Hoover," Mr. Castle was known also as the leader of the "little Cabinet" comprised of Under Secretaries of the various Federal departments.

During his 14-year diplomatic career, he was regarded as one of the most effective members of the State Department because of his wide knowledge of international affairs combined with his special talent and tactfulness.

Born in Honolulu on June 19, 1878, he was the son of William Richards Castle, Sr., and Ida Beatrice Lowrey Castle. He was also the grandson of Samuel Northrup Castle, a founder of the long established Honolulu business firm of Castle & Cooke, who had arrived in the islands in 1837.

Educated at Punahou School in Honolulu, Mr. Castle went on to Harvard University where he was a founder of the college's Fox Club. His efforts in the writing field earned him the appointment as editor of the Harvard Graduates magazine.

Later, he wrote three books: "The Green Vase" about Boston society which shocked proper Bostonians for its constant jabs at the city's elite, "The Pillar of Sand" and "Wake Up America." In 1938 he wrote an article for National Geographic entitled "Hawaii, Then and Now," which attracted nationwide attention.

But Mr. Castle turned from literary endeavors because, as he told a newspaper reporter years afterward, "I felt that Government affairs were more interesting."

In 1919 he entered the Department of State as a special assistant and later was appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Western European Affairs and Under Secretary.

He became acting head of the U.S. Government for 1 day in August 1927. As President Coolidge, Vice President Dawes, and every member of the Cabinet was out of town, Mr. Castle, as senior member of the State Department, was Acting Chief Executive, although he took no action.

During his distinguished career with the Government, he is known to have enjoyed the special trust of President Hoover. In 1930 he was dispatched by President Hoover as his representative at the London Naval Conference which led to a treaty signed by the United States, Japan, and other nations which regulated submarine warfare.

Mr. Castle was sympathetic to the Japanese point of view and stated at the time that whatever disagreement may be at the London Conference, it was not likely to come from Japan as he was sure Japan stood ready to cooperate to the fullest degree in the reduction of armaments.

In 1931, he again represented the administration in international negotiations leading to the establishment of the 1-year moratorium on World War I debts and reparations. The Hoover proposal, aimed at alleviating world depression, was adopted following Mr. Castle's delicate negotiations with the French for 3 weeks.

An outspoken individual, Mr. Castle had fought against the Exclusion Act of 1924 which brought to a halt Japanese emigration to the United States. He opposed recognition of the Soviet Union holding that the Soviet Government and the Third Communist International, with its ultimate goal of worldwide communism, were one and the same and, therefore, an inciter to war. Also he was critical of the Roosevelt New Deal foreign policies which he claimed were responsible for the strained relations with Germany and Japan as World War II approached. He pleaded for strict neutrality and criticized U.S. aid to Britain at the start of the war.

We of Hawaii are indeed proud of his public service to our country. With his wife and his brother, Alfred, of Honolulu, we join in mourning the passing of a distinguished son of Hawaii and bid a fond aloha.

AIR FARES ACROSS THE NORTH ATLANTIC

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a recessed meeting of great importance to the traveling public of the United States will resume in Salzburg, Austria, next Tuesday, October 22. That is when representatives of 18 North Atlantic carriers, who are members of IATA, the International Air Transport Association, will go back into session and attempt to resolve the complex problem of air fares across the North Atlantic.

You will recall, Mr. President, that Pan American World Airways and its far seeing president, Mr. Juan T. Trippe, have long championed the cause of the financially-average American traveler by seeking to bring about a continuing reduction in air fares.

It is a pleasure for the Maryland congressional delegation to follow keenly Mr. Trippe's activities in the field of air transportation inasmuch as he spent most of his youth on Maryland's Eastern Shore. The Trippe family in Maryland goes back many many generations, and it is probably not mere coincidence, nor operational expediency that made the city of Baltimore one of the original gateway cities when Pan American pioneered trans-Atlantic operations with the famous old Boeing Flying Boat in the late 1930's.

Mr. President, we are all hopeful that the philosophy of Pan American, TWA and the Civil Aeronautics Board—all of whom are in accord as to the necessity of lower fares between the United States and Europe—will prevail at the meeting to be resumed in Salzburg next week.

Pan American recently proposed to the Civil Aeronautics Board that it be allowed to fly between Los Angeles and San Francisco and the Hawaiian Capital of Honolulu for $100 one way. This new service to begin November 1 will save the traveler $66 on a round trip and he may depart from Los Angeles and return to San Francisco, if he so desires. This should be good news to Maryland residents who would enjoy visiting our 50th State, and who know that they will now be able to board a transcontinental jet at Friendship International Airport and arrive in either of those two great California cities in ample time to catch Pan American's jet operation to Honolulu.

There will be no frills on this new west coast to Hawaii operation. If the traveler wants cocktails, filet mignon and champagne he had better be prepared to spend $156 more for his round-trip fare. That will be the difference between Pan American's first-class operations to Honolulu and this new service which will be inaugurated on November 1.

Mr. President, I commend Pan American for continuing to pioneer in the field of low fares and I congratulate the Civil Aeronautics Board for giving Pan American the green light. It is about time some of the other carriers followed Pan American's example and gave the potential air traveler a better break.

I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD an article entitled "$100 to Honolulu," published in the Washington Evening Star of October 12.

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

ONLY $100 TO HONOLULU

American tourists who don't mind the risk of an elbow in the eye or a chicken wing in the lap are about to get a tempting $100 bargain flight from the shores of sunny California to the beaches of sunnier Honolulu.

Pan American thrift flights from Los Angeles and San Francisco, scheduled to begin next month, will trim the present economy fare by 25 percent.

The Civil Aeronautics Board's approval is a significant step in this country's determination to give tourists the best break possible commensurate with sound operating practices. Most pointedly, it lends at least tacit support to the American flag lines' bid for similar thrift-class fares over the Atlantic. This will have to be fought out with European lines later this month in the rate-making International Air Transport Association. If we win that fight for $160 flights to Europe ($103 off present economy fares), a whole new world would be opened to many tourists.

In the interest of giving more Americans a chance to see their 50th State, and vice

versa, the Pan American flight holds great appeal. There was some opposition from at least one CAB member who questioned whether a no-frills flight, packing in 189 passengers, would sacrifice too much in comfort and service.

Of even greater importance is the question of safety. As to that, the CAB was given assurance by the Federal Aviation Agency that safety standards, such as successful evacuation tests, would have to be met before the first Boeing 707 turbofan aircraft takes off. In this regard, the safety inspectors cannot be too strict. As to the comfort factor, every passenger has the option of going first class if he wants to pay for it.

OCEANIC STUDIES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Navy and interested college groups are engaged, and have been for some time, in a study of oceanography. This is highly proper and extremely desirable but, from a broader standpoint, I believe that the study should be expanded into one we might call "oceanology." This would entail a more involved study, from a much broader basis, of all aspects of the ocean, including the studies which now involve the oceans' bottoms.

Interest in the general subject of the ocean has seemed to vary with periods of international crises. So, to provide permanence for this important field of study, I have thought that it would be a wise move to establish an organization for this purpose similar to NASA.

Here is a field in which international cooperation already exists and which could be developed on a much greater scale, for the simple reason that all mankind can benefit materially from studies of the waters that cover this earth, studies that might even produce food and substance for the future.

Recently Rear Adm. E. C. Stephan, U.S. Navy, retired, spoke before the Federal Council for Science and Technology on some of the aspects of this field, and I ask unanimous consent that this appear at this place in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT OF REAR ADM. E. C. STEPHAN, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED, BEFORE THE FEDERAL COUNCIL FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, OCTOBER 11, 1963

On April 1963, U.S.S. *Thresher* disappeared in 8,400 feet of water, far more than its crush depth, with the loss of 129 lives. This tragic event served to focus the Navy's attention on certain aspects of undersea operations that appeared to be in need of review and improvement.

On April 24 Secnav notice 3100 established a deep submerging systems review group under my chairmanship to study and report to the Secretary of the Navy on a broad spectrum of undersea problems. A copy of the notice is before you.

The objectives of the DSSRG assigned by the Secnav charter are:

1. Review the Navy's plans for the development and procurement of components and systems related to location, identification, rescue from and recovery of deep submerged large objects from the ocean floor.

2. Recommend changes to such plans which will result in expeditiously obtaining sufficient capabilities which could be used to recover large objects at depths to be specified by the Chief of Naval Operations.

3. Recommend changes to such plans which will result in optimizing the future effectiveness of such components and systems and permit recovery at greater depths.

4. Develop a 5-year program including systems definitions, funding and personnel requirements related to items 1 through 3 above.

5. Recommend means and organizational responsibilities for implementation of these programs.

As a result of an exchange of memorandums between DDR&E, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy, the mission of the DSSRG was expanded on May 14, 1963, to include nose cones and other missile components.

In carrying out its objectives, DSSRG was directed to examine not only Navy plans but to consider also those of other Government agencies, the academic and scientific community, industry, and private individuals.

By late May key personnel had been assembled in Washington and began to function as a group. The review group is staffed with highly selected representatives from the scientific community, industry, and officers of the Navy and Air Force—most of whom are retired. Each individual was chosen for his demonstrated expertise in a particular feature of the problem under study. The current organization chart is also before you.

In the course of its deliberations, the DSSRG has received over 100 briefings from the Navy, other Government agencies, science, and industry. Over 1,000 documents from all sources have been reviewed. Extensive visits have been made both in the United States and abroad to search out and become acquainted with pertinent developments.

Soon after the formation of the DSSRG it became apparent that more than search, rescue, and recovery of submarines was involved in our study. In the case of a missing nuclear submarine alone—and a possible FBM submarine, at that—many questions began to arise. What was the cause of the disaster? What remains on the bottom that could be of intelligence value to unfriendly investigators? What are the short- and long-term radioactive hazards? Although at first glance the latter may be thought to be low by calculation, the propaganda value in enemy hands could be devastating.

Navy systems have been moving of late deeper into the remote oceans; Caesar and Artemis are but two examples. Weapons are achieving deeper capabilities requiring test ranges such as autec. All of these presage a need for vehicles which have an operational capability to do useful work in those depths. Installation, calibration, maintenance, and replacement has already become unwieldy, impractical, and expensive when performed from the surface. Our study shows that these functions can now, in many cases, be done better from submerged vehicles.

The DSSRG has therefore reached the conclusion that salvage, as it has been known in the past—or search, rescue, and recovery—must now take on expanded roles and missions. In addition to its historic mission of returning damaged ships to active service, it can now be expected to investigate, destroy, or "sanitize" a hulk, to remove components such as warheads or reactor pressure chambers, or even to encapsulate sections to make unfriendly investigation difficult or impossible. More study is needed of these possible requirements for they are associated, in most cases, with little explored eventualities which might face nuclear weapons and propulsion systems. Our ability to operate beneath the sea must include the performance of numerous functions upon a wide variety of submerged objects—ranging in size from an entire large submarine to smaller equipments or specific pieces of these.

We have noted also that whereas salvage of surface vessels will anticipate peak requirements in wartime, functional operations on underwater systems may be heaviest during periods of peacetime development.

Environmental contributions or restraints on undersea operations were studied in detail. Two of these, in particular, have had a major influence on our conclusions. First, we examined the distribution in depths of the world ocean in general and the areas of submarine and space testing specifically. Approximately 10 percent of the ocean floor lies between 0 and 1,000 feet; only another 10 percent lies between 1,000 and 12,000 feet; a little over 90 percent of the remaining ocean floor lies between 12,000 and 20,000 feet. A capability of 20,000 feet will cover 98.5 percent of the ocean. Secondly, we looked into the constraining influence of surface storms, ice coverage, and possible covert considerations which might make surface operations undesirable or impossible.

While our report has not been submitted to the Secretary of the Navy as yet, I have been authorized to discuss the general trend of our thinking. Current capabilities in the Navy and elsewhere are completely inadequate. Rescue cannot now be accomplished below about 600 feet, far less than present submarine crush depths. We are contemplating a rescue capability to 2,000 feet with a vehicle which has a 6,000-foot hull, is air transportable to a forward area, and will operate from a military submarine on the scene. This same hull is being considered for configuration as a deep search vehicle and also as a first generation of a "work" vehicle equipped with manipulators. This chart illustrates its possible employment on a rescue mission.

The next chart shows one of our thoughts for a recovery system. The essential elements include (pointing) a support ship, four lift barges and their mooring buoys, a buoyancy system operated either as shown here from the surface or by an attached control submersible, and at least one "work" vehicle with manipulators to make attachments and perform other similar functions. The ultimate system may differ considerably from the one shown here in view of the fact that our goal parameters for recovery are 9,000 tons from 20,000 feet. This does illustrate, however, the need for beginning immediate development of the basic components—the hulls, buoyancy system, and manipulators which can be integrated through operational experience into a completely submerged capability.

Development of the 6,000-foot vehicle can begin immediately, more research is needed before the exact design of a 20,000-foot vehicle can be decided upon. We are identifying these areas and will make necessary recommendations to the Secretary.

The DSSRG has already recommended that the responsibility for military implementation of a deep submergence program be assigned to a specific Navy office prior to completion of our final report. This would facilitate continuity. The office should have demonstrated a systems management capability in a related field, especially with regard to projects with multibureau cognizance, and should be "mission oriented" with particular interest in deep submergence development. We have recommended that follow-on responsibility be assigned to the Special Projects Office of the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

Perhaps the most important conclusion of the DSSRG will be that a system tied exclusively to rescue from or recovery of a wrecked submarine is doomed to failure. In the past, submarine disasters have been few and far between. Hopefully they will be even less frequent in the future. To simulate them for drill purposes becomes even more hazardous as submarine depth capabilities increase. These considerations may

make the maintenance of trained personnel and tested materials impossible if they exist for submarine rescue alone. The history of similar activities in the past is ample evidence of this fact. Budgetary support for these services rarely appears except in times of crisis.

If, on the other hand, we set about developing a broad capability to do useful work on the ocean floor at all depths, we may anticipate a more sympathetic reception for our suggested projects. This is the goal we have adopted. In doing so we have investigated the potential need of more than military organizations. The Bureau of Mines, for example, is thinking of the mineral and petroleum deposits in deeper waters, and looking hopefully forward to the day when we can develop systems that will support more economic programs in the ocean. An entire New Frontier of economic expansion can be opened when we have demonstrated a capability to work at depths. The scientific community is anxiously awaiting our vehicles, ready to put them to work on myriad projects.

It has become evident to us that submarine rescue and recovery need not be sole missions of deep submergence systems. Far greater requirements are easily recognized which extend across the functions and responsibilities of more than the Military Establishment, and invade the domain of economic, scientific, sociological—and even political programs. Furthermore, the work that we will recommend to be done is not now a part of the oceanographic program, nor does it belong there. We are advocating a program of ocean engineering, to produce systems capable of performing useful work in the oceans for the purpose of both military and economic exploitation. The oceanographic community has its hands full in the pursuit of ocean knowledge. Its program has been sanctioned by Congress, funded, and is in the process of orderly expansion. We will recommend that this effort be paralleled by a program of ocean engineering, bringing to the problems the contributions of our technical and engineering personnel. In this manner, with a national program of adequate scope, we can hope for enthusiastic support from many quarters. Our systems need not sit in the back channel awaiting another *Thresher*, but they can be put to work immediately and continuously on projects contributory to the national interest. Specifically, quantum advances in these fields can result: Basic oceanographic research, efficient extraction of food from the ocean and its floor, oceanic mining, oceanic oil production, undersea communications, recovery of space vehicle and missile components, improvement of fixed ASW systems, improvements in mobile ASW systems, possible future deterrent system sites.

The U.S. program in space received an invigorating jolt when the first sputnik sailed overhead. The United States was shocked by Russian success and our failure. Gentlemen, we are probably standing today in an even more embarrassing position with regard to the oceans. Soviet interest in the sea has been demonstrated forcefully by their submarine fleet, fishing fleets, and large-scale oceanographic programs conducted by well-equipped research ships—obviously configured for more than orthodox research missions. They have participated extensively in the IGY and the Indian Ocean expedition, ostensibly in pursuit of scientific knowledge. It would be irrational to assume that Soviet interests in the ocean will always remain academic. The expansionist dogma of communism will lead them inexorably to more practical attempts at ocean exploitation—and this could also mean domination. The way is clear for us to stay ahead. We cannot afford the consequences of an aquatic sputnik.

We must develop our ocean engineering capability now on a national scale. To do this we must at the earliest possible time start vigorous R. & D. programs in these areas.

1. Oceanographic understanding particularly in field of soil mechanics of the ocean floor.
2. Physiology to determine man's potential to penetrate and work in the deep ocean.
3. Materials for maximum strength for undersea vehicles.
4. Sensors of all sorts and particularly high resolution sonars.
5. Powerplants, chemical, fuel cell and atomic.
6. Tools and manipulators for deep ocean work.
7. The peculiarly oceanic problems of corrosion fouling and electrolysis.
8. Buoyant materials and buoyant ascent controls.
9. Stabilization and inertial control.

Gentlemen, this has been a very brief discussion of the work of the review group. We, in the group, feel very strongly that our work will not only result in giving the Navy a good capability to cope with submarine disasters but, even more importantly, will also start the Nation on a long overdue program of thoroughly understanding and engineering in the seven-tenths of the world which today is virtually unknown. It is our hope that the program will get not only national moral support but also national funding so that the Navy need not make the choice between this program and those that immediately and directly contribute firepower.

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR HATFIELD, OF OREGON, BEFORE WESTERN REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, annually, one of the most important meetings of the Republican Party is that held by the western group.

This year it was our pleasure to hold that meeting in the city of Eugene, located in the beautiful State of Oregon. The keynote address was given by one of America's outstanding young Governors, Mark Hatfield, of Oregon, and I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be placed in the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY GOV. MARK HATFIELD, OF OREGON, WESTERN REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE, EUGENE, OREG., OCTOBER 11, 1963

Welcome to Oregon. Welcome to a conference which will be the focal point of Republican attention throughout the Nation this week. Welcome to a neighbor of California where the eyes of the world will be focused when we convene there on July 13. We face here and now as we will face then the need to enlist men and women of courage in this party of courage to meet the challenge of our age.

You are met today in a State which is known for what we believe are useful extensions of the voter's franchise. The direct election of U.S. Senators was provided early in Oregon, the initiative, referendum, and recall are provided here in the widest of latitude. But it is our recent primary law which will be of the greatest interest as we turn the calendar to 1964.

It is not only a matter of interest to us. Oregon has twice within the past four elections been a real turning point for Republican presidential candidacies. I hope, therefore, that you may forgive a brief reference here today to Oregon's primary election because it is of more than local significance. The filing deadline is March 6. By then, our secretary of state is required to list those candidates who are "generally advocated" for the Presidency. They have 3 days after the filing deadline in which to file disclaimers. If they do not do so, their names will be on our ballot at the primary election which comes on May 15. Our 18-member delegation to the convention, each of whom is selected individually by name on our ballot, is bound to support the Oregon primary winner at the nominating convention in San Francisco for two ballots or until he receives less than 35 percent of the convention vote.

It is in this setting that I underline the importance of the Republican primary to those who would seek the nomination. It will not go to anyone on a silver platter. Oregonians expect candidates to criss-cross this State and get to know the voters. They welcome would-be darkhorses to try the track for time and distance.

It seems to be the lesson of political history that there is merit in considering Oregon in the spring of 1964 the proper forum for a full exchange of views and I would predict that any candidate who is successful here gains additional momentum to carry him into the California primary a few weeks later and into the convention itself.

We welcome two of those prominently mentioned as Republican nominees for President. We expect them back again and again, if they become candidates for the nomination. They have distinguished records of accomplishment, one for 30 years in the executive branch of Government at the National and State level; the other, service at the local level from the city council to the U.S. Senate.

We Republicans are fortunate in the number of able, articulate, experienced, attractive statesmen on our side of the aisle. In some of our new Governors we have voices that are being heard from. The teamwork that has evolved as a result of the formation of the Republican Governors Association will make itself felt for years to come.

I welcome the return to the public forum the expressions of Dick Nixon. In Pennsylvania tomorrow night, another great Republican gathering will hear again the wisdom of Dwight D. Eisenhower. And I, for one, hope and pray for the full recovery of one whose warnings were not always heeded but are always valid in their base, that great humanitarian, Herbert Hoover, so that he might come before us for at least another convention.

Any way you cut it, the Democratic convention is going to be a ho-hum affair. Of course, if some of the New Frontiersmen persist in trying to dump LYNDON JOHNSON it may become a heave-ho affair. And if Wallace and Barnett get the microphones it may become a toe-to-toe affair.

No one would criticize the President's use of his rocking chair for medical purposes, but why does he have to be pictured in it so often? It has become a symbol for contentment, all is well, why hurry. And it must be that this kind of forward-then-backward motion characterizes the administration in too many areas. He embarks on one mission for Cuba, then withdraw, then quarantine, then release. He progresses in Vietnam, then retreats, sends in Lodge, then loses face by second thoughts with McNamara and General Taylor. The President tells us to fly to the moon, then pulls the flying carpet out from under Apollo and I am not sure today whether it's A-OK or on the shelf. For now, we have a spatial yo-yo policy. He came back from Vienna to tell us he'd taken the measure of Khrushchev, that toughness and firmness was what was required, but today it's hard to tell the wheat from the chaff. In civil rights, he cancels an announced stop in Portland,

Oreg., because of the possibility of pickets at a Federal housing project, then he submits the Presidency of the United States to the indignity of a diatribe by Governor Faubus.

He offers an economic policy of tax reduction but more Federal spending, his Young Democrats resolve to resume diplomatic relations with Cuba, lift travel restrictions, abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, sign a nonaggression pact between the Warsaw Pact nations and NATO nations, and his national Democratic chairman has to wash his hands of their resolves, he urges noninterference with the workings of the free market, then proposes a tax on American purchases of foreign stocks and bonds which the New York Times brands "an ineffective tourniquet" to halt the outflow of $2 billion that took place in the first 6 months of this year.

But it is not enough to be negative, though the role of the loyal opposition must be to point out failures, whether they be of not knowing what to do or not knowing how to do it. In the sessions which follow you will hear the clarion calls from our leadership with positive programs of action. And the West can lead the way.

The rollcall of the West shows that talent and the test for the years ahead as we look at the following:

Alaska, which has not yet realized its potential under statehood.

Arizona where Paul Fannin's enlightened administration prevents and whose across-the-board good will program is a model of what can be done, a State with only a handful of electoral votes that has given the Nation and the world a great Senator and a spokesman for conserving our resources both human and fiscal, joined by Congressman RHODES despite overwhelming registration odds.

California, seeking a full partner for Senator KUCHEL, possessing nearly a score of driving Congressmen and a great group of dynamic legislators who stood up to Big Daddy's rough shod tactics.

Colorado, the comeback State, with two U.S. Senators, two Congressmen and a magnificent new face in the State capitol.

Idaho, home of our most able senior Republican Governor, the return to politics of LEN JORDAN after a brief retirement.

Hawaii, girding for a comeback, but strong with Senator FONG.

Montana, where a hard driving, all business, chief executive holds forth who had the courage to go before a congressional committee and say no thanks to pork barreling, paired with JIM BATTIN in Congress.

Nevada, where the best known New Frontiersman is Frank Sinatra, and where our work is cut out for us.

New Mexico, where ED MECHEM in the Senate needs some help in the statehouse and Congress.

Utah, where the steady, earnest guiding hand of George Dewey Clyde breeds confidence and Senator Bennett and Congressmen Burton and Lloyd hold forth.

Washington, where we have that splendid congressional delegation and one day will topple the senate and are getting closer to regaining the capitol.

Wyoming, the home of MILWARD SIMPSON'S comeback trail that is an inspiration to us all as is Cliff Hansen's capture of the statehouse and where Congressman HARRISON is ours in Congress.

In this party of individualism, it is appropriate to observe that ours is less a commitment by the party than by each and every one of us to face the challenge of these days with the courage of leadership.

May we be the active instrument of progress and not the passive mirror of past or present public opinion. May we have the courage to preserve our heritage and enrich by our own bold management of this Nation's destiny the heritage we will bequeath to those who follow us.

We see folly fostered on every side. The times cry out for the courageous programs and principles which have been historic with the Republican Party. Let us resolve here to come forward with solutions, not slothful soliloquies, and let us welcome a period in our history when we beckon with open arms those among us who may express varying viewpoints so that a consensus might be developed at San Francisco on which our nominee can proudly stand.

Nine months hence that convention opens. May we here dedicate our lives anew to the challenge that is ours. Our legacy to those who follow is at stake, lest they never know the thrill of freedom, the wonders of the competitive enterprise system, the spirit of independence and individualism that made this country the best in all of history. To do less than our full measure in the next 13 months will be to give by default a party and perhaps a nation over to those who sit and wait and watch, philosophical shovel in hand.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL AMERICANS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I cannot stand silently while Congress is urged to take only timid, short steps toward according equal rights to all Americans. Unless we stand firm, we will, as in 1957 and 1960, travel down the route toward a bill which has civil rights on the cover and not enough inside.

Have we learned nothing from the demonstrations in Birmingham, Ala., Albany, Ga., and Jackson, Miss.? Did the police dogs, the electric cattle prods, and the firehoses make no lasting impression? Has the march on Washington been so soon forgotten?

People of conscience throughout the Nation have been hoping that Congress would once and for all face the issue and do a job which has needed doing for the past century.

Instead, the Justice Department is quoted as urging the removal of a key section from the pending civil rights bill—part III—which would have given the Department the power to enter into varied types of civil rights cases developing in the South and in the North.

Time and again I have raised with the Justice Department incidents which cry out for governmental intercession, only to be informed that the Department lacks the authority to enter into these matters and assure Americans of their constitutional rights. Unless we have an effective part III to provide Federal protection, we must recognize that, as Donald Harris, a recent Rutgers graduate, is finding, the penalty for working to register voters can be prolonged imprisonment without bail and without being brought to trial on charges that can bring execution.

In 1957 and in 1960 there was a real opportunity to enact a meaningful civil rights bill, but each time the leadership gave up too soon and brought a watered down bill to the floor. Today in 1963 there is another opportunity to do the job so long overdue. For this opportunity there is little credit to the white majority or the Congress. Rather it is primarily due to the efforts of the Negro people themselves. But, if we agree to the Justice Department's recommendation and start out by dropping one of the key sections, we will once more have surrendered before the battle is joined.

I say to the political strategists—both Republican and Democratic—that civil rights is bigger than politics. Let us buckle down and face the issue realistically. Let us vote on all the legislation which many of us consider essential and let the American people decide whether we are carrying out our responsibilities effectively. There are some Democrats opposed to realistic civil rights; there are some Republicans opposed to realistic civil rights, but let us find out in the true American way. Let us vote, and the sooner the better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The limitation for morning business having expired, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

INCLUSION OF DISTRICT JUDGE OR JUDGES ON JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF EACH CIRCUIT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 244, S. 979.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 979) to amend section 332 of title 28, United States Code, in order to provide for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, S. 979, the legislation now under consideration would amend section 332 of title 28, United States Code, in order to provide for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit.

An identical bill, H.R. 6690, was passed by the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress on August 7, 1961. The Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate reported favorably to the Senate H.R. 6690, and on September 20, 1961, the Judicial Conference of the United States approved the bill. Shortly thereafter, objections were received on the bill from the circuit and district judges of the second and ninth circuits. On March 8, 1962, the Judicial Conference of the United States reaffirmed its approval on H.R. 6690, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I moved that H.R. 6690 be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, in order to hold a hearing in regard to the objections to this legislation. Such a hearing was held on March 9, 1962, at which both the proponents and the opponents were heard. At that time, a motion was made to make the bill optional with each circuit instead of

mandatory. This amendment was rejected by the subcommittee and the subcommittee again reported the bill to the full committee without amendment, and the bill was subsequently reported favorably to the Senate but no action was taken thereon prior to adjournment.

The Judicial Conference of the United States, as noted, twice approved the legislation during the 87th Congress. On January 10, 1963, the administrative office of the U.S. courts transmitted a draft of the bill which is S. 979, for introduction in the Senate. However, at the Judicial Conference of the United States held on March 11 and 12, 1963, a motion to approve the provisions in S. 979 failed. This then is the history of this legislation.

Mr. President, in 1957, the Congress provided for membership of judges of the U.S. district courts on the Judicial Conference of the United States. The experience of having district court representation on the Judicial Conference of the United States has been very wholesome, and has resulted in a vigorous and active Judicial Conference.

The bill, S. 979, will extend the same theory of district court representation to the circuit councils of each circuit. It is the belief of the committee that in the light of the recent experience of the Judicial Conference of the United States, great improvement in the work of the judicial councils will result, if judges of the district courts have representation on the judicial councils. This proposed legislation has the merit of bringing directly to the judicial councils the views of the judges who are engaged daily in the trial of civil and criminal cases and in the administration of the district courts. The daily experience of these district judges will afford the councils knowledge and experience which they can now obtain only by consultation. Moreover, representation by district judges should bring about more effective cooperation between the judicial councils and the various judges throughout the circuits. At present, the membership of the council of a circuit is composed only of circuit judges. These judges sit as appellate judges and in many instances have been appointed to the circuit court directly without the benefit of previous experience as a trial judge. For this reason, representation by active experienced district judges within the circuit should be of great value to the operation and administration of a circuit council.

Let me say again that when the Congress passed a bill in 1957 to include district judge representation on the judicial conference of the United States, it became quite evident great benefits were to be received by the judiciary as a whole, by reason of the additional knowledge of the district judges participating in these conferences.

Under the provisions of this bill, each circuit having five or more circuit judges in regular active service would have added to the judicial council two district judges. One of these district judges would be the district judge who represents the circuit on the judicial conference of the United States. The second district judge would be one who serves a district within the circuit other than the one represented by the district judge who is a member of the judicial conference. An exception is provided for, however, for the District of Columbia, which circuit is composed of a single district and, thus the two district judges would be from the District of Columbia.

The bill also provides that each judicial council have a secretary who shall be the clerk of the U.S. Court of Appeals.

At present, one of the circuit judges would normally act as the secretary. The designation by law of the clerk of the U.S. Court of Appeals of each circuit to be the secretary to the council will result in the responsibility being placed permanently in one individual. That responsibility will require keeping the records of the proceedings of the judicial council meetings so that at all times it can be referred to as needed. Under the present system, I am informed, records of meetings are not kept in many instances.

Mr. President, let me again say that on two occasions the judicial conference of the United States wholeheartedly approved this legislation. On three occasions the Senate Committee on the Judiciary approved this legislation and rejected any amendments. In addition thereto, the House of Representatives has approved this legislation in the form of H.R. 6990 of the 87th Congress.

After a complete and thorough study of its merits, this legislation has been submitted to the Senate by the Committee on the Judiciary for its approval.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will in its consideration of this legislation accept the recommendation made by the Judiciary Committee and pass the bill as reported.

Mr. President, at this time I invite attention to the fact that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] wishes to offer an amendment to the bill, which I have agreed to accept.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is my understanding correct that the amendment meets with the approval of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and other Senators who are interested in this particular measure?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I believe all have agreed to the amendment, without a great deal of objection. There was another amendment which I believe the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] wished to offer, but this amendment meets with his approval, according to my understanding.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, it does. The amendment I intended to offer, which was defeated in the committee, would not have gone as far as the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I am sure the Senator from South Carolina realizes that. I am delighted that the Senator from Arizona got into the act, because that has helped the legislation considerably.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment on behalf of the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as read, and may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

Beginning with line 3, page 1, strike out all to and including line 14, page 2, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

That (a) section 332 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the first and second paragraphs thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The chief judge of each circuit shall call, at least twice in each year and at such places as he may designate, a council known as the judicial council of the circuit at which he shall preside. The membership of the judicial council of the circuit shall include all circuit judges for the circuit in regular active service and, upon affirmative vote cast by a majority of such circuit judges, may include (1) the district judge in regular active service from such circuit selected as provided in section 331 of this title to serve as a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States, and (2) in any circuit having five or more circuit judges in regular active service, an additional district judge in regular active service who shall be chosen for a three-year term by the district judges in regular active service of the circuit at the next annual judicial conference of the circuit held after the conference at which the district judge in regular active service is selected to serve as a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Except in the District of Columbia circuit, such additional district judge shall be from a different district than the district judge then serving as a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States as provided in section 331 of this title. Each member of the council, unless excused by the chief judge, shall attend all sessions of the council."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on behalf of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 979) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 332 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the first and second paragraphs thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The chief judge of each circuit shall call, at least twice in each year and at such places as he may designate, a council known as the judicial council of the circuit at which he shall preside. The membership of the

judicial council of the circuit shall include all circuit judges for the circuit in regular active service and, upon affirmative vote cast by a majority of such circuit judges, may include (1) the district judge in regular active service from such circuit selected as provided in section 331 of this title to serve as a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States, and (2) in any circuit having five or more circuit judges in regular active service, an additional district judge in regular active service who shall be chosen for a three-year term by the district judges in regular active service of the circuit at the next annual judicial conference of the circuit held after the conference at which the district judge in regular active service is selected to serve as a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Except in the District of Columbia circuit, such additional district judge shall be from a different district than the district judge then serving as a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States as provided in section 331 of this title. Each member of the council, unless excused by the chief judge, shall attend all sessions of the council."

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Each judicial council shall have a secretary, who shall be the clerk of the United States court of appeals."

TRANSFER OF EXECUTIVE POWER ON THE EXPIRATION OF TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT AND INAUGURATION OF A NEW PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 424, H.R. 4638.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from New York, the bill would promote the orderly transfer of executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President.

The Senator will recall that a great deal of money has been expended, on a private or national committee basis, in times past when a transfer of power has been made from one President to another. In an attempt to face this particular difficulty, the Committee on Government Operations, of which the Senator from New York is a distinguished member, reported H.R. 4638. In respect to the bill, the policy committee gave serious consideration to the amount proposed by the committee. It is my intention, in line with instructions from the policy committee, and in accord with the views of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], to offer an amendment to reduce the amount from $1.3 million to $500,000.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Montana. That was the reason why I asked for the explanation. I knew there was to be a reduction.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I also wished to emphasize that the bill was one of the products of the work of the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], on which I also have the honor to serve, which subcommittee deals with the exercise of powers by the executive.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If my information is correct—and I think it is—this matter has also been discussed with the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], who raised a question about the amount involved. I believe it has been satisfactorily cleared so far as he is concerned.

Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk, and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 8, line 10, to strike out the numeral and insert "$500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 8, line 10, after the word "one" to insert the following language:

Presidential transition, to remain available during the fiscal year in which the transition occurs and the next succeeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] wish to engage in a colloquy, in order to clarify certain matters in connection with House bill 4638, which was passed earlier today. It will take only a brief time to bring up the bill for reconsideration, in order to permit the Senator from Iowa to ask certain questions of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

I now enter a motion that the Senate reconsider the votes by which the amendments to House bill 4638 were ordered to be engrossed and the bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be received, under the rule.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate reconsider those votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion that the Senate reconsider the votes by which the amendments to House bill 4638 were ordered to be engrossed and the bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I regret that I was not on the floor at the time when the bill was previously acted on. I had indicated that I might have some objection, or at least some question about certain provisions of the bill. I appreciate the deference of the majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], in permitting the bill to be reconsidered at this time so that I may have an opportunity to ask a few questions of the Senator from Washington about the bill.

I should like to ask questions about three parts of the bill.

The first question relates to the amount of money which would be authorized, as shown on page 8 of the bill. The bill as passed by the House would have authorized $1,300,000 for the purpose of paying the administrative and service expenditures of incoming and outgoing Presidents and Vice Presidents. An amendment was offered and accepted which would reduce that amount to $500,000.

My question is whether even that reduced amount is necessary. Can we get by with less than $500,000? I would appreciate a little enlightenment on the point from the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. As the amendment was agreed to, the $500,000 represented the maximum amount that the Appropriations Committee would be authorized to appropriate. Therefore, if there was no need for the maximum amount, the appropriation could be less.

In 1960 I served as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. One of the burdens placed on the committee was the payment of costs that had been incurred between the time of the election in November and the assumption of office by the President in January. Those costs amounted to a very substantial sum of money. I do not believe we ought to go through that process again, regardless of who the incoming President or Vice President should be. It is an unfair burden to be placed on the shoulders of either the Democratic National Committee or the Republican National Committee. It involves essential Government expenses that are necessary and pertinent to the job of the Presidency and the Vice Presidency.

Mr. MILLER. I share the view of the Senator from Washington that such a burden should not properly be placed upon the incoming or the outgoing President or Vice President. I would certainly like to see something done about it. My only question is whether we should authorize the amount of $500,000.

The House sent to the Senate a bill. If Senators will look in the report of the committee, they will see that the sum of $1,300,000 was the rock bottom amount

which would be authorized. The Senate has adopted an amendment which would cut the amount to $500,000.

I am wondering whether this is as far as we should go. We certainly do not wish to see unnecessary expenditures included in this proposal. What would be the mechanics involved? Would the Appropriations Committee in, let us say, the year 1964, come out with a request for an appropriation within the limits of the authorization, or would the appropriation request come out some time in January of 1965, let us say, with respect to a transition which might take place in 1964? Can the Senator enlighten me on that point?

Mr. JACKSON. I would assume that a sum less than $500,000 would probably be appropriated in the calendar year 1964, with the stipulation that if there was to be a deficiency, it could be taken care of in 1965. I would not want to venture what that sum should be initially. But I would assume that it would be some reasonable amount probably less than the total authorized by the pending bill.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Since there will be no transition in 1964, that money would be returned to the Treasury. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. Certainly. Mr. President, I am dealing only with a supposititious situation, purely fictional. The rest of the dialog here will be a part of the legislative record.

Mr. MILLER. Is the Senator suggesting that the Senator from Minnesota will change the record sometime later this fall or next fall?

Mr. President, I appreciate the responses on that point. My concern is much relieved compared with what it was prior to the reduction of the total amount of the authorization to $500,000.

I have two additional questions. On page 7, the bill provides that the transition expenditures will be available to both the outgoing President and the outgoing Vice President. The question arises as to whether or not such expenditures really are necessary for an outgoing Vice President. I can understand the problem with respect to an outgoing President because of the vast number of duties, personnel, and problems that are entailed in the White House. But it seems to me that, for all practical purposes, the outgoing Vice President does not have much more in the way of problems than does an outgoing U.S. Senator. I am wondering whether the bill should be directed at both an outgoing President and an outgoing Vice President. I do not believe there was any statement in the conference report to indicate the justification.

Mr. JACKSON. Today the Vice President of the United States has duties and responsibilities far greater than in the past. For example, currently the Vice President of the United States is serving as head of the Space Advisory Commission. He serves with the National Security Council.

The previous Vice President had similar broad responsibilities. The Vice President is concerned with subjects related not merely to one State, but to all 50 States. The present burdens of the office of Vice President are such that it is reasonable and proper that he should be included in the period of allowance of 6 months after he leaves office to take care of the necessary transition to private life. I do not believe that is unreasonable.

Mr. MILLER. I wonder if the Senator from Washington could indicate whether he had any experience in that connection or has had any familiarity with the costs of the transition of an outgoing Vice President heretofore, or whether or not he might think that the costs of an outgoing Vice President with respect to, let us say, the National Security Council and some of the other commissions or committees which the Vice President heads, would not be borne by those agencies or those committees anyway.

Mr. JACKSON. That is true so far as the organic organization is concerned. However, undoubtedly he will have correspondence with people in private academic life or in other areas of our country that would necessitate proper response to such inquiries. In addition, one cannot suddenly cease all his responsibilities and duties in that office or any other office. It is difficult enough for Senators. Former Senators have told me that, when they left office, the job of taking care of the mail alone was a serious one. I cannot help but feel that the duties and responsibilities of the Office of Vice President today are such that the provisions of section 4 are not unreasonable. I think they are entirely proper.

Mr. MILLER. In any event, the amount would have to be justified before the Committee on Appropriations before it would be appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLER. I thank my colleague.

The last question I have relates to page 6 of the bill on which there is a provision which, in effect, states that up to 20 percent of the amount of these expenditures can be of a confidential nature. I can understand, during the term of office of a President, the need for certain amounts of confidential expenditures.

It is my understanding that for many years there has been a fund which the President has had at his disposal for this purpose, but I must confess that I cannot understand why, in addition, during the transition period of an outgoing President or an incoming President, we should provide for up to 20 percent of the funds to be of a confidential nature. I believe, frankly, since this is the first time this type of legislation is being considered, that it might be a very good thing to keep them all subject to public scrutiny, so that we will know exactly how these funds are being used. If, perchance, there should be anything of a highly confidential nature, I would hope that the incoming or outgoing President or Vice President would take money out of his own pocket to take care of that. During the period of his term of office he could use the fund which is now available for confidential purposes, without having to resort to the transition money.

I would appreciate it very much if the Senator from Washington could possibly see his way clear to remove this part of the bill, or at least to take it out and go to conference on it.

Mr. JACKSON. If we assume—and it is certainly a correct assumption—that the President of the United States has business of an extremely confidential nature to transact, this very assumption applies to the period when he is getting ready to assume the duties and responsibilities of the Presidency. Logically, it seems to me that this period is of equal importance to the 4-year period of service for which he is elected.

I would have no objection to the deletion of the sentence to which the Senator refers, starting on page 6, line 20, through page 7, line 2, with the understanding that we shall take the amendment to conference to see what can be worked out.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator, and I appreciate it.

Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair what is the status of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering the motion to reconsider the votes by which the amendments were ordered to be engrossed, by which the bill was read the third time, and by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, before adopting another amendment to the bill, the Senate would have to act on that motion.

Mr. President, I now ask for a vote on my motion with the understanding that the reason for this is that we may have an amendment adopted to the bill and then have it passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). The question is on the motion to reconsider made by the Senator from Iowa.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. 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 6, line 20, after the word "Act.", it is proposed to strike out:

> Not more than 20 per centum of the total expenditures under this Act for any President-elect or Vice-President-elect may be made upon the basis of a certificate by him or the assistant designated by him pursuant to this section that such expenditures are confidential and that they accord with the provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (d) of this section.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I move the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the en-

grossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 4638) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 458, S. 283.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 283) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956.

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN RICE ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, instead of Calendar No. 458, Senate bill 283, the pending business be Calendar No. 482, House Joint Resolution 192, having to do with certain rice acreage allotments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 192) relating to the validity of certain rice acreage allotments for 1962 and prior crop years.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has a speech to make, which would fit in very nicely at this time. It is the intention of the leadership, after the disposition of the rice acreage allotments bill, to call up Calendar No. 458, S. 283, to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, and following that, Calendar No. 423, S. 1543, a bill to repeal that portion of the act of March 3, 1893, which prohibits the employment in any Government service or by any officer of the District of Columbia, of any employee of the Pinkerton Detective Agency or any similar agency, and following that to bring up reconsideration of S. 1914, a bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans, and the reconsideration of S. 1942, a bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we are now approaching a time of decision with respect to the civil rights package which will be acted on, because we already have the statement of the Senate leadership that it is going to await a bill from the other body. So we now know rather clearly that whatever we may try to do to accelerate the process, it is most likely that we shall have to consider what the other body passes. That is in issue right now.

Before I comment on what is going on and what I think we ought to do about it, let me point out that I do not agree that we should wait for a bill from the other body. We ought to go ahead and consider the Senate Commerce Committee bill as soon as it is reported to the Senate, which will launch us into the civil rights debate, and let some of that debate be absorbed before we receive the bill from the other body. This would advance the whole situation, in my judgment, not less than 3 to 4 weeks, and might prevent what most likely and easily could take place because Members of Congress will want to go home for Christmas, for which they could not be blamed, considering the fact that the session would have lasted all year, but for which civil rights might well suffer.

I intend to discuss today the position taken by the administration in the other body with respect to this bill, and the seriousness of it as I see it. It seems to me that what is being done now will determine whether or not there is meaningful civil rights legislation or whether, if we retreat, for which there seems to be a strong sentiment, before the battle actually begins, we shall be giving up a great part of what we are contending for, quite apart from whether we should or should not, and quite apart from whether or not the House or the Senate will consider it desirable to be done. In other words, we would have quit the battle even before it began.

I think the Attorney General indicated why this matter is vital in the Judiciary Committee of the other body, when he made it clear—and I could not agree more—that whether or not effective civil rights legislation is enacted in this Congress will determine very largely whether the so-called civil rights revolution in the country is going to be peaceful or not—or whether the struggle will be fought in the courts or on the streets.

I fear that if we do not give adequate opportunity for the people to fight in the courts, the impetus is so great that they will fight on the streets. This will be more disastrous for the domestic tranquillity than the events that have already taken place, which have been serious enough and have involved use of Federal troops, death to little children, great civil disaster, barbarities, which have been pictured to the world and which have been pictured so disadvantageously to the United States, including the use of police dogs and cattle prods, with which we are familiar.

What is at stake is not only a moral issue, but the prestige and standing of our Nation in the eyes of a great part of the world whose people have skins which are yellow, black, or brown, and also the redemption by the American people of wrongs clearly imbedded in their own consciences, and the redress for and satisfaction of serious wrongs which have deeply aggrieved people. It is within that framework that we must act.

Let us remember that President Kennedy, in his 1960 election campaign, said to our Nation, at a time when it counted for the most—that he would not retreat in the face of pressure from congressional leaders. That was his campaign promise.

Upon that most important issue before us on the domestic scene, the Attorney General, in the name of the administration, has beaten a clear and damaging retreat. In his retreat it is so easy to use sweeping generalities in which people will say, "What do you expect of JAVITS?" or of one of our other colleagues who is an ardent civil rights advocate; I am not going to name them; they speak eloquently for themselves, and I do not want to describe anybody but myself. But some people say, "What do you expect of JAVITS? Certainly he will want everything that the Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the other body has offered."

Actually, there are some aspects of that reported bill that I think can be usefully changed.

But what I am saying is that the essence of what the subcommittee was trying to do should not be compromised or given away now, which is what the Attorney General has done.

There is one other thing which is very important. Implied, without necessarily being stated, but clearly evident in this whole situation is the argument on the part of the administration that "we must keep in mind the Republicans. We must water down this measure. We must retreat because of the Republicans, because they want it weakened and watered down."

Mr. President, I deny that completely. Other Republicans can speak for themselves. However, if Republican votes are desired for the passage of the bill—and it is absolutely necessary that Republicans votes be had for that purpose, as the administration has itself said—the way to get them is not by insulting Republicans who are ardent civil rights fighters before the battle starts, by telling the country, "We must water it down for the benefit of Republicans."

Let us find out when the votes are counted, and not by the administration's withdrawal in advance, which is suspect on many grounds, not only on the ground that the administration is trying to pile responsibility on the backs of the Republicans alone.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. To reinforce what my colleague has said, it is well to point out, in this discussion, which the distinguished Senator from New York is leading with such eloquence, that one of the most important elements of the bill reported by the subcommittee in the House is the so-called part III section, which gives to the Attorney General authority to bring civil actions to enforce the constitutional right of all citizens in every area where unlawful discrimination exists.

I well remember that when the bill was before the House in 1957, a similar

provision had strong Republican support, and that a vast majority of the Republicans voted for it even in the Senate, where it was finally eliminated. It was certainly not eliminated by the Republicans. Any effort to attach that reason for watering down the bill does not "wash."

I am very glad that my colleague is bringing up this subject, because there are some who forget the past history on part III. It is an important provision which will have to be enacted into law if these constitutional rights are going to be enforced. All it provides is that the Attorney General shall be authorized to go into court to enforce the law of the land as declared in the Constitution. There is nothing very drastic or radical about it. I am glad that my colleague has seen fit to set the record straight on some of these issues.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague for his always timely and helpful intercession in the debate.

Part III, which my colleague speaks of, of course, is the main pattern which is now inherent in all civil rights legislation. It involves the authority of the Attorney General to sue to redress civil rights. It is a power which we have already established with respect to voting. It is one which the administration recommends in school desegregation. It is a power which the Senate Committee on Commerce, following out the recommendation of the administration, recommends with respect to places of public accommodation.

The only question about part III, as discussed in the Judiciary Committee of the other body, is, Shall the Attorney General have the right to sue also in other cases, in addition to those which are clearly contemplated even by the Attorney General?

It is not a question of part III or no part III; it is a question of how far part III shall go.

If we follow the Attorney General's position, we shall be running down the drain one of the most urgent and critical aspects of the civil rights package, which is indispensable, if we are to meet the Attorney General's test that civil rights legislation must be adequate to give us public order and tranquillity.

What the Attorney General is against covers very specifically and distinctly the problem of dealing with the unconstitutional denial to demonstrators, and Negroes generally, of their rights as citizens to protest and to meet for redress of their grievances; also the effort to deal with prosecutions, allegedly normal prosecutions, but which are in effect persecutions because of the legal machinery involved, which is based on statutes which themselves are unconstitutional; or because of the way in which the law is administered; or, more simply, the naked and brutal fact of police excesses. All these things the Attorney General would omit from redress in the Federal courts and would leave to the streets.

I respectfully submit that it is not effective civil rights legislation that we shall be passing; it will not meet the test of restoring public order and tranquillity if we omit redress for these acts from the bill.

What the administration, through the Attorney General, has said about the voting section, about the public accommodations section, or about the education section will not make or break the bill.

The question of whether there should be included an FEPC section in the basic bill is not the main question, although I feel very deeply that it must be included. This bill is the area where the battle will have to be fought, and it is necessary to have it in the bill.

However, the main, serious, important points that the Attorney General has said the administration is stepping away from are the questions I have raised, the very issues that have caused riots in Birmingham and Montgomery, which have brought about the bombing of little children, which so profoundly shocked the country. They are the very issues which the front pages of our newspapers report as the use of police dogs and cattle prods on fellow Americans.

All these the Attorney General would step away from.

Mr. President, this is a tough issue. It will involve a terrible fight. There will be expended a great deal of emotion and time and energy, and many efforts. The intention is to avoid a revolution which is peaceful, and not cause it to become a revolution which is harmful to the country in terms of public order and tranquillity.

All this the Attorney General wants to retreat from. I say it is wrong. That is the fundamental, basic issue.

In view of the fact that implicit in all this is the allegation that this cutting and trimming is being done for the benefit of Republicans, it is up to Republicans to speak up and to rebut that idea completely.

Mr. President, my fundamental thesis is that the Attorney General has retreated in the field of civil rights. In his appearance on Tuesday before the House Committee on the Judiciary, the Attorney General dealt with this question in a considered way. I have already given the history of how, in the 1957 act—the so-called part III principle—that the power of the Attorney General to sue in civil rights cases in a representative way was accepted in respect to voting. It is now advocated with respect to public school desegregation and public accommodations legislation; it has been utilized by the Attorney General, for example, in cases involving desegregation of beaches or other municipal establishments, with respect to which the Federal Government has contributed toward their construction.

It seems to me that the critical aspect of this matter is summed up in the fact that the part III that I am for, which incidentally is a part III somewhat more limited than that reported by the House subcommittee, would authorize Attorney General's suits in the denial of rights by municipalities or in unreasonable police-action cases. Among these are rights guaranteed by the 1st and 14th amendments to the Constitution, the right of peaceable assemblage and the right of petition for the redress of grievances.

The subcommittee language would authorize the Attorney General to sue to restrain the denial of any right, privilege, or immunity secured to any individual by the Constitution or laws of the United States. The version embodied in S. 1693 and sought by civil rights advocates would authorize suits to restrain denials only of rights guaranteed by the 14th amendment, which prohibits deprivation of equal protection of the laws and of due process of law, and which has been the basis for Supreme Court decisions outlawing State-enforced racial discrimination. By expanding the Attorney General's litigation power beyond the 14th amendment, the subcommittee has brought in all sorts of cases under the other provisions of the Constitution, whether or not they have anything to do with the crisis in race relations. Although there may well be other cases in which such power in the Attorney General would be a good idea, this is not the problem with which the Congress and the Nation are now faced, and to include them, in my judgment unduly burdens the bill, which everyone knows will be difficult enough to pass, especially in the filibuster-bound Senate. In this one regard, I would agree with the Attorney General.

I am confident that the Committee on the Judiciary in the other body would have made the necessary correction to bring the part III we have always contended for into conformity with the 14th amendment cases. Those are the cases which are at stake. Those are the cases to which we have always directed our pleas for this particular section.

So we are talking about a limited provision for the Attorney General to sue in cases involving the constitutional rights of individuals guaranteed by the 14th amendment. It would authorize Attorney Generals' suits in the denial of rights by a municipality or excessive police-action cases, including the right to parade, or the violation of rights attributable to criminal prosecutions which amount to persecutions, because they are carried out under unconstitutional statutes, and for similar reasons. Let us not assume that these are light matters. I have just given an indication from the newspapers of what we all know are areas in which the Attorney General could have sued; for example, in the Birmingham march, where we saw the dreadful picture of the use of police dogs, cattle prods, and similar demonstrations of violence. Also, I pointed out that the large number of charges of people who had been beaten up and abused could have been dealt with in this way.

Also, we have witnessed incidents in which persons have even been charged with violations against the State which were punishable by death, in cases involving civil rights demonstrations. We have also observed cases of obstruction of justice and other serious crimes. So we are not dealing with a light matter; we are dealing with very serious issues.

It is indispensable that the Attorney General have the right to step into court and bail out citizens whose rights are being violated in this way without the citizen having to endure the punishment which I have described, without having to endure the danger and fear which are involved, which discourage thousands from even petitioning for redress of their grievances, while they go through long trials or hearings, with the result always in doubt, with convictions perhaps already established, and having to be undone ultimately, if they are lucky, by some appellate court.

This provision was the part of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 which the House accepted and which was defeated in the Senate under the threat of filibuster. Since that time it has been universally acknowledged by civil rights advocates, like myself, as the crucial lack in existing law. I have made repeated attempts, all so far unsuccessful, to get the Senate to enact this provision.

When the administration finally sent a broad, omnibus civil rights bill to the Congress in June, the bill included a part III provision, but not with the scope which civil rights advocates had long pressed for. Instead the administration limited its coverage to school desegregation cases, which is indeed probably the single largest class of cases, in number, in which such power in the Attorney General would be useful. But the provision which civil rights advocates have long pressed for would authorize such suits by the Attorney General in all cases under the 14th amendment to the Constitution, not just denials of equal protection of the laws in school cases, and this is vital to an adequate civil rights effort.

Such broader coverage typified by the bill, S. 1693, introduced on June 11, 1963, by myself and six other Republicans, which would authorize suits for all denials of rights guaranteed by the 14th amendment. The principal differences in impact between this bill and the administration's proposal are in two vital areas: it would authorize Attorney General's suits in denial of rights by a municipality or excessive police action cases and in cases involving official denials of rights, guaranteed by the 1st amendment through the 14th amendment, of peaceable assembly and petition for redress of grievances.

The enormous need for some strengthened Federal protection in municipal and police excess cases was thoroughly documented in the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's 1961 report on the administration of justice, which unanimously found police excesses by some State and local officers "a serious and continuing problem in many parts of the United States" with Negroes "the victims of such brutality far more, proportionately, than any other group in American society." The Commission found the existing misdemeanor statute and provision for civil suit for monetary damages by the victim wholly inadequate, the former principally because of inadequacies in the statute, the latter principally because most victims are too poor to bring suit and most defendants are unable to satisfy a money judgment even if one can be obtained. This is a clear case in which there is a real need for additional Federal legislation, and in its recent report for 1963 the Civil Rights Commission repeated its earlier conclusions about the inadequacy of existing law and specifically recommended that the Congress enact the part III provision.

In its 1963 report the Commission also stressed the need to protect the right of peaceable assembly and petition, which has developed from the small beginning in the Greensboro, N.C., sit-in cases in 1960 to the swelling movement of peaceful demonstrations which reached its climax in the great March in Washington on August 28 of this year. As the Commission unanimously found in most cases, these protests "have been peaceful and orderly and well within the protective guarantees of the first amendment." The Commission also found that "breach of the peace and trespass ordinances, on their face unrelated to the preservation of segregation, have been employed by local officials to maintain it. That this use of breach of the peace and trespass ordinances may be prohibited by the 14th amendment has now been recognized by the Supreme Court in a series of cases decided in 1963." Again, as the Commission concludes, this is an area in which injunctive suits by the Attorney General are critically needed.

Mr. President, what do we want of these people? Do we want them convicted in magistrates' or recorders' courts and sentenced to jail terms, and perhaps be held in jail, without being permitted bail, or, even if permitted to be at liberty on bail, to be held in jeopardy for 2 or 3 years; or do we want the Attorney General to be able to step in and prevent that from being done in the first place, in violation of the Bill of Rights and the United States Constitution?

The Attorney General himself notes that a broad title III is aimed at "police excesses which have occurred during racial demonstrations in some cities. These excesses have included the use of police dogs, cattle prods, and even tear gas bombs on peaceful demonstrators, and have, quite frankly, set white policemen against Negro demonstrators in a way that is an affront to the conscience of the Nation." The question is, as the Attorney General himself puts it, whether title III is an effective and appropriate means of dealing with this problem. His answer is "No." I say, "Yes." The Attorney General gives, in connection with his answer of "No," the following reasons, which I shall, in turn, answer; and I shall show why he is wrong:

First. The Attorney General contends that title III cannot prevent sporadic acts by terrorists or isolated acts of brutality by individual police officers. While this is true, of course, it is also true, as the Civil Rights Commission found in its 1961 report, that suits, whether criminal or civil, may serve as deterrents to illegal violence: "The threat of suits may well dissuade officials from using unnecessary violence. Moreover, both criminal and civil suits, by directing public attention to police abuses, may develop community pressure for their correction. Such public sentiment can also be expected to deter law-enforcement officers from committing (and their superiors from condoning) acts of brutality." The Commission also found that the cost of paying for civil suits was so great that it made such suits under existing law almost nonexistent, because "the victims of police brutality and racial violence are predominantly the poor and the powerless." Clearly, one effective way to inject this deterrent factor into the situation is to permit the Attorney General to bring such suits.

Second. The Attorney General contends that not all demonstrations are protected by the 1st and 14th amendments, and therefore not all offensive police conduct in connection with civil rights demonstrations would be within the reach of title III. This is an extraordinary argument from the chief law-enforcement officer of the United States: carried over to other fields, it would mean that no law should ever be enacted until it can be shown that it will be entirely effective in eliminating the evil it is directed against, and this is virtually always the case, as I am sure the Attorney General would concede.

Yet as I have noted, the Civil Rights Commission after careful study finds that most of the demonstrations have been within the protective guarantees of the first amendment. Why should those demonstrations not be protected effectively, I ask the Attorney General .

Third. The Attorney General contends that title III would require the Federal courts to make the difficult determinations as to whether a particular demonstration was or was not protected by the Constitution. This is true; but it is also true of all the difficult constitutional cases presented to the courts at all times, with or without Federal statutes authorizing the Attorney General to become involved in them. The State courts are now deciding these questions every day, in the many trespass and breach of the peace prosecutions which local authorities have brought against demonstrators; many of these cases are being contested, at enormous cost and individual sacrifice—as in many cases, as I pointed out a moment ago, serious criminal charges are involved—on the ground that the demonstrators were protected by the 1st and 14th amendments. The Supreme Court had no great difficulty in deciding the Edwards case, on appeal from State breach of the peace prosecutions, on just these grounds in January of this year. Title III would not require the Federal courts to handle any new or unusual question which courts are not already deciding. It would simply authorize the U.S. Government to initiate such litigation to protect rights of U.S. citizens under the Constitution, rights which individuals are finding extremely difficult to redress under existing law. It should also be noted that in the cases, in which under existing law the courts are faced with deciding these issues, there is no redress for denials of

rights where such denials are finally found to have existed, and therefore little deterrence to a repetition of the denial during the next demonstration: the demonstrators' convictions under State law are simply reversed. This revolving door can go around and around, in the absence of injunctions issued at the request of the Attorney General.

Fourth. The Attorney General contends that the courts would have to decide in advance what police action might or might not be justified in the fast-changing conditions accompanying demonstrations. The Supreme Court had no difficulty in making the applicable distinction in the Edwards case, in which it said of the demonstrators, whose convictions were reversed on this ground, that "there was no violence or threat of violence on their part, or on the part of any member of the crowd watching them. Police protection was ample." And the Court was able to distinguish this case readily from another case in which the contrary was true. These were cases decided after the fact, rather than in advance of it; but the principle is one which local authorities in some parts of the Nation apparently do not accept, even in the face of clear Federal law. It would, therefore, be of enormous value for the Attorney General to be able to ask a Federal court for an injunctive order embodying this principle, even in general terms, against local authorities who have consistently and daily denied the principle. The deterrent value of such an order, punishable by contempt proceedings, can hardly be doubted. In fact, in his next argument, the Attorney General not only concedes its effectiveness, but argues that it would be too effective. Therefore, he does not want to use it. Then the Attorney General pulls out of the closet all the hobgoblins about a Federal police force; but he forgets that in lieu of a Federal police force, the Federal Government had to call out the National Guard, federalize it, and send Federal troops in. That was the alternative, rather than just to permit the local authorities to do what they chose.

Fifth. The Attorney General contends that injunctions in advance might cause State and local authorities to abdicate their law enforcement responsibilities altogether, thereby requiring a Federal police force to fill the gap. This is precisely the result under existing, inadequate Federal law. In the case of the Birmingham, Ala., demonstrations last spring, just as in the cases of Little Rock, the University of Mississippi and the University of Alabama, the Federal Government was unable to handle the situation of virtual anarchy which the State and local authorities permitted to develop, short of having the President call into Federal service the State's National Guard and bring other armed forces into the breach. Does the Attorney General want that to be the only remedy which the Government of the United States has when rights of citizens of the United States are flagrantly denied by State and local authorities?

On the contrary, title III would at least permit the Federal courts to decide the constitutional questions rather than forcing the demonstrators to test their rights in the streets with only the hope that, if conditions finally become anarchic to the point where it is impossible to maintain order, the President will have to send in troops. The Attorney General's prediction cannot dismay us, and he should not scare us with a Federal police force, since the present situation is even more dismaying than the one that he foresees. Even if the outcome were precisely as it is now, at least the power and authority of the U.S. Government would be involved from the beginning on the side of protection of constitutional rights, rather than after the photographs of police dogs attacking demonstrators appear on front pages throughout the world.

Sixth. The Attorney General contends that demonstrations are only a means to an end, and the end should be reached by specific legislation aimed at elimination of racial discrimination and segregation. This again is true, of course, so far as it goes, but it stops short of two important points. One is that demonstrations are only one consideration in pressing for an adequate part III provision. Police excess, which I have quoted the Commission as finding, is itself discriminatory against Negroes.

So when excesses are not curbed, civil rights are curbed, and a discrimination as great as any other discrimination against Negroes is suffered. And, even if it were not discriminatory, one would expect the Attorney General to be concerned about ending it, especially when the Commission finds that existing remedies are inadequate to end it. Secondly, even in regard to demonstrations, the Attorney General seems to forget that the first amendment right of assembly and petition is a constitutional right in itself. And it is a right which by its very nature is always used as a means to an end; the Constitution says in so many words, "for the redress of grievances." Surely, this is a right which deserves protection by the Federal Government, especially when the Civil Rights Commission finds, as it did, that it is being denied discriminatorily and that existing remedies are inadequate to end the denials.

Finally, it should be said that the Attorney General has found one aspect of the subcommittee draft of title III which I agree is unfortunate. I described that point before. I had urged that the subcommittee not adopt it. That is the application of a part III to the entire Constitution instead of the 14th amendment only.

The Attorney General properly poses the question raised by part III by asking whether, on balance, police practices and systematic repression of Negro rights, which he acknowledges exist in some communities in the United States, are so prevalent and so menacing as to justify creation of such broad Federal discretionary authority as part III. My answer is a resounding "Yes," so long as the provision is properly amended to cover 14th amendment cases only. My answer is based on the unanimous recommendation of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and on the unanimous recommendation of the civil rights groups in the Nation. In his negative answer, the Attorney General is neglecting both, as well as the plank in his party's platform in 1960—on which this administration was elected—which stated that "the Attorney General should be empowered and directed to file civil injunction suits in Federal courts to prevent the denial of any civil rights on grounds of race, creed, or color."

Mr. President, the bill, S. 1693, and the amendment embodying that bill, which has been submitted by me along with other Republican Senators, with the full determination to propose the amendment as an amendment to any civil rights bill which is debated in the Senate, is exactly along those lines and would seek only to protect 14th amendment rights. It is those rights which I have invoked in answering the Attorney General's case. But the Attorney General retreated much too far, and that is what I cry out against today. In addition, I oppose the idea of loading this responsibility on the back of Republicans, which in my opinion is a great disservice to the effort to get bipartisan support for civil rights legislation, including part III.

The apparent acceptance yesterday of the essence of the Attorney General's position by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the other body is clearly dictated by his views as to obtaining the necessary support for civil rights legislation. If we are not to have a tragic retreat on civil rights even before the battle has begun, those of us who are devoted to a meaningful civil rights program at the present session of Congress must speak out against it now.

The Republican Party may not and should not bear the responsibility which is implied in the statement of the Attorney General on the reasons for the administration's retreat from the subcommittee's bill. There could be many other explanations inherent in the administration's strategy. Therefore, Republicans have a duty to express themselves now for the very reason that their votes are indispensable for any meaningful civil rights legislation, and also because the moral status of this issue requires more than the Attorney General is supporting.

There could be many other reasons inherent in the strategy of the administration. We cannot count the votes until they are cast. Our moral duty to the country and to the issue is so great that I strongly hope that the administration will change its mind and that the Attorney General will come back and say, "Yes, I do want some change in part III." I agree with that thoroughly, as I explained, but I do not retreat from it altogether, as he did. It is needed to prevent the people from being subject to indictments and convictions for serious crimes which we know are based on unconstitutional actions or statutes. It is needed to protect municipalities from denying to citizens the right to assemble peacefully and to march to redress their grievances.

It is essential to protect against police excesses or police brutality. The police in most places are doing a great job. In my city of New York the police have shown how to do a great job, even with civil rights problems. But when a police officer's power is abused, it can be as discriminatory and repressive as the most discriminatory of any of the discriminations that we complain against. I do not wish to see that imposed on any American, Negro or not, contrary to the Constitution of our land without the Attorney General of the United States asserting the majesty and power of the United States to protect the right of a citizen of the United States wherever he may be, and in whatever State, and whatever may be his policy on segregation.

So I hope that as we speak up, the Attorney General will see that we mean business on this question. We will have been here all year. We should not have been here all year in vain. I deeply feel that the Attorney General will fall far short of the mark in dealing with the domestic order and tranquillity of our Nation if he persists in retreating from a reasonable part III provision as I have described it.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I commend my colleague for the very well-reasoned argument which he has presented against the attempt to eliminate any part III from the bill which is before the House. There is only one way to deal properly and responsibly with the civil rights crisis, and that way is to define the problems that exist and then to try to enact the best legislation we can devise to resolve these problems.

That is why I believe, as does my colleague, that part III is an essential provision of meaningful civil rights legislation. That is why we ought to make it clear now that no matter what strategy of expediency may be recommended by some, those of us who advocate effective and meaningful legislation, will press for the enactment of part III in the Senate and we will make a determined effort to retain it in any bill which is finally enacted.

I express the hope that the other body, in its wisdom, will include the provision in the bill which it sends to us. But whatever the House decides, the Senate certainly should not be asked to swallow whole whatever the House sends over to us. We have our own constitutional responsibilities in this process.

I commend my colleague for bringing the subject before the Senate at this important time. I am confident that it will be helpful in shaping a civil rights measure which will be fully responsive to the needs of the present situation.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague for his intercession. I appreciate very much his approval and his joining me in this endeavor. It is very clear that part III originated in the Eisenhower administration. It had substantial Republican support. It actually passed the other body with substantial Republican support. It will be before the Senate. I can promise that it will be before the Senate.

How much stronger will be our position, therefore, Mr. President, if the administration does not retreat, but fights for what it needs, for what it knows it needs, for what is right. The administration should stop looking over its shoulder toward those who sit in positions of power here, who can affect its other programs. The administration is not going to get any breaks on those, anyhow. We are down to the wire on the civil rights proposition. We must see it through now. If we do not see it through we shall gravely endanger our country in every aspect of its national life.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a very brief statement regarding the discussion on civil rights. I have the highest respect and admiration for the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and know of his dedication to this fundamental issue of human rights. I know of no Senator who has a greater commitment to it, but I wish him to know—as well as all Senators on both sides of the aisle—that the administration, the President of the United States and the Attorney General, and those in support of the administration are committed to an effective program of civil rights legislation in this session of Congress.

We want a program, and not an issue. We want action, and not merely speeches. We want legislation that will have remedial effects. None of us could possibly believe that we can remedy every weakness or defect in one program, or in one bill, or in one session of Congress. But I wish to make it crystal clear that the administration—and the lieutenants of the administration, of which I am one—will see that the Senate has an opportunity to vote on and, if I have my way, to pass an effective, meaningful civil rights program that encompasses every issue that the President laid out in his message on civil rights.

It may well be that we cannot get every point that some people wish, but there will be action. There will be legislation. I have no doubt that in the years to come there will be opportunity to improve what we accomplish in this session of Congress; but the important thing, I believe, is for both Houses of Congress to be able to act, and to act promptly.

It is imperative that we act in 1963.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I will stake my right arm that the Senator from Minnesota is a proponent of civil rights, whatever the Senator may do about this legislation. The Senator should have no doubt about that. I am as convinced of that as I am about what is in my own heart.

I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question. Is it not a fact, feeling as I do, that it is my duty to speak, because I feel very strongly about this issue? The able Senator knows a good deal about that. Does not the Senator agree with me, too, that it is also the duty of the Administration to listen? It may not act, but it is its duty to listen?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from New York not only has a duty to speak; but, since for years he has had a commitment to this fundamental area of human rights, of course it is his duty, his privilege, and his responsibility to speak—and he speaks clearly and unequivocally.

It is also the duty of the administration to seek counsel and advice. I do not consider the remarks of the Senator from New York today to be in bad temper, or to be motivated by partisanship. I wish him to know that. I should like Senators on the Republican side of the aisle to know that we cannot pass civil rights without their help; and, therefore, it is imperative that we try to have as much cooperation as humanly possible among us.

Those of us who believe in the civil rights program may have our differences—and it is quite obvious there are some differences on details—but we will have to reconcile those differences and work them out among ourselves.

I am not being critical of the Senator from New York. I merely wish the Senator to know that when this issue is before the Senate we must have action, and not merely another futile effort. We must make progress. Whether we can make as much progress as the Senator from New York proposes may very well be doubtful, but I agree with him that he should state his case and state it effectively. I shall state my case as best I can. But I would be less than honorable with Senators if I did not say that when we get down to the line we shall have to make a judgment as to what we can really pass in this body, and how we can stand together to support it.

I have no doubt that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], his colleague [Mr. KEATING], and the minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] will be in the forefront of that battle.

PROHIBITION OF EMPLOYMENT IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE OF ANY EMPLOYEE OF PRIVATE DETECTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 423, S. 1543.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1543) to repeal that portion of the act of March 3, 1893, which prohibits the employment in any Government service or by any officer of the District of Columbia, of any employee of the Pinkerton Detective Agency or any similar agency.

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

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I call up the amendment No. 223.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. Hereafter no employee of any detective agency shall be employed in any Government service or by any officer of the District of Columbia for the purpose of providing investigative services.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, when the bill was reported, it had the support of the agencies of government involved. All of them approved it. A question was raised by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] with respect to the provisions of the bill. I have discussed them with him, and we have ironed out the differences. The amendment I now propose will do what everyone actually intended should be done and what we had in mind at the very beginning. So far as I know, there is no objection to the bill, and I ask that it be passed.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the consideration that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas gave to my comments on the bill as it originally came from committee. I believe we now have, in the form of the amendment, a better bill, certainly a bill which meets the test that everyone concerned wishes to have established. I join the Senator from Arkansas in expressing the hope that the bill will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1543) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the paragraph immediately after the paragraph bearing the caption "Lighting the Capitol and Grounds" of the Act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. 591, 5 U.S.C. 53), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Hereafter no employee of any detective agency shall be employed in any Government service or by any officer of the District of Columbia for the purpose of providing investigative services.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to repeal that portion of the Act of March 3, 1893, which prohibits the employment, in any Government service or by any officer of the District of Columbia, of any employee of the Pinkerton Detective Agency or any similar agency, and for other purposes."

VISIT TO WASHINGTON BY TITO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, previously I have made several statements expressing my belief that a mistake has been made in inviting Tito to the United States, and more so in having him as an honored guest at the White House. My views on that subject have not changed at all.

In my judgment, Tito has done more to spread communism throughout the world than has been done by the combined efforts of Stalin, Khrushchev, and Mao. People who are in doubt have witnessed the silk-glove treatment that we have given to the Communist government of Tito. Knowing that he has succeeded, such persons have adopted, in many instances, the view that if Tito, with his communism, can get by, why cannot they, if they follow a similar course?

Throughout the world, in many nations, are Hungarians, Germans, Slovenes, Croatians, and Serbians who have fled from Yugoslavia. They either had to face death there or seek sanctuary in foreign countries.

Tito, when he took over the government, indulged in political oppression of the cruelest kind. He put countless people to death solely because of their political opposition. He put to death General Mikhailovitch. That act is one of the blackest in history.

Today I look with sadness upon the fact Tito is being graced and favored in the White House.

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN RICE ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 192) relating to the validity of certain rice acreage allotments for 1962 and prior crop years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House Joint Resolution 192 is before the Senate. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, in some States, rice acreage allotments are apportioned to farms on the basis of the rice history of the producers on the farm, rather than the rice history of the farm. In these States, the Department's regulations for 1956 through 1962 required that, in order for a producer's history to count toward the allotment for a particular farm, the producer must contribute land, labor, water, or equipment to the production of rice on the farm for a share of the crop. In 1962, it was discovered in a number of cases that after the allotment was properly made to the farm, the producer did not actually contribute land, labor, water, or equipment for a share of the crop. Instead of performing or hiring the labor and taking a percentage of the crop, he may have settled for a flat payment per acre. He may have furnished equipment which was never used; or he may have entered into a partnership to carry out the farm operation which was defective in some respect and did not meet the Department's regulations. Out of 202 cases in Texas in which it originally appeared to the Department that there might exist irregularities of this nature affecting 1962 farm allotments the State committee had cleared 194 as of May 13, 1963. The irregularities are of such a technical nature that the Department has little expectation of setting aside many allotments, and estimates that the costs involved in seeking to collect marketing penalties would be greater than the amount of any penalties that might be collected.

Setting aside the acreage allotment for any farm would affect all of the producers on the farm, including those that followed the regulations to the letter.

The resolution applies only to allotments properly apportioned from the State rice acreage allotment and allocated to the farm by the county committee in good faith. It would not apply to allotments obtained by duplication, forgery, bribery, intimidation, or practices which would increase the acreage allotted in the State.

I wish to have it plainly understood that this would not attempt to clear up any situation in which an ASC agent acted in any way in a fraudulent manner.

I believe the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has some questions he wishes to ask.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, what I wish to be sure about is that the proposal would not relieve the producer or the county committeeman, the Government official, from any legal responsibility in cases when either intentionally violated the law.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The joint resolution in no way helps any agent of the Government, the ASC agent, or any person who received any benefit through that agent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In June of 1962 I had occasion to call some of these violations to the attention of the Department of Agriculture, and on April 3, 1963, this year, I received a reply, which I incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24. I wish to read that letter, and then ask the Senator from South Carolina to follow me as I read it and state whether or not the joint resolution will excuse the types of cases which are described in this particular report furnished by the Administrator, Mr. Godfrey.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I shall be glad to try to answer the question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The letter is dated April 3, 1963, and is addressed to me. It reads as follows:

This is in further reference to your letters of June 29, 1962, and February 28, 1963, with respect to multiple assignments of rice acreage allotments in Matagorda and Brazoria Counties in Texas.

On June 3, 1962, Carl E. Lively, the Matagorda ASCS county office manager died of cancer. Immediately thereafter the Texas State office became aware of some indicated rice allotment irregularities in the county. A preliminary investigation by State office personnel pointed up several illegal transfers of producer rice allotments between Matagorda and Brazoria Counties. A further check in Brazoria County confirmed their suspicions. Similar transfers appeared to have taken place between these and other counties, Jackson and Waller.

Evidence indicated certain persons in the county offices of Brazoria, Matagorda, Jackson, and Waller Counties had accepted money from producers for rice acreage allotments or for increases in producer allotments.

The services of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Investigation Division, Office of the Inspector General; Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Internal Audit Division, Office of the Inspector Gen-

eral; and the Federal Bureau of Investigation were requested on or about June 8, 1962, to determine the extent of the acreages and personnel involved. As their findings were disclosed, certain actions were taken by the Department.

When the investigations were well underway it became apparent that the indicated violations fell into the following categories:

A. Instances where a producer paid a county office employee annually over the past 2 or 3 years a monetary fee per acre for an increase in his producer rice acreage allotment. These irregularities appeared to be confined to four counties. This allotment acreage is usually duplicated by having been allocated to two or more farms and planted, but in some cases the producer allotment so allocated was in the name of a fictitious person.

B. Instances where two producers entered into an agreement or partnership for the purpose of producing rice on a joint basis, although it appears that one of the producers actually withdrew from the production of rice and was paid money at the time by the other producer for the use of his allotment, on an annual or permanent basis. In either instance, annual applications for allocation of producer allotments to a farm were approved on the basis that both producers were to be "engaged in the production of rice" on the farm. Effective with the 1958 crop year, regulations have provided for the recall of any producer rice acreage allotment and a reduction of the farm allotment upon a finding after a scheduled hearing before the ASC county committee, that the producer was not "engaged in the production of rice" as indicated at the time of allocating his producer allotment to the farm.

Category A cases are of a limited number; category B cases are numerous and affect many producers directly and indirectly. One or more years during the period 1958 through 1962 are involved in each.

My question is, Does the joint resolution relieve any of the groups in those two categories?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It relieves those in the B category, but does not relieve those in the A category.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In some instances those in category B knew they were filing a false report. Under the joint resolution, if they knew it, they would not be excused.

Let me continue reading from the letter:

However, subsequent to the initial action taken by the State committee, which resulted in the recall or revocation of allotments in the category B cases, many of the producers involved have furnished the State committee with evidence which substantiated their claim that they were "engaged in the production of rice" in the 1962 crop year, thereby clearing their operations for such year.

Those who could produce evidence that they were in line have cleared themselves. Would the Senator say that, under the joint resolution, those who could not produce such evidence are excused?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The bill is intended to relieve those in the category B cases. All of those cases involve some technical irregularity. The allotment was properly made on the basis that the producer would contribute land, labor, equipment, or water to the production of rice on the farm for a share of the crop. For some reason he did not follow through on this to comply fully with the regulation. He may have taken a smaller share of the crop as a way of paying for the labor. He may have taken a flat payment per acre. He may have thought he was complying with the regulation, or had some doubts, or he may not have intended to carry out his declarations as to his intentions. He may have misrepresented his intentions, but that is difficult to determine or prove. The Department has not been able to prove it in any cases to date.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If there is any evidence to prove that their acreage was fraudulently obtained or transferred, they are not affected under the joint resolution?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Department does not believe that fraud is involved, or could be proved, in any of the category B cases. It is possible that there could have been some misrepresentation of intent in some of these cases, but that is almost impossible to prove. Many of the cases involve small amounts. The Department advises that the cost for the Government to bring those cases would probably exceed any penalties that could be collected. They would not have sufficient evidence to prove the case.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Government does not have evidence to prove the case, certainly it should not be bringing those cases. I am not speaking of such cases, because it seems to me it would be useless to pass a measure telling the Government not to take a case into court if it could not produce sufficient evidence. I am speaking of cases which can be proved, and in which the evidence is clear. Does the joint resolution relieve any of those cases?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The evidence in those cases is not clear, as is indicated by the fact that the Government has lost the 194 cases that have proceeded to completion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But if the Government feels it has evidence to prove the case, does the joint resolution excuse them? Is this joint resolution a blanket excuse for category B cases, without regard to the evidence the Government may have in its possession? I am not concerned for the moment with cases in which the Government does not have any evidence to prove the case, because no Government official—he ought to be fired if he did—is going to take someone into court to try to convict him in a case if he does not have proof. That would be blackmail. I hope there is no evidence that the Government is trying to do that. I am speaking of cases in which the Government has evidence which, if presented to the court, would prove a case of willful violation. Are we excusing that type of case?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In cases involving a statement of intention concerning an action to be taken, it is difficult to determine that there was an actual willful misrepresentation or violation. The regulations were quite technical, requiring that the producer receive a share of the crop rather than a flat payment. The purpose of the bill is to relieve the producers of penalties which might be assessed for these technical violations where they had no intention of doing wrong. That is the purpose of the bill, but we cannot be sure that one or more of these producers might not actually have had some wrongful type of intent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No one is arguing that point. I would be very critical of the Government's trying to go into court with a case it knew it could not prove. I am speaking of cases the Government thinks it can prove. Are we excusing those cases? I would be critical of the Government's trying to make a case if it did not have evidence. I am not speaking now of technical violations. At times all of us violate rules without intention. I am not speaking of cases of that kind. I am not speaking of unintentional violations. But is it intended to excuse cases of willful violation, when the evidence is such that the Government could prove it in court and could present evidence to prove the person was violating the law?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think the last paragraph of the joint resolution answers the question. I read:

This resolution shall not apply to any producer rice allotment or any planted rice acreage that has been obtained by duplication, forgery, bribery, intimidation, or practices that would result in the total allotted acreage in the State exceeding the State acreage allotment, less any unallocated reserve acreage.

The object of the joint resolution is to clean out the few cases remaining, which are mostly in California and Texas, with a few in Louisiana. That is about the limit. Perhaps a half dozen cases in the other States of the Union could be found.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. From which part of the report has the Senator been reading?

Mr. JOHNSTON. What I have read is not in the report. I have been reading from the joint resolution itself. The language I read appears at page 2 of the joint resolution, in the second paragraph.

I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that it is impossible to prove an intent in a man's mind unless there are some facts from which to draw the intent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I recognize that fact. I am not asking the Government to try to prove something it cannot prove. I thought I heard something in the last part of the Senator's statement as he read it which would indicate that the provision did not apply unless there was an increase in the allotment for the county. I wonder what that phrase was.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The last phrase is:

That would result in the total allotted acreage in the State exceeding the State acreage allotment, less any unallocated reserve acreage.

In other words, it refers to an increase in the acreage. The resolution does not apply to any case which would result in an increase in the total acreage allotted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not quite understand what difference it makes whether it increases the acreage in a county or decreases the acreage in a county, if it was fraudulently obtained.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If it was fraudulently obtained, of course, it cannot be excused, but the Department has no evidence that fraud was involved in any

of the category B cases. It could be that there was some, but the Department has not been able to find it. They could still seek to collect the penalties, since fraud would not have to be shown for that purpose. But even there the Department has had no success, because the cases are so technical. The committee has earnestly tried to give relief to those guilty of technical violations who have had no wrongful intent. That is the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I read further from the letter:

Your inquiry was directed to category A cases in Brazoria and Matagorda counties.

The excess or unexplained acreages in this category in Brazoria County from 1958 through 1962, and the illegal transfers of such acreages which emanated from Brazoria County, during this period, are as follows:

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Brazoria	90.0	1,518.7	1,706.0	1,541.1	2,357.0
Fort Bend	--------	271.4	125.0	--------	--------
Jackson	--------	908.2	1,019.2	427.1	200.0
Matagorda	146.0	315.5	242.2	455.9	420.6
Victoria	--------	110.0	60.0	--------	--------
Waller	--------	--------	166.8	639.1	1,183.7
Total	236.0	3,123.8	3,319.2	3,063.2	4,161.3

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is reading about category A cases. All of those are not excused.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This is part of category A. Do I clearly understand that these are not excused?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. With respect to category B, when there are known and provable violations, again I ask what would happen in such cases?

I will read the remainder of the letter. Perhaps the language will clarify that point:

As information became available, the field officials of the Department took steps to cancel improper allocations in the category A cases and to recall or revoke producer allotment allocations in the category B cases as provided for in existing regulations.

In view of the fact that these violations came to light just prior to or at the time of harvest of the 1962 crop of rice, administrative action was directed to 1962 cases only, with action on violations for 1961 and prior years to be taken at the earliest practicable date.

On September 7, 1962, suit was brought in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas against the Texas ASCS State executive director, the ASCS county committees and county office managers of six counties in Texas by seven Texas rice farmers, praying for a preliminary injunction to prevent the recall of the allocation of producer rice acreage allotments to farms and the cancellation or reduction of farm acreage allotments as a result thereof and asking also for affirmative relief to require the return or issuance of rice marketing cards which had been canceled or withheld. Basis for the suit was that the Government's regulations under which the defendants had acted were invalid. The suit was a class action on behalf of all farmers in Texas similarly situated and it was sought to join as party defendants all other ASCS county committees and county office managers in the Texas rice-producing area. One plaintiff withdrew from the case at the start of the trial. Trial was held on October 1, 2, and 3, 1962, and decision was rendered on October 5, 1962. The court upheld the regulation and ruled also that the plaintiffs should have exhausted their administrative and judicial remedies provided for in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. Plaintiffs appealed to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and requested a stay order pending the appeal to prevent defendants from adjusting any more farm rice acreage allotments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,

Washington D.C., April 3, 1963.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reference to your letters of June 29, 1962, and February 28, 1963, with respect to multiple assignments of rice acreage allotments in Matagorda and Brazoria Counties in Texas.

On June 3, 1962, Carl E. Lively, the Matagorda ASCS County office manager died of cancer. Immediately thereafter the Texas State Office became aware of some indicated rice allotment irregularities in the county. A preliminary investigation by State office personnel pointed up several illegal transfers of producer rice allotments between Matagorda and Brazoria Counties. A further check in Brazoria County confirmed their suspicions. Similar transfers appeared to have taken place between these and other counties, Jackson and Waller.

Evidence indicated certain persons in the county offices of Brazoria, Matagorda, Jackson, and Waller Counties had accepted money from producers for rice acreage allotments or for increases in producer allotments.

The services of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Investigation Division, Office of the Inspector General; Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Internal Audit Division, Office of the Inspector General; and the Federal Bureau of Investigation were requested on or about June 8, 1962, to determine the extent of the acreages and personnel involved. As their findings were disclosed, certain actions were taken by the Department.

When the investigations were well under way it became apparent that the indicated violations fell into the following categories:

A. Instances where a producer paid a county office employee annually over the past 2 or 3 years a monetary fee per acre for an increase in his producer rice acreage allotment. These irregularities appeared to be confined to four counties. This allotment acreage is usually duplicated by having been allocated to two or more farms and planted, but in some cases the producer allotment so allocated was in the name of a fictitious person.

B. Instances where two producers entered into an agreement or partnership for the purpose of producing rice on a joint basis, although it appears that one of the producers actually withdrew from the production of rice and was paid money at the time by the other producer for the use of his allotment, on an annual or permanent basis. In either instance, annual applications for allocation of producer allotments to a farm were approved on the basis that both producers were to be "engaged in the production of rice" on the farm. Effective with the 1958 crop year, regulations have provided for the recall of any producer rice acreage allotment and a reduction of the farm allotment upon a finding after a scheduled hearing before the ASC county committee, that the producer was not "engaged in the production of rice" as indicated at the time of allocating his producer allotment to the farm.

Category A cases are of a limited number; category B cases are numerous and affect many producers directly and indirectly. One or more years during the period 1958 through 1962 are involved in each. However, subsequent to the initial action taken by the State committee, which resulted in the recall or revocation of allotments in the category B cases, many of the producers involved have furnished the State committee with evidence which substantiated their claim that they were "engaged in the production of rice" in the 1962 crop year, thereby clearing their operations for such year.

Your inquiry was directed to category A cases in Brazoria and Matagorda Counties.

The excess or unexplained acreages in this category in Brazoria County from 1958 through 1962, and the illegal transfers of such acreages which emanated from Brazoria County, during this period, are as follows:

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Brazoria	90.0	1,518.7	1,706.0	1,541.1	2,357.0
Fort Bend	--------	271.4	125.0	--------	--------
Jackson	--------	908.2	1,019.2	427.1	200.0
Matagorda	146.0	315.5	242.2	455.9	420.6
Victoria	--------	110.0	60.0	--------	--------
Waller	--------	--------	166.8	639.1	1,183.7
Total	236.0	3,123.8	3,319.2	3,063.2	4,161.3

As information became available, the field officials of the Department took steps to cancel improper allocations in the category A cases and to recall or revoke producer allotment allocations in the category B cases as provided for in existing regulations.

In view of the fact that these violations came to light just prior to or at the time of harvest of the 1962 crop of rice, administrative action was directed to 1962 cases only, with action on violations for 1961 and prior years to be taken at the earliest practicable date.

On September 7, 1962, suit was brought in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas against the Texas ASCS State executive director, the ASCS county committees and county office managers of six counties in Texas by seven Texas rice farmers, praying for a preliminary injunction to prevent the recall of the allocation of producer rice acreage allotments to farms and the cancellation or reduction of farm acreage allotments as a result thereof and asking also for affirmative relief to require the return or issuance of rice marketing cards which had been canceled or withheld. Basis for the suit was that the Government's regulations under which the defendants had acted were invalid. The suit was a class action on behalf of all farmers in Texas similarly situated and it was sought to join as party defendants all other ASCS county committees and county office managers in the Texas rice-producing area. One plaintiff withdrew from the case at the start of the trial. Trial was held on October 1, 2, and 3, 1962, and decision was rendered on October 5, 1962. The court upheld the regulation and ruled also that the plaintiffs should have exhausted their administrative and judicial remedies provided for in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. Plaintiffs appealed to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and requested a stay order pending the appeal to prevent defendants from adjusting any more farm rice acreage allotments. The stay order was granted. Arguments before the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit were heard on February 21, 1963, but to date no decision has been handed down. At the close of the argument, motion was filed by counsel for plaintiffs

seeking withdrawal from the action by three of the remaining plaintiffs.

The stay order has been in effect since October 15, 1962, and the Department has been precluded by reason thereof from taking administrative action leading to the recall or revocation of the rice acreage allotment in any case in which action had not already been taken at the time the stay order was issued.

Practically all farmers whose allotments were reduced or canceled before the stay order was issued have availed themselves of the opportunity to apply for a review of the administrative action before a review committee, as provided for in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Many hearings before review committees were scheduled, but most were postponed or continued at the request of the farmers pending the outcome of the court action.

However, six category A cases were heard by the review committee for Matagorda County and three category B cases were heard by the review committee for Chambers County. In each case, the review committee found for the farmer. The Matagorda County cases were reopened on behalf of the Secretary of Agriculture, but the review committee affirmed the prior determinations.

If the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is favorable to the Government, further administrative and review committee action will be taken in accordance with applicable regulations. If the decision is unfavorable, no such action can be taken and any prior action by the Department under the regulations would likely have been invalidated.

We are informed by the Criminal Division, Department of Justice, that as a result of the investigations, criminal indictments have been obtained against Victor M. Dziewas, farmer fieldman, district 13, Texas ASCS State Office, David C. Stephens, Brazoria ASCS County office manager, Tacitus Thornhill, Waller ASCS County office manager, J. W. Killough, Jr., farmer, Brazoria County, Lawrence G. Newman, and (Mr.) Pearl Bellard. The latter two men posed as farmers from Brazoria County, but actually were not engaged in farming. Carl E. Lively, former Matagorda ASCS County office manager, and Norman E. Scaff, former Jackson ASCS County office manager, who were involved in the investigations, are deceased. Dziewas has pleaded guilty, but has not been sentenced pending trial of Stephens, who has pleaded not guilty. Thornhill originally pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 2 years in prison and fined $30,000; he later had a nervous breakdown, his guilty plea was withdrawn and a not guilty plea entered for him, a motion was filed to test his competency, and he is now in a hospital undergoing treatment. Killough pleaded guilty, but has not been sentenced, pending trial of Stephens. Newman pleaded guilty and was given a 2-year sentence, which was suspended, and fined $1,500. Bellard has pleaded not guilty and will be tried with Stephens. It is expected that the trial of Stephens and Bellard will be held during the summer months, although no date has been set.

As it became known that employees of the Department were involved in illegal transfers of rice allotments, appropriate personnel actions were initiated. As a result, all the persons indicted who were employees of the Department were removed from office. Many others who, although not considered to have violated any criminal statute, were considered to have been guilty of conduct incompatible with their continued employment, and were removed from office or their employment was terminated. These include three county committeemen, one alternate county committeeman, one county office clerk, one performance supervisor, two performance reporters, two community committeemen, and two alternate community committeemen. One review committeeman was not reappointed when his term of office expired. Three county committeemen and four community committeemen were permitted to serve out their terms of office. In addition, resignations were accepted from one State committeeman, one community committeeman, and one county office clerk.

Personnel actions in the cases of certain persons holding minor offices or positions have been withheld pending the holding of review hearings which have been initiated by such persons, and/or the results of further investigation currently in progress. Additional personnel actions of the types indicated above are currently underway and it is contemplated that others may be forthcoming.

If we can furnish you any additional information, we shall be glad to do so.

Sincerely yours,

H. D. GODFREY,
Administrator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Would the joint resolution affect any of the cases that are brought into court?

Mr. JOHNSTON. All of category B cases are exempt. The Government has found that cases in that classification are cases which it cannot prove, or in connection with which it cannot find a wrongful intent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Government does not feel it can prove a case, why does not the Government drop the case? Is it necessary to have Congress tell the Government not to prosecute a man against whom it does not have sufficient evidence? We should not have to tell the Government not to prosecute a case which the Government cannot prove.

If the provision goes beyond that, I want to know to what extent it goes. I would be surprised to hear that the Department of Agriculture would try to harass farmers with suits the Department cannot prove.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Department has not been able to collect penalties in these cases against the farmers themselves. The Department has cases pending with regard to those who probably have committed some wrong. Those cases would not be excused.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does it affect in any way the status of the Government's case against an employee of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Not at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It does not affect such a case in any degree?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does the Senator have assurance that it does not affect in any way the right of the Government to prosecute any employee of the Government?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The joint resolution does not affect suits against such employees in any way.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In no way at all?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In no way at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It affects only those in category B?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Where it appears that some wrong has been committed but where the person involved did not know he was committing any wrong.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Only the type of case in which a regulation has been violated unknowningly?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Where there has been a technical violation. It involves cases in which a person did not have a clear understanding of the fact that he was doing something wrong, or he was doing something wrong without any intention to do wrong. We do not believe any clear, willful violations are involved.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. With the assurance that the joint resolution does not go beyond that point, I will not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 192) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 458, S. 283.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 283) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, at the beginning of line 6, to insert "(a)"; on page 2, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$7,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000"; in line 9, after the word "of", to strike out "$7,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000"; at the beginning of line 18, to insert "(b)"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 15, to insert "(c)"; at the beginning of line 20, to insert "(d)"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 1, to insert "(e)"; at the beginning of line 9, to insert "(f)"; at the beginning of line 12, to insert "(g)"; on page 5, at the beginning of line 10, to insert "(h)"; in line 25, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "If a loan has been made by another Federal agency for this purpose on a project approved for a construction loan under this Act, the Secretary may provide from construction funds the full amount necessary to repay that loan and that amount shall be repaid as a part of the construction loan under this Act." and insert "If a loan or advance of funds has been made by another Federal agency for planning with respect to a project theretofore or subsequently approved for a construction loan under this Act, the Secretary may provide from construction funds the full amount necessary to repay that loan or advance of funds and such amount shall be included as a part of the construction loan under this Act.";

on page 6, at the beginning of line 12, to insert "(i)"; at the beginning of line 14, to insert "(j)"; after line 19, to strike out:

SEC. 10. The Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

At the beginning of line 23, to insert "(k)"; on page 7, after line 14, to strike out:

SEC. 12. This Act shall be a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws and may be cited as the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956.

And, after line 17, to strike out:

SEC. 13. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person, organization, or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to persons, organizations, or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1044, as amended by 71 Stat. 48 and 49) is amended as follows:

(a) Amend subsection (d) of section 2 to read as follows:

"(d) The term 'project' shall mean (i) any complete irrigation undertaking including incidental features thereof, or distinct unit of such an undertaking or a rehabilitation and betterment program for an existing irrigation project, authorized to be constructed pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws and (ii) any similar undertaking proposed to be constructed by an organization. The term 'project' shall not include any such undertaking, unit, or program the cost of which exceeds $10,000,000: *Provided,* That no loan or grant or combination thereof in excess of $5,000,000 will be made: *Provided further,* That nothing contained in this definition shall preclude the making of a grant not in excess of $5,000,000 in accordance with the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this Act, to organizations whose proposed projects qualify for the same but which are not applicants for a loan under this Act: *And provided further,* That nothing contained in this Act shall preclude the making of more than one loan or grant, or combined loan and grant, to an organization so long as no two such loans or grants, or combinations thereof, are for the same project, as herein defined."

(b) Amend subsection (a) of section 4 to read as follows:

"(a) Any proposal with respect to the construction of a project which has not theretofore been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws shall set forth, among other things, a plan and estimated cost in detail adequate to provide a clear understanding of the project, to demonstrate that it is financially feasible, and to define the maximum amount of the loan; shall have been submitted for review by the States of the drainage basin in which the project is located in like manner as provided in subsection (c), section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), except that the review may be limited to the State or States in which the project is located if the proposal is one solely for rehabilitation and betterment of an existing project; and shall include a proposed allocation of capital costs to functions such that costs for facilities used for a single purpose shall be allocated to that purpose and costs for facilities used for more than one purpose shall be so allocated among the purposes served that each purpose will share equitably in the costs of such joint facilities."

(c) Amend subsection (b) of section 4 by striking out the word "construction" from the phrase which now reads "and willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this Act such portion of the cost of construction" and insert in lieu thereof "the project".

(d) Amend subsection (d), section 4, by adding at the end of the first sentence the following: "*Provided,* That an appropriation may be made before the end of said sixty days if both House and Senate committee shall have earlier approved the proposal by committee resolution."

(e) Amend subsection (a) of section 5 to read as follows:

"(a) The maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed the estimated total cost of the project minus the contribution of the local organization as provided in section 4(b) and the amount of the grant approved."

(f) Amend subsection (b) of section 5 by inserting in the second sentence after the words "said grant" and before the words "shall not exceed" the following: "may equal but".

(g) Amend subsection (c) of section 5 to read as follows:

"(c) A plan of repayment by the organization of (1) the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available; (2) interest, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which the contract is executed, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue, and by adjusting such average rate to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on which the contract is executed, on that portion of the loan which is attributable to furnishing water service or facilities to land held in private ownership in each year by any one owner in excess of one hundred and sixty irrigable acres; and (3) in the case of any project involving an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or commercial power, interest on the unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the loan at a rate as determined in (2) above: *Provided,* That interest as determined herein shall apply to loans made heretofore under this Act;".

(h) Add, as a new section, section 8, to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. If he determines that it is justified, the Secretary may advance to an organization, eligible for a loan under this Act, funds up to half the amount required to undertake project investigations, to prepare the loan applications, and to do other work necessary to obtaining of a construction loan, the funds so advanced to become a part of the loan and grant or combination thereof; to be repaid as provided in section 5 of this Act, if not otherwise repaid. If no loan under this Act is made to the organization and no construction (whether or not financed under this Act) is performed as a result of such investigations or studies, such funds advanced may be nonreimbursable. Funds for this purpose shall not be advanced until the local organization has presented its program for these activities for approval by the Secretary.

If a loan or advance of funds has been made by another Federal agency for planning with respect to a project theretofore or subsequently approved for a construction loan under this Act, the Secretary may provide from construction funds the full amount necessary to repay that loan or advance of funds and such amount shall be included as a part of the construction loan under this Act."

(i) Renumber existing sections "8," "9," "10," and "11," as sections "9," "10," "11," "12," and "13," respectively.

(j) Amend section 9, formerly section 8, to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. The planning and construction of projects undertaken pursuant to this Act shall be subject to all procedural requirements and other provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act."

(k) Amend section 11, formerly section 10, to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act, this limit to be extended by the amounts of repayment of principal received from loans and the amount of nonreimbursable expenditures under this Act: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall advise the Congress promptly on the receipt of each proposal referred to in section 3, and no contract, except as may be necessary under section 8, shall become effective until appropriated funds are available to initiate the specific proposal covered by each contract. All such appropriations shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under this Act, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided."

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to extend one of the most successful programs undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 established a program under which certain types of organizations, both private and public, could obtain loans for small reclamation projects and grants for those portions of the projects that are nonreimbursable as a matter of national policy.

The present limit on the amount that may be loaned is $5 million with an overall limitation of $10 million, the balance being supplied by the local entity that applies for a loan to construct or rehabilitate a project whose purpose is primarily for irrigation. Actually, the program to date has been largely for rehabilitation and betterment of small existing irrigation district works, improving distribution systems, providing drainage, and other matters related to the better use of land and water.

The projects are constructed by the local agency which is responsible for planning, building, operating, and maintaining the system. The Bureau of Reclamation examines the plans to determine whether the project can accomplish its purpose and will provide for the repayment of the loan.

The program has demonstrated that through real cooperation, very favorable results can be obtained by joining Bureau of Reclamation know-how with the advantages of local administration.

The proposed amendments to the original act would increase the authorized amount from $100 million to $200 million. The original authorization has been practically exhausted and if the program is to continue, as we of the committee feel it should, the increase in authorization is a must.

A second amendment relates to and defines more specifically the amount of

detail to be included in the application for a loan.

Under the present act the Appropriations Committee cannot make funds available for construction of an approved project until the proposal has been before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House for 60 days, and then only if a resolution of disapproval is not adopted by either committee during this time. An amendment would permit this requirement to be bypassed if a favorable resolution on the project was adopted by both committees.

Another amendment would provide that, for those portions of the project that require interest, the rate to be charged would be in conformity with the criteria established by the Water Supply Act of 1958, the formula that now controls in all water projects including those of the Department of the Interior, the Corps of Engineers, and the Department of Agriculture.

Based on current average prices on Government securities, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for 15 years, the bill would reduce interest costs on projects started after its passage by slightly less than 1 percent. This provision would be retroactive and would thus save money for present projects as well as for future ones.

These are the proposals of the sponsors and the decision of the committee. We of the West believe that the program is a good one and should continue. We are satisfied that the experience of the past 6 years indicate that the matters proposed here will make for better procedures and establish further guidelines for the implementation of a program that is designed to help the small organizations in solving their own problems at the local level. I know that this is true in my own State of Utah where at least nine different agencies have either completed their projects, have them under construction, or are in the process of completing application. I am sure that the record will show that the same is true in the other States in the West where the program has been utilized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments will be agreed to en bloc, and the bill as thus amended will be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, lines 6 and 9, it is proposed to strike out "$5 million" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,500,000".

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I speak as a Senator from a State whose people have utilized the beneficent principles of the small projects legislation to great advantage on many occasions. I speak for individual enterprising Americans who, of their own volition, have created local water districts of various types, and in some instances now find it possible to move forward with respect to what otherwise would be a reclamation project under the aegis of the Department of the Interior.

The costs of construction of small projects, or of any other public or private facility, for that matter, have increased. Therefore, I have offered an amendment to provide that the level of the loan may be $7,500,000 rather than $5 million. Let me make it clear that the size of the project will stay at the present rate of $10 million.

In support of the amendment which I offer, I cite a number of groups across the Nation which, at the hearings, also supported the bill as introduced. But, basically, in support of the amendment, I cite simply the reasonableness and fairness of my proposal. None of these groups objected to the increase from $5 million to $7.5 million. The asterisks shown in the list denote those groups which specifically called for that increase.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill as introduced was supported at hearings by the following, none of which objected to the increase from $5 million to $7.5 million. The asterisk denotes those who specifically called for that increase.

1. National Reclamation Association* by William Welsh, District of Columbia, secretary-manager*, and Doyle Boen, California, chairman, small projects committee*, and M. T. Martin, Texas, member of the committee. In accord with the association's Resolution 19 of last annual meeting, October 1962, paragraph C(4) of which urges the increase "which in light of increased construction costs will construct works comparable to what $5 million provided when the original loan maximum was contemplated."

2. State of Hawaii* by Robert T. Chuck, manager-engineer, division of water and land development, department of land and national resources, saying that with rising costs this increase would be important re their Molokai project.

3. State of Utah by letter from Governor Clyde and resolution of water and power board and letter from Utah Water Users Association.

4. State of Colorado* by letter from Governor Love.

5. State of Idaho by letter from Assistant State Reclamation Engineer Tappan, including resolution of Idaho State Reclamation Association.

6. Oregon groups: Klamath Basin Improvement District, Klamath County Farm Bureau, Oregon Reclamation Congress, Klamath Basin Water Users Protective Association.

7. California groups:* (a) United Water Conservation District, Santa Paula,* conservation dam and pipeline conveyance; (b) Semitropic Water Storage District, Kern County,* distribution system for State project water; (c) Wheeler Ridge, Maricopa Water Storage District,* Kearn County, distribution system for State project water.

8. State of Arizona by statement of W. S. Gookin, State water engineer.

9. Nebraska District Judge Wm. C. Smith, Jr., chairman of Nebraska Reclamation Association's resolution committee. Need for the increase:

1. Increased costs since $5 million limit set in 1956.

2. Meritorious projects within general purpose of legislation could not otherwise be undertaken because: (a) Conventional financing not available to requisite extent, and/or (b) regular reclamation program prevents service to excess acreage which this program permits, provided interest is paid.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I believe the amendment is in order and is in the public interest. I ask the Senate to approve it.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Senator from California has correctly informed the Senate that the overall amount of the cost of any project that would come within the purview of the bill would remain at $10 million for the project. However, the effect of his amendment would be that three-quarters of that amount, or $7,500,000, could be obtained by loan or grant from the Federal Government. This would change the present situation, under which only 50 percent, or $5 million, may be obtained by loan or grant.

The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation acted to increase the amount in accordance with the amendment now offered by the Senator from California. However, when the bill came before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the point was raised and discussed at some length, and by the vote of the full committee the amount was reduced to that provided in the bill, that is, $5 million. The sense of the committee at that time was that the formula should not be changed so as to make more than 50 percent of the amount of the small projects available by loan and grant from the Federal Government.

Although it was recognized that the costs of projects have increased to some degree, it was felt that the percentage should not be varied. For this reason, Mr. President, I must oppose the amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Utah opposes the amendment. It is precisely what we joined in sponsoring when we introduced the bill. The precise language of my amendment comes from our original bill.

It is true that a member of the staff of the Department of the Interior said to the committee, "We object to it." That is not a sufficient reason for the Senate to reject it. On the contrary, the Senate has the benefit of affirmative statements by persons representing most of the Western States, each of which wants this development to take place and the Senate ought to pass its own independent judgment on my proposal.

I can develop this argument further; but in the interest of time and orderly procedure, I ask the Senator from Utah to accept the amendment and take it with him to conference.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I certainly could do that. So far as I personally am concerned, in the subcommittee I voted for the amount the Senator proposes in his amendment. I felt that I was bound to present here the view of the full committee, because a vote was

taken there. But I think I can accede to the request of the Senator from California. The amendment can be taken to conference. I am sure it will be thoroughly discussed by the House conferees, who very likely will have a strong opinion in regard to it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am most grateful to the Senator from Utah. As he has said, he has reflected the views of the committee. On the other hand, we joined in sponsoring this language which is in the public interest. So I am grateful to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the amendment is now thoroughly locked in, in Kuchel style?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 283) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] for his leadership in the handling of this bill, which is known as the Small Reclamation Projects Act. He joined other Senators in introducing the bill, and he gave powerful impetus to the action on the bill in the subcommittee, in the full committee, and on the floor of the Senate. His service in that connection commends him to all of us.

This bill means a great deal to the West and to the Nation; and I am sure that everyone who is vitally concerned with irrigation, reclamation, and land conservation is indebted to the Senator from Utah. On behalf of the leadership, I commend him.

I also commend the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] for his cooperation in this connection. Reclamation measures mean a very great deal to the States in the Rocky Mountain area, in the Southwest, and in the Far West.

So, Mr. President, I commend all these Senators.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

THE PRESIDENT'S "NONPOLITICAL" TRIP

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Washington Daily News there appeared an interesting article, by Lyle C. Wilson, entitled "Taxpayers Stuck for J.F.K.'s Trip."

Ofttimes the question is asked, "Why was such a trip labeled 'nonpolitical'?" The answer is very simple: When it was so classified, the taxpayers, rather than the Democratic National Committee, paid the expenses.

I ask unanimous consent that this article appear in the RECORD at this point.

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

TAXPAYERS STUCK FOR J.F.K.'S TRIP

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The U.S. taxpayer put up the scratch that paid for the elaborate public relations trimmings to President Kennedy's "nonpolitical" swing to the west coast. The taxpayer doesn't know it, but he paid.

There were pamphlets, booklets, maps, movies, and still pictures. One securely strapped container hand delivered to UPI's Washington bureau contained 16-millimeter movie film, sufficient for a 30-minute show. An accompanying letter said these were film sequences of "projects and other installations which President Kennedy will either visit, fly over or (fly) near during his western trip."

An 8-by-10 pamphlet bound in slick brown paper turned out to be an 18-page, glossy stock copy of Mr. Kennedy's March 1, 1962, message to Congress on conservation. This was a great improvement on the roughly mimeographed text UPI received last March. The glossy version had several pages of pictures showing the recreational and other delights and advantages to be enjoyed by the people if Congress would create the new parks proposed by the President.

All of this material was printed by the Government Printing Office. The Agriculture and Interior Departments cooperated in preparing some or all of the material. It came to the news media with the compliments of Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall.

UPI was informed at the Interior Department that most of the 16-millimeter film footage was documentary material from the Reclamation Bureau's film library, but that some film was shot especially for the Kennedy trip. Four prints of the film were distributed. The Department roughly estimated the cost of the film project at $1,500 but emphasized that this was not precise.

An elaborately illustrated glossy booklet entitled "The Trip of the President" was especially produced for Mr. Kennedy's western swing. About 500 copies were run off on Interior Department offset facilities. No cost estimates were available.

The nonpolitical, speechmaking swing through political significant States is a political gimmick, almost a political tradition. It is a phony, of course, because a President no more can divorce his journeys from the political realities than he can deny his membership in a political party.

But if a President is on a nonpolitical junket, the opposition party scarcely can demand equal time on the air for the political speeches because it obviously is not possible to make a political speech on a nonpolitical journey.

Toward the end of Mr. Kennedy's trip last week in Salt Lake City, veteran reporters detected politics in the President's speech which all but denounced Senator BARRY GOLDWATER by name. But the pretense of nonpolitics was maintained in the White House tradition.

So it is with the expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars to make the President's nonpolitical journey look as good as possible. Perhaps the taxpayers should come up with their own version of equal time—a demand, for example, for a trip at Government expense to all of the lovely spots Mr. Kennedy visited.

Of course that wouldn't work, either. So it comes down to this: When any President decides to go tripping off to make some political hay on a nonpolitical trip, the taxpayers will just have to pay and like it.

ECONOMIC PREPAREDNESS FOR PEACE—PROPOSED AUTHORITY FOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO MEET DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on page 12 of the Legislative Calendar there is listed, under the heading "Resolutions and Motions Over Under the Rule," Senate Resolution 209, of which I am the sponsor. It would authorize the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to hold meetings during the sessions of the Senate during the remainder of October and all of November.

As the result of some quite complicated parliamentary maneuverings and as the result of a ruling on rule VIII made by the Vice President—a ruling which I do not understand, and with which I am completely out of sympathy, my resolution has been held over, and has been placed on the calendar until such time as, in its infinite wisdom, the leadership decides to have the Senate adjourn, rather than take a recess.

Mr. President, in due course, Senate Resolution 209 will be called up for action under the somewhat peculiar procedure required by the ruling of the Vice President a week or so ago.

My purpose today in obtaining the floor is to explain to Senators and to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the importance of granting the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the right to sit, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session, during the remainder of October and all of November.

The hearings which we contemplate holding come under the general heading of "Economic Preparedness for Peace."

Our major national failure on the domestic scene over the past decade has been our inability to match the growing capacity to produce goods with corresponding increases in job opportunities for an expanding work force.

For 10 years we have been plagued by nagging, chronic, and persistent unemployment.

Even today, in the midst of the longest lived period of business expansion since the 1920's, unemployment levels have refused to come unstuck.

I submit, Mr. President, that the Nation cannot tolerate this tragic waste of priceless manpower much longer. It corrodes the confidence of hundreds of American communities. It gives rise to serious questions concerning the operation of our superb free enterprise system. It is a cancer on the economy which cannot be allowed to grow malignant.

And, like a cancer, there is no simple cure, no panacea, no wonder drug which

can remove it overnight. It is a complicated disease.

No body of Congress is more aware of this at the moment than the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Ever since the end of May, this subcommittee has been hard at work, week in and week out, exploring the dismal depths of national unemployment. It is searching hard for answers to this nagging problem. We have held more than 30 days of hearings, and heard nearly 70 witnesses.

During the remainder of October and November, the subcommittee hopes to conclude this year's investigations and prepare its recommendations for the next session of Congress.

Yet in view of what looms ahead, the subcommittee may not be able even to meet, because of the pending filibuster on the civil rights bill, which it now appears may occur in the Senate within the next 2 weeks.

Is the national interest to be sacrificed to some quaint and antiquated custom which says the Senate of the United States will not be permitted to vote to determine whether a committee can continue to work on matters of great national concern? Does anyone think floor attendance during the filibuster will be improved by this action? No Senator can seriously believe that a single member of this subcommittee will sit and listen to the weeks and weeks of dreary discussions which will have as their purpose the frustration of intelligent legislation.

During the remaining weeks of this month, the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower will be concerned with the techniques which can be employed by management and labor to adjust to technological advances. It will be concerned with chronic depression in certain regions of America, and what we can do to cure it at the Federal level.

Then in November it will turn its attention to the many difficult questions dealing with the impact of the defense effort upon our national employment and manpower problems.

This matter of great national concern, I suggest, should not be given second priority to that exercise in Senate futility and frustration known as the filibuster. I suggest that the subcommittee to which I have referred and, for that matter, a score of our committees and subcommittees, should be permitted to continue the work which they are doing, in an attempt to bring meaningful legislation to the floor, instead of being told that the duty of Members is to stay on the floor and listen to the filibuster, which we all know they are not going to do anyway.

Twice within the recent history of the United States, we have found ourselves engaged in major wars at a time when we were not adequately prepared to wage those wars. In December 1941, and again in June 1950, we were overtaken by world conflagrations for which we had not made adequate preparation. Of course, in due time, our great technological and manpower potential met the military challenge and ultimately the enemy was contained. But in the interim there was tragic and unnecessary loss of lives and territory which adequate national preparation might have forestalled.

Today, after 15 years of the cold war and the arms race, we are presented with the paradox that we may now be as unprepared for peace as formerly we were unprepared for war. Currently 10 percent of our gross national product is concentrated upon national defense. Millions of men and women in the Armed Forces and in the defense industries are engaged in work related solely to the Military Establishment. Whole communities are dependent on such enterprise. The employment of millions and economies of whole cities rest on the shoulders of the Secretary of Defense—an able and effective man, the finest Secretary of Defense, in my opinion, we have ever had, on whose shoulders rests a precarious economic foundation at best.

Each month a defense contract is canceled or expires. Weapons become obsolete. International conditions alter. Yet little anticipation, little foresight has been brought to bear upon the economic effects of defense shifts, or even the possible eventuality of defense cutbacks or disarmament.

This is a critical question of interest to those who concern themselves with our national manpower. What plans do we have, what concrete alternatives may we afford as a nation for the employment of those who are engaged in the defense effort but who may be affected by changes in its structure or size?

Can we not take the tremendous energies and latent potentials bottled up in defense and put them to constructive use on the many unmet domestic needs of the country we have been bypassing for over two decades?

What are the alternative prospects for the industries today absorbed in the defense sector—particularly those in the highly technical missiles and electronic fields? Have these companies planned for alternative enterprise should defense demands reduce the need for their services in the defense production area? An excellent study of this question by two staff writers appeared in the New York Times of last August 16. This analysis tended to indicate that many of the most vulnerable defense industries have no alternative plans for the employment of their skills, resources, and manpower forces, should they no longer be required to engage themselves in the defense effort.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article, which appeared in the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

DEFENSE INDUSTRY SHUNS PLANS FOR POSSIBLE ARMS BAN—FEW CONCERNS FOUND READY TO CONVERT TO NORMAL ROLES

(NOTE.—The following survey was prepared by Philip Shabecoff and Joseph Lelyveld, financial and business reporters of the New York Times.)

What is the Nation's defense industry, the largest single sector of the economy, doing to cope with the impact of possible arms control or disarmament?

Very little.

Many defense contractors simply refuse to consider a sizable cutback in arms production as any kind of possibility in the foreseeable future.

Some, who have given thought to the problem, say a sharp reduction in defense spending would deal them a severe if not a crippling blow, but they have no idea at present of how to plan for such a development.

A few companies are confident they would be able to make a smooth transition to civilian business.

Fewer still report that they have actually done some long-range planning in this area.

That is the gist of a survey made by the New York Times of the 25 biggest prime defense contractors. Together, the contractors account for 50.8 percent of all defense work.

SPECULATION ON CUTBACK

Although President Kennedy specifically ruled out a cutback in defense spending as a result of the agreement on a partial ban on nuclear testing, that agreement has produced rising speculation about the possibility of an East-West détente. Few observers believe that any kind of real disarmament is imminent, but many argue that the time has come for American industry at least to make preparations for a possible slackening in the arms race.

Within the Government and Congress the problem of economic adjustment to arms control is slowly emerging as a matter of serious concern. The defense industry itself, however, apparently has yet to make a serious effort to smooth what could be a painful transition.

It is now generally agreed that—in the long run—the economy of the United States could be successfully adapted to any kind of arms control, including general and complete disarmament. That was the conclusion of a report prepared for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency by a panel headed by Prof. Emile Benoit, of Columbia University.

REASONS FOR CONCERN

The key words in any discussion of disarmament and the economy are "in the long run." When it comes to the short run, confident assertions about the resiliency of the U.S. economy often give way to cries of sheer panic.

The reasons for such consternation are not hard to locate. They can, in effect, be pinpointed geographically in those regions that have become centers of defense activity.

It has been estimated that one out of every three jobs in southern California is directly tied to defense expenditures. In the San Diego area for example, 82 percent of all manufacturing jobs were in the missile and aircraft industries when a check was made there is 1959.

The leading defense contractors farm out much of their work to one another and to smaller concerns. In effect, then, they sit atop a huge pyramid, the dimensions of which have never been definitely measured. In order to convey an impression of the size of this pyramid, one official in the Defense Department pointed out that subcontracts for the B-70 had been scattered through every State.

In 1960 it was estimated that 30.2 percent of all manufacturing jobs in Kansas were in defense; in the State of Washington, the figure was 28.6 percent. At the same time in Virginia, the Department of Defense payroll accounted for 10.2 percent of all personal income.

VALUE OF STATISTICS

According to one estimate, more than 2,500,000 civilians were directly employed in the defense industries in 1960. It is a fair assumption that if all military contracts

were suddenly terminated, the rate of unemployment, in July 5.6 percent of the labor force, would more than double overnight.

Such statistics can be embroidered and extended almost endlessly. But it is obvious that disarmament cannot occur overnight. Instead, it has become a cliche to say that careful advance planning by the Government, by industry and by labor would help to avert the nightmare the statistics seem to portend.

Recently the calls for such planning have become more and more widespread and insistent.

On August 2, Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, called for a reshaping of perspectives on both defense planning and spending. He noted that the $53,600 million requested for the Department of Defense in the current fiscal year represented well over half of the entire Federal budget. The United States, he asserted, already possesses an enormous "overkill" capacity.

CUT IS PROPOSED

Senator MCGOVERN proposed a slash of $5 billion in the budgets of the Armed Forces and the Atomic Energy Commission. Acknowledging that such a cut could produce "painful economic dislocation," he outlined a plan to prepare the economy for conversion from military to civilian production. The plan had two main facets:

All Government contractors with 25 percent or more of their personnel engaged in defense work shall as a condition of contract be required to establish an "operating conversion committee" to prepare for a possible loss of their military orders.

The President shall establish an "economic conversion committee" under the Secretary of Commerce to outline the role of Government agencies in facilitating a switchover to a civilian economy.

Interviewed by telephone last week, the Senator said he was planning to embody these proposals in a bill to be introduced when the defense budget comes up for final debate in Congress.

Even as Senator MCGOVERN made his speech, a number of tentative starts in the same direction had already been made in Washington. If it is too early to speak of a developing consensus on the way to approach the problem of industrial conversion, it is not too early to speak of a developing sense that a consensus is needed.

STUDY GROUP IS SMALL

The fledgling Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has already established a so-called economic bureau to study the problems of conversion and provoke serious thought on them. But this bureau, as it now stands, has a staff of just nine men, only four of whom are specialists. It would like to do a study on the likely regional impacts of disarmament, but it has neither the manpower nor the money needed for the job.

For the past 4 months, the head of this bureau has been Archibald S. Alexander, who, during the Truman administration, was an Under Secretary of the Army.

Important as it may seem, industrial conversion is, according to Mr. Alexander, but one aspect of an even larger problem of how to speed the economic growth rate, end high unemployment, and put the Nation's full industrial capacity to work.

"All of these things," he remarked, "are part of the same ball of wax."

That view was echoed over at the Pentagon by Adam Yarmolinsky, a special assistant to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. "This is a problem we're quite familiar with," Mr. Yarmolinsky declared. "Whenever there's a major shift in defense procurement, there is, in effect, a little bit of disarmament."

Washington officials also point out that defense contractors are not really growth industries, that the work they do is almost incredibly specialized and that, as a result, it is best restricted to the huge corporations that have developed the special capabilities required.

PRODUCTION IS LIMITED

More and more, these corporations—especially those in the aerospace field—do not do anything like mass production work. Rather they are, according to one corporation planner, "custom engineering consultants." As their work grows more specialized, it requires fewer blue-collar workers and more highly trained technicians. One result is that the growing defense budgets do not necessarily create more jobs. Moreover, the contracts tend to become fewer but larger in dollar volume.

Sudden shifts in military procurement patterns can turn a boomtown into a depressed area. The Pentagon is already attempting to persuade communities and corporations that have lost big contracts to get out of the defense field—now, not when and if an arms control treaty is signed.

To facilitate the process of adjustment, the Defense Department has established an office to assist the communities and corporations that have lost out. The work this office does every day is a smaller scale version of what would have to be done in the event of full-scale arms control.

Its head, Robert F. Steadman, is a confirmed believer in the proposition that the communities can save themselves by establishing new industries. He points out that a company, its stockholders and its management personnel, can often make the adjustment by closing a factory in one State and opening a new one in another. Obviously, such a corporate move does nothing to ease a community's adjustment.

But communities do adjust. Wichita, Kans., lost 18,000 jobs in the airframe industry in recent years. Nevertheless, Wichita's rate of unemployment is, according to Mr. Steadman, significantly below the national level. The answer was new industry and diversification.

While the areas that have lost out have been forced to adjust, those that have been most successful in winning contracts are beginning to worry. The California Assembly this year appropriated money for a study by its ways and means committee on the impact of defense spending in southern California. The committee's mandate specifically mentioned the possibility of a cutback in the event of arms control.

FEDERAL PLAN URGED

If previous studies along this line are any indication, one result is likely to be a plea for action from Washington. That, at least, is what happened when the southern California associates of the committee for economic development, a group sponsored by business leaders, made such a study in 1961. It urged the Federal Government to prepare "a flexible and comprehensive program to be activated when important reductions in national security expenditures become possible."

What is emerging is a kind of chicken-and-egg argument: Who plans first, government or industry? In fact, the argument is really three-cornered, for the labor unions believe that both government and industry have so far failed to meet their responsibilities.

The United Auto Workers proposed 2 years ago that defense contracts carry grants for conversion studies by the contractors.

A GOVERNMENT INDUSTRY

"It is," said Nat Weinberg, the union's director of special projects, "an urgent problem from an immediate as well as a long-range point of view. This industry has gotten used to operating on a pipeline to Fort Knox. They talk about private enterprise, but it's really a government industry operating for private profit."

To get the three viewpoints together, a small study group was established in June under the aegis of the Defense Industries Advisory Council. The non-Government members of the group come from the major industrial associations and the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

A parallel group, one that involved some of the same people, was called together on the last Sunday in June by the staff of a Senate Labor Subcommittee. The subcommittee, headed by Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, is making a wide-ranging study of the whole area of manpower and unemployment.

HEARINGS ARE SET

It expects to conduct hearings in November on the defense industries and the question of industrial conversion. These hearings, members of the subcommittee believe, will form a necessary and fitting coda to its study.

Last fall, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, reported to the Senate on a study made by his Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Disarmament. Looking ahead to the prospect of arms control, the Senator declared: "We need to start planning now in conjunction with the two dozen or so key defense companies which account for the major share of defense procurement, research, and development."

That was last fall. But do these key defense companies think they need to start now?

In general, the 25 top prime defense contractors feel no sense of urgency about arms control and its corollary, of at least partial conversion to civilian production. Asked if they were doing any planning in this area, many of the companies reacted with surprise and even shock, as if they were ice cream vendors being asked what they would do if children were abolished.

Several of the companies refused even to accept the possibility of arms control as a current working hypothesis. After ruminating the question for 2 days, the General Dynamics Corp., the Nation's second largest defense contractor, replied, "We do not expect any abrupt change. We will have nothing to say on this subject for at least the next 6 months."

Two other companies would not discuss the problem. One was the International Telephone & Telegraph Co., which stated in response to a query, "We do not want to be connected with this in any way."

A DEFINITE PLAN

The other was the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., the No. 25 contractor, which did say it had a definite plan of action. It added: "With 19,000 employees, however, the company has the largest payroll in Virginia and probably in the entire South, and does not wish to make any comment regarding its plans because of the possible effect it might have on the economy of the Virginia community in which it operates."

The subject of arms control was obviously a delicate matter for some companies. The Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. said it had prepared a statement on its plans. Three days later, a company spokesman said the statement could not be released because Grumman's president, E. Clinton Towl, was out of town, beyond the reach of a telephone. The spokesman explained that no one but Mr. Towl could speak for Grumman on arms control.

There is another group of companies among the major contractors that concedes that arms control is a distinct possibility but that assumes an almost Olympian detachment from the problem. This group is composed chiefly of corporate giants such as the General Motors Corp., American Telephone & Telegraph, the Ford Motor Co., and the Radio

Corp. of America, whose defense contracts are a relatively minor segment of their total business, although still involving very large sums of money.

READY FOR CONVERSION

"General Motors does what is needed in any situation," said a spokesman for the world's largest industrial enterprise and 10th largest American defense contractor. "We are always ready to convert to whatever the Government thinks is necessary."

Among the companies surveyed, the largest group consists of those which have seriously considered planning for conversion to nonmilitary production, but which have rejected the whole idea because they believe it is not practicable, would be premature, or is unnecessary for the needs of their company.

Robert Shirar, acting director of planning for the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., asserted that his company "has done quite a lot of thinking about arms control," but has not "pursued the subject to the extreme of conversion studies."

Mr. Shirar said that Lockheed, the No. 1 defense contractor, with orders totaling $1,419,500,000 in fiscal 1962, was constantly thinking about the danger of having all its eggs in one basket. "But we just haven't believed strongly enough that arms reduction is a coming thing."

In the first half of this year, 91 percent of Lockheed's business was with the Government and 85 percent of that Government business was military. Commercial work accounted for only 3 percent of the company's revenue.

WIDESPREAD VIEW

A rather widely held point of view was expressed by George Trimble, vice president, advanced planning, of the Martin division of the Martin-Marietta Corp.

"We've looked at conversion [to commercial production] but we don't know how to do it. We really are a large research organization rather than a production company. We have to have some sort of complex project to attack."

Several of the prime contractors, including the Boeing Co., have not specifically planned for industrial conversion but as a matter of general policy have sought diversification into nonmilitary fields.

Boeing, which had 95 percent of its business in military work a few years ago, now has a $770 million backlog of orders for its commercial aircraft, compared with $374 million for military aircraft and $338 million for missiles and space programs.

HUGHES AIRCRAFT'S POLICY

Stahl W. Edmunds, director of marketing research for the Hughes Aircraft Co., explained that his company "maintains a continuous evaluation of shifts in Government and civilian demand as part of an effort to aline its research and development programs with the national interest."

On the other hand, Mundy I. Peale, president of the Republic Aviation Corp., declared in a speech earlier this year that his company was against illogical "diversifying for diversification's sake." The company would diversify, he said, "only when such a move can pay its way either now or in the foreseeable future."

The economy of Long Island experiences periodic upheavals whenever Republic wins, loses, or completes a major contract. Recently, Grumman has had a similar impact on the area's economic health.

Finally, there are five major contractors that stated that they already have planned—to some degree—for conversion to civilian production in the event of reduced Government spending on arms. These are the Bendix Corp., the Douglas Aircraft Corp., the Aerojet division of the General Tire & Rubber Co., the American Machine & Foundry Co., and the Raytheon Co.

BENDIX HAS PLANS

Bendix has had a group planning for conversion for the last 3 years, according to A. P. Fontane, executive vice president. The company, which now devotes 70 percent of its production to military products, is engaged in an acquisition program to increase its stake in nonmilitary programs, Mr. Fontane said.

The arms control problem is placed in a somewhat different context by Douglas, which sees it as only one of the many long-range problems it faces. One of these is the fear that defense work will move out of southern California, where the corporation is located.

A. J. Quackenbush, director of corporate planning and control, explained that Douglas' current 10-year plan anticipates that defense spending will remain near present levels.

However, he said, Douglas also has prepared two alternate contingency plans. One is based on the assumption that cold-war tensions will increase and that arms spending will rise. The other postulates that a detente will produce an arms control accord with concomitant reduced spending by the Department of Defense.

A major contract, such as Douglas' contract on the late and sometimes lamented Skybolt, ties up a company's resources. Until the Pentagon blows the whistle on the contract, the company must work on, even after it anticipates the loss. Only when the loss does occur can the company act on its contingency and diversification plans.

For that reason, the plans are kept under constant review. But, for the same reason and no matter how good the plans, the pain of the loss is in direct proportion to its size. Thus Douglas was thrown off balance by the loss of the Skybolt, even though it was not caught off its guard.

The plan for lower defense spending calls for diversification into the consumer market, but does not specify particular products.

ASSUMPTIONS ON SPENDING

Virtually all of the contractors that acknowledged that arms control lay within the realm of the possible also made two assumptions about Government spending if it did happen. One was that arms control would not signal an end to Government spending on a massive scale, but rather a shift from strategic to tactical weapons systems. The other was that any reduction in defense spending would be matched by spending on massive civilian projects.

These two assumptions provide the foundation for the advanced planning of some contractors.

Thomas Philips, executive vice president of Raytheon, declared that "our general feeling is that even in an arms control situation, arms will still be ordered. The first curtailment will be in strategic nuclear weapons. Because our work is chiefly in tactical systems such as the Sparrow and Hawk [defensive] missiles, we would be able to make the conversion successfully in any shift of emphasis from strategic weapons."

DETECTION SYSTEM CONTRACTS

Raytheon, the Sperry Gyroscope Division of Sperry Rand, and several other companies noted that they already had received contracts for research and development on inspection systems to police an arms control agreement. One official said that Government spending on these systems alone could result in an increase in defense orders for his company.

One economist has estimated that inspection systems would necessitate an annual Government expenditure of around $12 billion. However, Defense Department officials scoff at so large an estimate. They said that any system developed would not strive for perfect control, but would aim at preventing cheating at an optimal cost.

Although Government expenditure in other areas is tacitly accepted by the contractors as the escape hatch in an arms control system, many of them complain that they cannot program this spending in their advanced planning because they have no idea of just what the Government will do.

"The big problem," said Mr. Quakenbush, of Douglas, "is to find out what areas the Government would shift their spending to. Some attempts to specify policies which would go along with disarmament would be extremely helpful to industry. Otherwise the transition would be very difficult."

BETTER DIRECTION AWAITED

A spokesman for North American Aviation, Inc., put it even more bluntly: "We're not going off to start a lot of studies with the remote hope that maybe one of them will hit the mark. We're waiting for a little better direction."

Government officials, however, believe that it is up to the companies to plot their own adjustments. According to Arthur Barber, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Arms Control, "Some of them are going to have no alternatives. There are already more contractors than are needed.

"We would like to see them get into commercial production with a minimum of sweat. It is a management challenge."

Just what would be the impact of disarmament on the major defense companies? Here, again, there is a broad range of opinion. At one end of the spectrum are the Rock of Gibraltar organizations such as Ford, which commented that "arms control would be no special problem with us. We would just put our workers on something else."

HIS ONLY CUSTOMER

At the other end was the official of the company with close to 90 percent of its business in defense work who commented with grim humor that "if the Government stops buying weapons we will go out of business just like anybody who loses his only customer.

Generally, however, the contractors feel that although the transition would be a difficult one, it could be made.

A spokesman for the United Aircraft Corp. declared that potentially great markets existed for its commercial aircraft and engines, and if the transition were gradual, these markets could be developed without the company's losing strength.

The Avco Corp. commented that although much of its work was in defense, no one project accounted for more than 5 percent of its volume and therefore the company would not be subject to violent shifts. Other companies with diversified product mixes, such as American Machine & Foundry, also expressed confidence in their ability to weather changes wrought by arms control or disarmament.

Most of the respondents said that they were always seeking commercial applications for their military research if for no other reason than to make greater profits. Defense contracts produce very low returns on investment.

Yet even with this incentive, many companies, particularly the aerospace companies, have been unable to make any real headway into the commercial market.

The contractors often defer conversion efforts because they do not know where to turn. "We have no idea of how to market a commercial product," a planning official of a major aerospace company declared.

His counterpart in another company ruefully recounted the efforts it had made to diversify by taking on commercial or public works projects. These efforts got nowhere. "We really don't have products," he concluded. "We have a scientific capacity. It's like asking how do you convert chemistry."

Seymour Melman, a professor of industrial engineering and management at Columbia

University and a crusader for conversion planning declared that this scientific capacity developed by defense contractors amounts to "a trained incapacity for operating in the commercial market."

Professor Melman scoffed at the idea that defense contractors would be able to compete for public works contracts without extensive and arduous retraining and reorganization.

"They would have to deal with many customers," he said. "They simply don't know how. Not every State and city has a Department of Defense to tell them what to do."

But Mr. Barber, of the Defense Department, said he was sure the adjustment could be made. "Our brainpower has been working in outer space, but it can be brought back," he declared. "Really good brainpower can adjust."

A REASSURING NOTE

His colleague at the Pentagon, Mr. Yarmolinsky, also sounded a reassuring note. He said fears about what arms control might do to the economy reminded him of the story of the man on a sinking ship who refused to get into a lifeboat because he was afraid of starving on a desert island.

"We are much more worried," he said, "about the problem of getting an effective arms control agreement."

The notion that the American economy depends on armaments has been generally disowned. Mr. Yarmolinsky, for instance, dismissed it as "a simplistic economic analysis." But virtually no one predicts that the sophisticated defense industries of today will be able to make the transition to civilian production as easily as their ancestors did after World War II. The reason given on all sides is the lack of planning.

A recent economic study put the problem succinctly:

"Swords," it noted wryly, "do not serve readily as plowshares."

25 largest defense contractors

	Fiscal 1962 (millions of dollars)	Percent of total
1. Lockheed Aircraft Corp	1,419.5	5.6
2. General Dynamics Corp	1,196.6	4.7
3. Boeing Co	1,132.8	4.4
4. North American Aviation	1,032.5	4.0
5. General Electric Co	975.9	3.8
6. Martin Marietta Corp	802.7	3.1
7. United Aircraft Corp	662.7	2.6
8. American Telephone	467.7	1.8
9. Sperry-Rand Corp	465.6	1.8
10. General Motors Corp	449.0	1.8
11. Raytheon Co	406.6	1.6
12. General Tire & Rubber Co	366.1	1.4
13. Douglas Aircraft Co	365.6	1.4
14. Radio Corp. of America	339.6	1.3
15. Republic Aviation	332.8	1.3
16. Avco Corp	323.3	1.3
17. McDonnell Aircraft	310.9	1.2
18. Grumman Aircraft	303.6	1.2
19. Bendix Corp	285.9	1.1
20. Ford Motor Co	269.1	1.1
21. Westinghouse Electric	246.0	1.0
22. International Telephone	243.6	1.0
23. Hughes Aircraft Co	234.2	.9
24. American Machine & Foundry	187.3	.7
25. Newport News Shipbuilding	185.0	.7
Total	12,994.6	50.9

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it may be that this survey is unduly pessimistic and that defense industries have in fact tangible plans for alternative production activity outside the defense sector. Certainly it is a matter of direct congressional and national concern to inquire whether practical alternatives exist for the employment of defense industries and their workforces outside the defense program for the fulfillment of other national community and individual needs.

I believe I express the views of many of my colleagues in saying that there exists a national obligation to assure realistic alternative utilization of defense involved industries with their advanced technologies and superior research and production facilities. Reasonable redeployment of those industries and their workforces is something that, as a nation, we owe first of all to the industries and the workers themselves.

We cannot possibly leave great defense industries and millions of their workers in so vulnerable a position that they constitute an independent obstacle to the achievement of a stable peace. We must not forget the admonition of President Eisenhower in his last speech, to remain on guard against a military-industrial complex which might add fuel to the flames of the arms race if it is left with no alternative outlet for its expertise, energy, and productive capacity except defense.

We have a national obligation to bring the many lessons we have learned in defense-related enterprise to bear upon the continuing unmet needs of our communities and our people—needs which the great defense industries and their advanced technologies may be able to help meet in this century of technological revolution. Certainly we have seen in the last decade, in defense and in space, the most remarkable achievement of national goals undreamed of a decade ago. We have assembled in recognition of new national goals in space, in communication, and in national security—expert teams of engineers, research men, and men of industry as well as production forces. By a massive infusion of human effort, these teams have put man into space and will, hopefully soon, place men on the moon and on other planets.

We have proved through these efforts, that when, as a nation, we clearly define for ourselves a priority goal, our 20th-century technology can span in a matter of months or a few years a human advance which might otherwise have taken decades for its achievement.

In my view the time is soon approaching when we must harness the kinds of energies and technical skills and of know-how which have been created to meet national goals in defense and in space, to the improvement of the conditions of human life. There are vast unmet community and human needs in the United States. I do not refer merely to depressed areas or to poverty. There are millions of Americans who wish simply to better their lot. Our technology has the capacity to help them do just that.

I have in mind the millions of Americans who would benefit from a mass urban and interurban transportation system—efficient, speedy, and inexpensive. I believe that the experts on propulsion who can put tons of instruments on the Moon or send a man around the Earth in 90 minutes, could get a commuter to his job and back to his home, 30 miles away, in one-half or one-quarter the commuting time presently endured by millions of working citizens, because adequate research is not being done by the top brains of the country on problems like these.

I have in mind the millions of American children who are waiting for the benefits of 20th-century technology to provide them with adequate schools, educational facilities, and teaching aids. I am confident that a communications system which can flash a television picture around the Earth in an instant, can solve the communications tangle in our schools and provide a topnotch information and education service to millions of schoolchildren.

We know, too, that millions of American families who desire to purchase a private home cannot achieve that goal until the housing industry creates new habitable housing at lower price levels. Millions of Americans would buy a summerhouse if there were available for purchase and construction a habitable vacation home at a price range under $4,000. So, too, the development of our national resources can produce untold benefits for communities whose productive potential today suffers from lack of an adequate water supply, or other resource deficiencies.

Can we harness the technology which has put us in space to meet pressing human and communty goals? What is the proper role of the Federal Government in providing the benefits of 20th-century technology to a community's schools, its mass transportation system, its public works, and its productive resources? These are some of the challenging questions for which we must find answers, for I am convinced that in this innovating economy—this economy of systematic invention—the new jobs we need so desperately will not come necessarily from the application of sophisticated technology to traditional productive enterprise, but they will come from the application of technology to whole new lines of endeavor and unmet need. This is one of the answers to the manpower revolution in which we are now engaged.

The time has come for us to plan not only for war but equally for peace and prosperity.

It is for this reason that the Manpower Subcommittee will be exploring in coming weeks the manpower implications of national defense production, adjustments and shifts in manpower requirements in the defense sector, national preparedness for shifting use of manpower resources in the event of arms reductions or disarmament, and the potential for applying new technological frontiers to the solution of increasingly burdensome public and community needs in our Nation.

Following its hearings, if we are permitted to hold them—and I trust we shall be—the committee is hopeful that it will be able to make concrete proposals to the full committee, and in turn to the Congress, to assure that industrial skills and human resources currently engaged in the defense and space programs of the United States are put to maximum use for the meeting of civilian needs whenever they are no longer required to serve the interest of national security. This, in my judgment, is one of the routes to full employment.

That route must be explored. It should not be stalled by a filibuster.

I ask unanimous consent that there may appear at the end of my remarks an article entitled "If Cuts Come in Defense Spending," published in the Morgan Guaranty Survey for August 1963.

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

IF CUTS COME IN DEFENSE SPENDING

Besides stirring cautious hope of a thaw in the cold war, the agreement to limit nuclear weapons testing has prompted fresh surmise about the economic effects that would ensue if a reduction were to occur in U.S. defense spending. The first of the two reactions may be premature, but the second is almost certainly overdue. Well before the Moscow accord, a number of developments were suggesting the possibility of a break in the pattern of steadily increasing outlays for national security. Even clearer have been signs that the composition of defense expenditure is likely to shift. Either event—reduction or restructuring—would impose economic adjustments on individuals, companies, and communities. The prospect, therefore, ought to be receiving consideration in the private sector of the economy, where adjustment would chiefly fall. Thus far, it appears to have been rather broadly neglected.

The developments that suggest the possibility of a change include certain implications that flow from the basic strategy of U.S. defense; the high level that the Nation's supply of nuclear weapons already has reached; signs (including the partial ban on tests) of a new basis for international negotiations; and intimations of a changing mood in Congress.

The picture, admittedly, could be changed overnight by any of a host of conceivable happenings, many of which are outside this country's control. There is still no ground for assuming a change in the Communist aim of world domination. Subject to such qualification, however, it seems more reasonable now than at any previous time in the cold war to begin looking for a turn in the long road of higher and higher military costs.

Directions already taken in the composition of the defense budget are signaling virtually assured shifts in the make-up of future outlays. They also hint at a possible lowering of costs—at least in relation to total economic output and perhaps even in absolute amount. This despite the fact that the administration is asking for authority to commit in fiscal year 1964 the highest amount devoted to national security in any peacetime year—a total of $56.7 billion for all defense purposes, including military aid, civil defense, and parts of the space and atomic energy programs.

EASING UP ON STRATEGIC RETALIATORY FORCES

Within the total, there is a significant decline in the funds requested for strategic retaliatory forces, the category that includes development and procurement of such high-cost items as Titan, Minuteman, and Polaris missiles, nuclear submarines, and long-range bombers. These are components of the U.S. retaliatory capacity, intended to deter any potential attacker by letting him know he would be destroyed by the counterpunch.

At $7.3 billion, the strategic retaliatory forces request for fiscal 1964 is $1.2 billion less than the estimated appropriation for the same category in fiscal 1963, and $1.8 billion less than was actually committed for fiscal 1962. The tapering-off suggests that the building of a massive nuclear strikeback force—a program which in its present phase began about 1958—has reached a level where further buildup can safely proceed at a more modest pace. This would mean that the cost peak of strategic retaliatory forces has been passed. If it has, the effect on expenditures could be considerable. The buying of strategic weapons and delivery vehicles "for stock," as distinguished from research and development outlays, is currently running in the vicinity of $4 billion per year. Research and development costs for strategic retaliatory forces have already started downhill, being programed at about $1 billion for fiscal 1964, compared with $1.6 billion the year before.

Defense Secretary McNamara told Congress last winter that development costs for long-range missiles, which were very high during the period of breakthrough into the present technology, are likely to diminish after fiscal 1964 and that development expenses for "new generations" of missiles are expected to be lower than those for the present systems. He also expressed the belief that the United States is "in a position where we can now afford to move more carefully in the initiation of new major weapon system developments."

THE OVERKILL ARGUMENT

Related to discussion of the adequacy of nuclear deterrence is the controversial concept of "overkill"—a term used to denote nuclear capacity more than sufficient to wipe out a given enemy in a single strike. A number of analysts hold that the United States and the Soviet Union have reached a mutual status of overkill, many times over. The grim mathematics of their computations involves rather broad assumptions as to the accuracy and effectiveness of weapons that have never been used, and many experts dispute the overkill thesis or discount its significance. Secretary McNamara disavows the concept as customarily presented. But he did tell Congress in discussing the current budget proposal:

"Given the force we have today, I believe that that force can survive a Soviet attack with sufficient power to destroy the Soviet Union. I mean that in any normal sense of the word 'destroy.' It can be destroyed as a civilized nation of the 20th century, by destroying its industrial capacity, by destroying a high percentage of the population, and by destroying its military power."

An appraisal of the Soviet striking force prepared by the Institute for Strategic Studies—an unofficial analytical group based in England and supported by the Ford Foundation—indicates far more than enough capacity to knock out all U.S. cities of more than 100,000 population.

Without conceding validity to the overkill theory, it is possible to conceive of a saturation of deterrence for all practical purposes. A nation feeling it has reached that point might well decide that further stockpiling of present types of strategic nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles would not yield enough military advantage to be worth the cost. Such a conclusion may account in part for the sudden Soviet willingness to accept the long-standing U.S. initiative toward a limitation on nuclear testing.

In the United States, the Atomic Energy Commission has confirmed within recent weeks that it plans a substantial reduction in the output of fissionable materials for use in weapons. And Secretary McNamara said earlier this year: "In adding to a defense budget as large as the one we now have, we begin to encounter the law of diminishing returns, where each additional increment of resources applied produces a smaller increment of overall defense capability." Outlining the Defense Department's plans for weapons acquisition through 1968, he told a congressional committee: "Further increases in the large forces already programed would provide only marginal increases in capabilities in relation to their additional cost."

ON THE OTHER HAND

Mutual deterrence on the nuclear level does not insure a reduction in defense spending. Any number of developments could thwart such a trend. Serious new eruptions of international trouble would almost certainly involve heavier outlays. A return of inflation in the U.S. economy would increase the dollar cost of defense. In addition, there are a number of possible policy decisions that could soak up any savings that might be effected by curtailing or even stopping the purchase of strategic hardware of existing types.

For example, such savings could be negated by greatly increased expenditures for the development and procurement of an antimissile system. Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense, has said: "The contest probably most significant in current research and development efforts with potential to alter the strategic equation is the contest between our antiballistic missile capability and the penetration aid capacity of the enemy." If a significant breakthrough in antimissilery should occur, it would almost certainly touch off a massive and expensive procurement program.

It might also mean greatly increased outlays for fallout shelters if the nature of the antimissile device were such that many of the knockouts of enemy weapons would be likely to occur over U.S. soil at altitudes where large doses of radioactivity would be dumped on the ground. Yet another possibility involving heavy spending is that vast civil defense programs might be adopted in lieu of an antimissile system.

For the present, the modest reductions that have been made or scheduled in the cost of the strategic retaliatory forces have been more than offset by increases in the amounts allotted to "general purpose" forces, the men and machines of conventional war. Greater emphasis on equipping and maintaining this kind of force could continue for a while to offset savings that may be realized in development and procurement of strategic weapons. Short of actual engagement, however, it is unlikely that the buildup of ordinary combat units will be on such a scale as would continue indefinitely to involve annual cost increases.

A CRIMP FROM CHINA

Eventual attainment of some degree of nuclear capability by Communist China could put a crimp in prospects for reducing total U.S. defense costs. The then-achieved or soon-to-be-reached level of U.S. deterrent power might be judged adequate to cover both China and Russia, so that presently programed manufacture of strategic weapons would not need to be increased on that specific account. The psychological impact of even a crude nuclear explosion by Red China, however, could lead to increases in U.S. military aid to non-Communist countries in the Far East for morale purposes.

It is commonly—if debatably—assumed now that the Chinese Communists will not receive help from Russia in their efforts to become a nuclear power. Without such help, the development of an actual nuclear potential—including delivery systems—seems a long way off for Red China. A showoff test detonation, however, might be managed in the relatively near future. Whether it is or not, the consistently belligerent posture of Peiping creates an additional major focus to which the U.S. defense effort must be addressed—and this affects defense costs.

No major direct effect on U.S. military spending can be expected from the agreement reached by this country, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union to limit nuclear testing. For the longer run, the contract drawn at Moscow—and the somewhat easier international atmosphere that helped prepare the way for it—could strengthen the chance

of reaching agreements later on to limit production of certain kinds of weapon systems. If ratification of the Moscow compact comes without serious difficulty, the impetus to try for some kind of start toward arms limitation could be considerable.

Meanwhile, hope for future relief from the economic drain of defense spending must be shaded by the prospect of rising Federal outlays for space programs. Only a part of the total space expenditure comes within the defense budget (for fiscal 1964, $1.7 billion of a space total of $7.4 billion), but in their effect on the economy the two are very much alike. Present estimates of the cost of meeting the "commitment" to land a man on the moon by the end of this decade range all the way from $20 to $40 billion.

A CHANGE IN CONGRESS

The initial frenzy of the space race has calmed somewhat, however, as the military significance of the effort has been put in perspective and even its assumed scientific value has been deflated by an increasing chorus of professional doubt. In Congress, a new skepticism about crash programs in space is evident. The House Committee on Science and Astronautics has cut $470 million from the $5.7 billion requested by President Kennedy for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1964. This is the first time since the space age began that a congressional unit has asserted itself with a sizable reduction in the spending authorization requested for space.

Other recent expressions of the congressional mood lend support to the view that the established trend of rising defense expenditures may possibly be halted and even reversed. The House, authorizing funds for the major items in the 1964 defense budget, cut nearly $2 billion from the $49 billion requested by the administration. Some Members of Congress wanted to cut as much as $3 billion.

Representative MAHON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations of the House Committee on Appropriations, took note last winter of a growing economy-mindness among some of his colleagues. He said they were asking him: "Where can we cut this defense budget? We have got to make a reduction in defense spending and at the same time not impair our military strength."

But, he also noted, there is a counterforce to this sentiment, both in Congress and in the Nation at large. "These urges to reduce the defense budget," he predicted, "will be matched equally, if not excelled, by more determined urging to increase the defense budget." In the same context, Secretary McNamara stated: "My problem has been to prevent appropriations exceeding those which we have recommended. There have been tremendous pressures, for example, to appropriate funds for programs that I do not believe add to our national security."

The substantial sentiment favoring bigger defense spending reflects in part a sincerely held conviction that a nation, once embarked on a course of preparedness, should keep going as far and as fast as its resources will possibly allow. It also reflects, however, the existence of a built-in obstacle to reductions in defense outlays—namely, the extent to which the U.S. economy has become a defense economy. With about one-tenth of gross national product devoted to military purposes year after year, there has developed an element of reluctance, both public and private, toward cutting back so sizable a sector of economic activity. Thus the very fact that makes it important to prepare for the possibility of a reduction in defense outlays—that is, the economy's heavy involvement in defense—could also make it more difficult to achieve reduction.

This paradox was hinted at in the troubled comment with which President Eisenhower departed the White House in 1961. The man who had held both the highest military and the highest civilian office in the United States remarked that there was no precedent in American history for the existing "conjunction of an immense Military Establishment and a large arms industry." He cautioned: "We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications."

President Eisenhower's expressed concern was principally over "the potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power," a danger against which he urged constant vigilance on the part of all citizens. Less dramatic, but no less real, is a new potential for economic distortion and disturbance that has been created by the growth of military preparedness into a vast and continuing public enterprise. Decisions made in the Pentagon—and often based, quite properly, on considerations totally unrelated to the market place—can have deep effect on the future of companies and of whole communities. A subtle change in strategic approach, a shift of emphasis from one kind of missile to another, a phasing-out of procurement of a given item because a better one is coming along—any of these can confront the affected firms and individuals with sudden and substantial readjustment.

MISSING THE POINT

Shakeups of these kinds have occurred often enough to make industry aware that there are uncertainties in producing for defense. There appears to be considerably less focus of attention on the uncertainty from another source: the possibility that spending for defense may begin one of these years to decline significantly instead of continuing its pattern of perennial increase. A Senate subcommittee recently queried a sampling of defense contractors on what they are doing to get ready for possible cuts in Federal arms outlays. Only about one in six reported it had conducted any kind of study as to how it would respond to the loss of business presumably involved in a defense cutback.

With the intention of stimulating more active consideration of readjustment problems, the Defense Department recently formed a subgroup within the Defense Advisory Council to examine "the economic aspect of possible arms control arrangements." Members include Department officials, representatives of defense industry associations, and a labor union official.

Notwithstanding the prods from Washington, it is difficult for many defense producers to feel a sense of urgency about preparing for a possible slowdown in the pace of military business. Their reaction merely mirrors that of a whole society conditioned to the steady escalation of defense needs. Cold war by its nature carries the implication of going on indefinitely. Arms cutbacks, to most people, still mean only the massive, idealistic kind of disarmament that is a remote dream in today's world of tension.

LITTLE DISARMAMENT EACH DAY

Accordingly, the real challenge of working out of the armaments bind is largely ignored. A few theoreticians tinker with models of an economy in which defense expenditures have been cut by half or more, but very little serious consideration is given to the problems of living with a gradual, modest step-down of the total.

These are the problems of small economic units—areas, companies, individuals—rather than of the economy as a whole. Arguing about how to divide a $20 billion defense-budget saving among debt retirement, tax reduction, and increased public works is an interesting exercise for an academic seminar. Hopefully it will some day have practical application. The realistic, near-at-hand questions raised by the new outlook for defense spending, however, are more likely to be found in the communities where defense-based companies are clustered or military installations form the economic core.

CONCENTRATION OF DEFENSE INDUSTRY

Concentration in certain industries and certain regions is an inevitable characteristic of defense activity. A Government report reflecting the situation in 1960 showed that 94 percent of all employment in the aircraft and parts industry was attributable to defense contracts, 61 percent in shipbuilding and repairing, 38 percent in electric components and accessories. In ordnance and directly related fields, of course, all jobs were dependent on defense.

In seven States and the District of Columbia, 10 percent or more of personal income was from the payrolls of defense agencies (both military and civilian personnel) or defense-related industries. The ratios ranged from 29 percent in Alaska to 10 percent in California, with Hawaii, Virginia, Washington, Maryland, District of Columbia, and New Mexico coming between. Some local communities, of course, showed considerably higher ratios.

GETTING READY: THE ADJUSTMENT PROBLEM

How can areas vulnerable to defense cutbacks prepare to offset possible future shrinkage in military contracts? Those that already have some diversification will be in better shape to make the adjustment than all-out defense towns. The latter probably still have time to try to attract a leavening of civilian enterprises and encourage steps toward conversion by present companies, but the effort ought not be delayed much longer.

People, as well as companies, will have to "convert." A generation of specialized professionals exists whose training has been mainly defense directed and whose whole work experience has been in that field. Even for those with a predefense background, reentry into a vastly changed civilian technology will present problems of adjustment. Defense workers at all levels of skill and specialization, if their jobs dry up, face a probable need to retrain, possibly to relocate. Adjustment is primarily a matter of individual initiative, which the prudent presumably are already exercising by laying preparatory plans. But many will need help.

Depending on the severity of the circumstances, financial aid probably will be required from Federal or State Governments, perhaps both. Since the problem is essentially a product of national policies dictated by the needs of security, Government must be expected to assist in the solution.

The assistance should be temporary and should aim at helping individuals, companies, and communities integrate as soon as possible into the ongoing private economy. If dependence on defense spending is merely replaced by long-range dependence on some other Government program, the overall economy will lose the opportunity for increased thrust that could come from transfer of a portion of activity out of the public sector into the private. The governmental role in adjustment to any gradual phasing down of defense expenditures ought to be one of lubricating the friction points rather than stoking the engine.

Such a role might include emergency aids similar to those designed for rehabilitation of depressed areas or for relief of individuals and companies adversely affected by tariff reductions—relocation allowances, payment during retraining, improved placement services, credit assistance. Even before rescue measures are necessary, however, there are more imaginative steps the Government could be taking that should lessen the need for palliatives later on.

If, for instance, a modest allowance were granted to defense contractors for research aimed at conversion to nonmilitary activity, many companies could greatly improve their chance of making the transition success-

fully—and of taking their employees with them.

Without some provision of this type, many defense companies—especially the smaller ones and those entirely or almost entirely engaged in military work—cannot afford to divert resources to disarmament insurance. Profit margins are generally low in the fiercely competitive defense industry, with its one buyer and multitude of sellers. Secretary McNamara has said:

"The average profit as a percent of sales on defense work, for example, is something on the order of 3 percent-plus. This is far too low a rate in relation to the investment required to draw to this defense business the most efficient resources in terms of human abilities and equipment."

Encouragement of research looking to conversion is an especially attractive idea for two reasons: first, the development of new products is a prime source of the kind of lift and excitement that will be needed to perk up demand in one sector of the economy if demand is being withdrawn from another; second, research geared to the civilian economy has suffered heavily in recent years from the preemptive requirements of defense and space. Scientists have been recruited away from both commercial and academic activity—in far greater numbers, it is often alleged, than can be efficiently employed. If "stockpiling" of scientists is in fact being practiced as widely as some critics have charged, it may be one of the major wastes in the defense and space efforts. An important part of getting ready for a possible curtailment of defense activity is the reorientation toward nonmilitary wants and needs of a part of the Nation's great new research capability.

WITH A DIFFERENCE: DEMOBILIZATION AND DISARMAMENT

It is only partly relevent to the present situation to recall the ease with which the U.S. economy, after major wars, has adjusted to cuts in military spending many times more massive than anything that can be reasonably contemplated in this decade. One important distinction is that those adjustments came after shooting wars. Shortages of civilian goods, pent-up demand, and the liquid aftermath of inflationary war financing smoothed the transition. None of those factors exists now; in fact, there is the converse circumstance of an uncomfortably high level of unemployment.

Today's defense industry, moreover, is different in nature from that which came out of past wars. In those cases the work of war was done by a civilian industry hastily converted to military production. A large part of the present apparatus, by contrast, came into existence for the sole purpose of producing defense goods or services; it has no prior history of civilian output. The problem ahead of it is not reconversion but conversion, a much more difficult adjustment. It means breaking into an unfamiliar kind of market, meeting a new kind of competition, grasping drastically different managerial concepts. The complexity of the challenge accents the desirability of starting to plan early.

Despite the important differences in setting, the successful adjustments after World Wars I and II and Korea do have a bearing on the prospects for accommodating a decline in cold-war arms budgets. They prove that military spending is replaceable without shrinkage of the total economy, and therefore that it has no unique magic as a stimulant to or sustainer of economic growth. The problems of effecting the replacement may be harder in the current context, requiring earlier and greater deliberate efforts on the part of all groups concerned, but the basic lesson of the past is still valid.

That lesson should be answer enough for any who might be inclined to resist cuts in defense spending on the ground that the economy "can't afford it." For a long time it was a standard Communist deprecation of capitalist economies to allege that they needed the fuel of armaments activity to keep going. That theme has changed. The Russian Government, replying in 1961 to questions of a United Nations group studying disarmament, asserted—not surprisingly—that changing over from military to nonmilitary production would present no economic problems for Socialist countries. Then, in a remarkable revision of party dogma, it added: "Nor are there any insurmountable economic obstacles to disarmament for the capitalist countries, including the United States."

What a pity it would be if faint-faithed capitalists were to pick up a tired old line that the Communists appear to have dropped.

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

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

THE REAL ISSUES IN LATIN AMERICA—AN EDITORIAL

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in an editorial in its October 8 issue, the Vision Letter, an authoritative weekly newsletter devoted to analyzing Latin American affairs, places into proper focus what it terms "The Real Issues in Latin America." Although it is an angry editorial, it contains the essence of what I feel is the true and correct picture of events which have transpired in that area in recent days. While we may not agree with all the contentions set out, the editorial cannot be ignored nor can we afford not to assess the views outlined.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be placed in the RECORD.

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

THE REAL ISSUES IN LATIN AMERICA

With all Washington's head-holding despair about the military takeovers in Honduras and the Dominican Republic, and before them in Ecuador and Guatemala in this year alone, the real issues facing the hemisphere aren't even being debated. These are simply: economic development of Latin America in partnership with the United States, and the struggle to block the spread of Castro-communism, again in partnership with the United States.

Because it is the richest nation in the world, because it is the bulwark of the West's struggle against communism, and because it is the natural leader of the Western Hemisphere, these huge and fundamental problems are laid in the lap of the United States. They cannot be avoided. Events in Santo Domingo and Tegucigalpa cannot be explained, as the administration would like, on the basis of "local situations" without relevance to the Latin American whole. They are directly traceable to the fact that the United States under the Kennedy administration is not living up to the fundamental challenges facing it:

The isolation of Cuba is a myth. Castro-Communist agents are openly at war with every government on the arc of the Caribbean. Homegrown extremists threaten the stability of other nations further to the south. The administration still has no program with a Chinaman's chance of toppling the Castro regime, and it has yet to work out a policy flexible enough to help other countries fight local and imported subversion.

The Alliance for Progress, while well intentioned, has not been carried through vigorously enough to convince Latin America of its fundamental value. Although President Kennedy refers again and again to the fact that "Latin America is the most critical area in the world today," it is starkly apparent that his Government has treated it on a second or third priority basis.

A catalog of failures—of commission and omission—on these basic issues is long and tawdry, starting with the Bay of Pigs and leading to the emasculation in the House of Representatives of the Alliance for Progress budget. President Kennedy and his aids have plenty of good ideas and good intentions for Latin America, but they have never shown the energy or sense of purpose to translate them into meaningful and sustained policy. To this day the administration hasn't even found a man of national stature to put the Alliance and other inter-American problems across, either here or in Latin America—as it has with Harriman for South Asia, Stevenson for the United Nations, Williams for Africa, and even Shriver for the Peace Corps.

What good does it do to argue whether or not any form of aid should be withdrawn from Honduras? Toward what goal do we consider acts of retaliation against the military-civilian government in the Dominican Republic?

Latin America is threatened to its foundations by a Communist-extremist conspiracy which attempts to make orderly development impossible. Military reaction in the face of this provocation is often inevitable, and not always unjustified. If Washington wants to see pure democracy in this hemisphere, it must take the vigorous steps necessary to make it possible.

SECRETARY DILLON'S STATEMENT ON A NEW FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in today's Wall Street Journal appears a very interesting article, one which could well sound the death knell of the administration's massive public works spending program.

In the article it is pointed out that Treasury Secretary Dillon concedes—albeit reluctantly—that a new Federal public works program is not needed "at this particular time."

This is one area in which expenditures could be reduced and I feel that this statement by Secretary Dillon should be pushed to the ultimate—so that the American taxpayers will not again have foisted on them a repetition of what occurred last year.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Dillon Concedes He Thinks Works Bill Is Not Needed," be placed in the RECORD.

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

DILLON CONCEDES HE THINKS WORKS BILL IS NOT NEEDED

WASHINGTON.—Treasury Secretary Dillon reluctantly conceded he doesn't think a new Federal public works program is needed at this particular time.

The Secretary's view was expressed at Senate Finance Committee hearings on the Kennedy administration's tax-cutting bill. Across Capitol Hill, the House Public Works Committee was holding hearings on a separate measure authorizing an additional $900 million for accelerated public works spending.

The administration had been hoping to avoid taking any position on the public works bill, sponsored by Representative BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota. Officials fear endorsing it would endanger chances for the tax cut, touted as a major administration remedy for unemployment; critics say both bills would worsen the Federal budget deficit. But outright administration opposition to the public works bill would anger labor leaders and liberal Democratic Congressmen who are enthusiastic for public works projects.

Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, asked Mr. Dillon how he felt about it. At first the Secretary loyally followed the administration line, insisting the White House has taken no position and isn't responsible for recommending it. But, pressed further by Senator WILLIAMS, Mr. Dillon wound up with this observation: "At this particular moment; at this particular time, I don't think that the bill is necessary."

DEFICIT SPENDING

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier, in an editorial on September 20, underscores what some of us have been warning for many months. That the proposed $11 billion tax cut, if not accompanied by reduction of Federal expenditures, could well be the beginning of a pattern of fiscal irresponsibility which would assuredly be fatal to the economy of the Nation.

The editorial emphasizes that "deficit spending is a pain-killing narcotic which eventually transforms a nation into a dope addict."

I feel this editorial is deserving of the attention of every Member of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Deficit Spending Is Habit-Forming Narcotic," be inserted in the RECORD.

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

DEFICIT SPENDING IS HABIT-FORMING NARCOTIC

A big issue of the 1964 campaign has now been fixed. The question is, Can the Government artificially stimulate greater prosperity by spending more than it takes in?

Northern Democratic liberals have for more than 30 years been advocates of big spending whether the budget balanced or not. But they have mostly in the past used the argument that spending was necessary to alleviate hardship or take the bottom out of a recession or share the wealth.

But now President Kennedy is deliberately advocating deficit spending during a period of prosperity in the hope that it will stimulate greater prosperity and eventually bring in more tax revenue with lowered rates because corporations and individuals will be earning more income.

The President has the support of some academic economists and a few business economists on this theory. They point out the astonishing economic growth of some Western European countries where variations of the Kennedy plan have been practiced. They admit that this European growth has also been stimulated by such new factors as the Common Market and continental mass production which are not exactly paralleled in the United States.

Our opinion is that controlled deficit spending under ideal conditions could perhaps be used to level off fluctuations in the business cycle. Additions to the national debt during recessions could be repaid during periods of expansion and a steadier upward growth could be maintained.

But such ideal control of Government spending does not exist and cannot exist in a democracy where pressures for constantly increased Government spending are apparently irresistible. Suppose, for the purposes of argument, that the Kennedy program is enacted and, after a 4-year interval, did result in such economic growth as to cause a balanced budget. The result would be a national debt 30 to 50 billion higher than at present, with resulting questions as to the fiscal stability of the Government and the soundness of the dollar.

Moreover, it is absurd in view of the record to argue that this increase in the debt will be repaid. If (again for argumentative purposes) the Kennedy program did succeed with an $11 billion tax cut, the temptation would be irresistible to vote a $22 billion deficit the next time and thus stimulate the economy twice as much.

The $11 billion tax cut proposed by President Kennedy, if adopted, is not going to be fatal to the economy of the United States. But it could be the beginning of a pattern of fiscal irresponsibility which would assuredly be fatal. Deficit spending is a pain-killing narcotic which eventually transforms a nation into a dope addict.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN OUTER SPACE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it was with shock and disappointment that I learned today of the approval by the United Nations of a 17-nation resolution, banning the use of nuclear weapons in outer space. Our own Ambassador to the world organization, Adlai Stevenson, was one of the sponsors of the resolution, which, in effect, kills the Nation's long-sought development of the military use of space.

The U.N. action, Mr. President, was the result of an agreement reached between Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, President Kennedy and U.S. Secretary of State, Dean Rusk. Soviet U.N. Ambassador Nikolai T. Fedorenko, perhaps with tongue in cheek, told the General Assembly his government "felt it imperative" to agree with the Kennedy administration to ban the orbiting of nuclear weapons.

Approval of the resolution constitutes an open and flagrant assault by the present administration on our national security, our constitutional form of the government and the future freedoms of people throughout the world.

First, as has been pointed out in several of our larger national newspapers, the U.N. action is in effect a commitment by the United States which cannot be escaped or nullified by the Senate. The resolution and our support of it thus may be termed an open and blatant usurpation by the Executive of the advice and consent powers bestowed on this body by the Constitution.

Second, the Soviet Union's achievements in orbiting heavy space vehicles and its acknowledged crash program to develop military uses of outer space while this administration has refused to pursue any such program places us at the mercy of Russia should attack come from that quarter.

Third, the resolution, by killing our own program for development of the military uses of outer space, seriously weakens the last great bulwark against Communist domination of the world.

The Senate of the United States was never consulted about this proposal, obviously because the executive branch of Government considers this body an unnecessary and cumbersome appendage which should be amputated. As a result, the Members of this body, those of the House of Representatives and the 180 million Americans whose security and future are at stake find themselves committed to a treaty about which they have never been consulted or told.

In view of the manner in which the Moscow Test Ban Treaty was rushed to approval, despite testimony from the foremost experts in the field that it would endanger our security, it is important that every Member of this body consider without delay what may be done to reverse the U.N. action and how we can restore the historic separation of powers which has been violated by this Executive action of the Kennedy administration.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, subsequent to the debate on S. 649, yesterday, I received three letters from Federal officials commenting on the merits of the legislation. I believe it is important to place these communications in the RECORD to round out the publicly expressed opinion of the administration on this water pollution control legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters from Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, and General Services Administrator Bernard Boutin be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., October 16, 1963.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution Control, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: This responds to your recent request for this Department's comments on S. 649, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters, and for other purpose, as recently reported out of the Committee on Public Works.

Since our report in June of this year, your committee has substantially revised the bill. We now believe that the bill will overcome most of the problems that we had anticipated at the time of our earlier report, subject possibly to some technical amendments

that we are still considering. Accordingly, we recommend the enactment of legislation along the lines of this bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., October 15, 1963.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution Control, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your recent letter regarding S. 649—amending the Water Pollution Control Act—as reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works October 4, 1963.

As pointed out in your letter, section 4(c) of the bill now refers to certain labor standards provision not presently contained in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. These additional provisions, which were recommended in our report to the committee on this bill, relate to Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950, and section 2 of the Copeland Act, as amended. They carry out our recommendation and we appreciate the committee's favorable action in this regard.

Yours sincerely,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 16, 1963.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution Control, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: Your letter of October 8, 1963, requested the comments of the General Services Administration on S. 649, 88th Congress, as amended and reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works, entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes."

The purpose of the proposed legislation is stated in the title.

GSA is particularly interested in section 6 of the amended bill which would require Federal agencies in control of buildings, installations, and other facilities discharging any matter into the waters of the United States to obtain a license therefor from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and would authorize the Secretary to revoke such licenses if he found pollution was endangering the health and welfare of any persons or was otherwise violating standards of water quality established in accordance with the bill.

Under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, GSA is responsible for the construction and alteration, including repair and improvement, of public buildings. Such buildings include Federal office buildings, post offices, courthouses, customhouses, appraisers stores, border inspection facilities, warehouses, records centers, relocation facilities and similar Federal facilities. In addition, GSA has the function of acquiring space by lease, with certain exceptions, for the housing of Federal agencies.

In carrying out its cooperative responsibility under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, GSA, pursuant to a memorandum of understanding with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, compiled an inventory of waste water disposal practices at Federal installations owned by or leased to the United States as of December 31, 1960. Reports received from the various agencies were forwarded to the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. GSA's report indicates that there are some facilities under our management or repair and improvement responsibilities which may require the expenditure of funds to meet the standards to be established for licensing under section 6 of this proposed measure.

The General Services Administration would favor the enactment of legislation along the lines of S. 649 as amended and reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works.

The effect of the enactment of this measure on the budgetary requirements of GSA cannot be estimated at this time.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I have expressed my appreciation for the splendid cooperation given by all the members of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, and by the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. I want to repeat that expression taking particular note of the contributions made by the senior Republican member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS].

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the hard work and devoted efforts of the members of the staff of the Public Works Committee and the staffs of the members of the committee, who contributed so much to the improvement of S. 649 and to the language of the committee report. The staff included Public Works Committee Staff Director Ron M. Linton and his associates, Richard E. Garrish, John L. Mutz, and Richard B. Royce.

The staff from the offices of the committee members included William F. Hildenbrand, legislative assistant to Senator BOGGS; Alyce M. Thompson, research assistant to Senator FONG; Allen E. Pritchard, Jr., administrative assistant to Senator PEARSON; and Donald E. Nicoll, my administrative assistant.

THE WATER ON THE SECOND FLOOR IS 2 INCHES DEEP—AND RISING

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it was my privilege last night to attend the annual banquet of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America held in New York City where the principal address was given by our United Nations Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson.

We have come a long way in a short time, relatively, so far as our national thinking concerns what Ambassador Stevenson terms "the flood tide of population."

Ambassador Stevenson compared the world's population problem today to the distressed householder who called the police to come rescue him during a flood:

"I'm standing in 2 inches of water," he yelled over the phone. The harassed officer replied, "Sorry, but that's not an emergency." But, said the householder, "I'm on the second floor." And that's where we seem to be these days with the flood tide of population—on the second floor, if you please.

The remarks made by Ambassador Stevenson trace the constructive and creative role now being played by the United Nations in the worldwide population picture. For as Ambassador Stevenson suggests:

There are not many areas in which governments and international organizations move creatively to lead public opinion in new directions. Yet I believe that population problems provide one of the rare.

Because Ambassador Stevenson's remarks are pertinent I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his address be printed in the RECORD at this time.

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

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON

As the grandfather of five children under 6, I am beginning to wonder if I'm not coming to the Planned Parenthood Federation a little late. Moreover, I planned and planned to have a daughter—and ended as the father of three sons. But some of my other plans have gone astray too—take 1952, for instance, or 1956.

So I have reason to be in favor of better planning. And I'm not fainthearted about it like the condemned man who was about to be hanged. As he started to ascend the rickety scaffold, he shrank back and said: "Is this thing safe?"

We are always hearing predictions about future increases in population, only to discover a little later that the predictions were on the conservative side.

It's like the distressed householder who called the police to come rescue him during a flood: "I'm standing in 2 inches of water," he yelled over the phone. The harassed officer replied: "Sorry, but that's not an emergency." But, said the householder, "I'm on the second floor."

And that's where we seem to be these days with the floodtide of population—on the second floor, if you please.

It is something to which we cannot be indifferent. I share with Rousseau the conviction that as soon as any man says of the affairs of state "what does it matter to me?" the state may be given up for lost.

And so the presence of so many of you crowded into this room tonight is very reassuring. Because you do care.

I know there are some who don't believe it is possible to find a formula for family planning that is both effective and universally acceptable. But, I recall Browning's line: "Do the things you cannot do so your soul shall grow."

That's what you have to do, and are doing. And we try as best we can to practice that at the United Nations. The results are not always spectacular, but we are learning not to be easily discouraged. We try not to neglect any work of peace that is within our reach, however small. We have constantly to carry on, or rebegin, the work of building the institutions and practices of a nonviolent world, keeping always in mind, beyond the setbacks and disappointments, our own vision of a peaceful future for men.

And it is a vision, I would say, that the opening of the present session of the United Nations General Assembly has projected more hopefully than in preceding years.

I don't mean to imply that we are suddenly threatened with total harmony, or that the light of sweet reason is about to shine forth, or that peace is about to break out. Any such dangers are remote. But I would say, too, that more and more nations are less and less flouting the general consensus of most nations.

Some do it grudgingly, some with poor grace; some are even reluctant to admit they are doing it at all, and some are just letting it happen. A few, of course are still unmoved. But we are inching forward. That in itself is a miracle, a small miracle, but a miracle nonetheless—and a very timely one.

For within the very recent past, discovery of some of the secrets of the atom has put such destructive force into the hands of the great powers that the whole purpose of armed struggle is becoming meaningless. The conventional wisdom about national security which has instructed the leaders of all states in all times past, has suddenly become obsolete. And so it is that the unconventional wisdom of a national security based on developing means and procedures for the peaceful settlement, or at least, the containment of vital differences among states has suddenly become even more urgent—if that is possible—than ever before.

And this, not at all strangely, is linked directly with the reason we meet here tonight. For within the very recent past, too, scientific discoveries have so extended the average span of life that population growth threatens to frustrate all our costly efforts to achieve significant improvements in living standards. So it is not only in the attainment of peace that conventional wisdoms must give way to the unconventional wisdoms.

To say the obvious, ours is a world of multiple revolutions, of vast ferment, of pervasive change, of political turmoil. Oliver Wendell Holmes once said: "We need education in the obvious more than in investigation of the obscure." This observation seems to me particularly apt with regard to the work that brings you together here tonight.

Last year, Richard Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, told the General Assembly on behalf of the U.S. Government that population growth was "a matter of transcendent importance for the United Nations." "Transcendent" is a word to use most sparingly, but since Mr. Gardner's statement 10 months ago, the population of the world has gone up even more swiftly so that there are now 45 million more people than when he spoke. In the next decade, man's numbers will swell by a full half billion and probably 100 million more.

So I would like to endorse the word "transcendent." Whether or not, any one nation at the moment can be said to have a population problem, mankind's runaway growth in the 20th century must concern every nation. And within the family of nations we must do our utmost to help each other understand and deal with it. As Prof. George Zeegers, the eminent Catholic sociologist of Geneva, said recently, "the expected growth of world population * * * puts before humanity great problems, the like of which it has never known before."

A more informal way of stating it would be to say, "this thing is bigger than all of us." But it need not be if we become concerned with the quantity of life as well as with the quality of life. This depends to some extent on the quality of people; for I think our own estimate of ourselves, the human species, is somehow amiss these troubled days, in a way that bears obliquely but deeply on our approach to population.

Some time ago I came across a comment that the major problems confronting the world today could be summarized as bombs, babies, and bulldozers: Nuclear bombs and missiles which might destroy civilization overnight; an excess of babies which could frustrate efforts at economic development; and bulldozers which are well on their way to leveling the world's countryside to make way for a chaotic urban sprawl.

In short, the more we learn about our expanding universe, the more we must be impressed with the minuteness of our planet, and of our species, in the infinity of space. We are learning to master the physical universe faster than we learn to control ourselves. Surely man's view of himself has been rudely shaken and diminished since those quaint pre-Copernican days, brief centuries ago, when he looked upon himself and his world as the hub around which all else turned. And yet, for all our new knowledge and for all our peering even further into space, we have yet to discover anything like man—indeed, any inklings of sentient life—or any other place than this earth where he could live.

Our reason tells us that the galactic vastness of space may contain other creatures, some other organic intelligence. But our most advanced instruments have yet to find it: The satellite Mariner II confirmed, in the first space probes of another planet, that the temperature of Venus is 800°; reports about the Moon, meanwhile, indicate an equally unlivable temperature at the other extreme—around zero minus 500. So our own Mother Earth, and our own species, should again begin to seem uniquely precious.

For practical purposes in our time, therefore—and perhaps absolutely and forever—man is alone. Will he recognize, in God's wisdom, that his needs for his fellow men far outweigh his arguments with them? Can he grasp and act wisely on the simple truth that we are living on a small jewel of a star which is our only habitat and hope, and that its God-given resources must therefore be nurtured and cherished for the benefit of all mankind, rather than plundered and fought over? There may be a special irony that the so-called population crisis—calling attention to a potential excess of humanity in relation to resources—may finally drive home this fact. Perhaps the necessity of confronting the population dilemma will finally usher in the brotherhood of man.

In addressing this audience, I need not dwell further on the importance of population problems, nor on the spreading awareness of the implications of population trends evident throughout the world and our own country. Nor do I need to read to you the lengthening roster of diplomats and statesmen of many countries who have spoken out on this subject—including Senator GRUENING, of Alaska. But I do want to say a few words about the role of leadership in this field, and the special contributions of the United Nations.

If we look behind the words of diplomats and statesmen, we find that their leadership often lies in discerning and articulating the existing balance of forces which moves beneath the surface of popular opinion. There are not many areas in which governments and international organizations move creatively to lead public opinion in new directions. Yet I believe that population problems provide one of the rare opportunities.

For in this field, marked by deep differences of conviction, by slogans, by emotion, it may be possible for statesmen to discern underlying principles not fully apparent in the intense partisan. In this field we need not fear differences of conviction. In this field, so intimately intertwined with the most basic facts of human life and existence, we must fear ignorance, inattention, easy solutions.

We know, only too well, that there is no one, simple solution to this many-faceted population problem. And even with respect to the most important aspect, responsible parenthood, the obstacle is not the intransigence of one group or another.

The obstacle is not political timidity; it is not lack of consensus. The true obstacle is the long neglect of population problems, only now beginning to be remedied by scientists, by theologians, by administrators, by social scientists, and by statesmen. The simple, shocking fact is that we know very little about human behavior in this vital area.

Our ignorance would be even greater if it were not for the work of the United Nations. With remarkable foresight the pioneers of the U.N. provided for a special organ on population problems—the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council. They also provided a corresponding population section in the Secretariat which over the past 17 years has patiently and tirelessly assembled the basic data which have enabled us now to begin to chart dimensions of world population problems.

And now their work is beginning to bear fruit:

Last December, for the first time in its history, the General Assembly debated the question of "Population Growth and Economic Development." As a consequence of that debate, the Secretary-General is conducting an inquiry among all the members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies which will, for the first time, assemble the views of all member governments.

This December there will convene in New Delhi under United Nations auspices an Asian Population Conference, the first formal conference of governments ever held in this field.

In April the Economic and Social Council adopted a comprehensive resolution on the intensification of the demographic work of the United Nations.

I venture to predict that these first steps presage a lasting interest in population problems by the most important organs of the United Nations system.

Are there principles which should guide the United Nations and associated agencies as it moves to grapple with so complex a problem? I believe that there are.

The greatest contribution which the United Nations can make is the encouragement of attention, of sound knowledge, and of careful analysis of problems deeply involving the most basic human values. Population problems are not an area in which drama contributes nearly so much as thought.

Last December the General Assembly found itself divided on the question of technical assistance for dealing with population problems. Yet a careful reader of the records of that debate will find little concrete specification of precisely what would be involved in a program of United Nations technical assistance. I believe that interest in technical assistance will be more nearly universal when we clarify what it is we are talking about.

The United Nations already possesses authority to lend technical assistance in all aspects of population problems. Quite apart from legal authority, however, there is no reason for the United Nations to supply particular birth control devices which are repugnant to many of its members. The limited resources of the United Nations are insufficient for this purpose. What is more important, such materials are already available from certain governments and through private channels. The less developed countries are perfectly capable of securing these materials without special provision for technical assistance or external financing.

With respect to population there are, however, several vital tasks which the United Nations should be equipped to perform in its technical assistance programs and related activities:

First, the United Nations should be able to help member countries to learn more about their own population trends, particu-

larly in relation to the implications for economic and social development. The inquiry currently being undertaken by the Secretary General may provide some information on the need for this kind of technical assistance.

Second, the United Nations should be prepared to extend technical assistance to member countries which desire to undertake surveys of the attitudes of their people toward marriage, child rearing and family size. Surprisingly little is known about this important subject, even in the case of our own country.

Third, the United Nations, along with such agencies as UNESCO and the World Health Organization, can advise countries upon request on how to transmit information on family planning consistent with the cultural and religious values of their people—so that individual parents will have free access to the growing fund of knowledge in this field.

Fourth, our knowledge of the basic life processes involved in human reproduction needs to be enlarged, so that parents can have the knowledge they need to overcome both involuntary parenthood and involuntary childlessness. As President Kennedy said last April, we need to "know more about the whole reproductive cycle," and this knowledge should then "be made more available to the world." The World Health Organization has been enabled to make a small start in this direction by the pledge of the United States last May of $500,000 to initiate research on human reproduction.

Fifth, the United Nations can help less developed countries build effective institutions for health and social services. These are not only desirable for their own sake—they are essential to the success of family planning policies at the village level.

The common element in all these activities is the development and dissemination of knowledge. It should be made unequivocally clear that in this field, as in others, the United Nations and its related agencies will not engage in propaganda, and will not seek to influence the policies of member countries. But the United Nations system can and must provide international mechanisms for making knowledge available to all countries who desire it for the purpose of finding solutions to their population problems, and for expanding and deepening that knowledge. To this effort the United States has pledged its wholehearted support.

II

But the United Nations systems, with its many instrumentalities and its rich fund of experience, still is but one of the resources available to the international community. What about our own Government, with its resources for foreign assistance, its vast research laboratories, and its familiarity with the immense reservoir of experience gained by foundations and private firms?

We ourselves will help other countries, upon request, to find sources of information and assistance in dealing with problems of population growth.

Within limits of scientific feasibility—and the more prosaic and abrasive limits of the availability of trained personnel—the Government is well launched toward this objective. The National Institutes of Health have committed more than $3.4 million a year to reproductive studies—a figure that is destined to grow. Within the National Institutes of Health, the new Institute of Child Health and Human Development embraces research in human reproduction as one of its specific and important functions.

As this new Institute becomes more firmly established, expansion of federally supported research in this field may be expected—assuming that scientific institutions are ready and able to merit Federal support.

For its part, the Agency for International Development, which as you know is responsible for U.S. foreign assistance programs, is currently surveying the needs of developing countries for U.S. assistance in collecting and analyzing basic data on population trends needed for national development planning. This is an outgrowth of the longstanding AID program under which the United States had made skilled demographers and statisticians available to countries for census taking and vital statistics,.

AID is also in a position to refer requests for medical assistance in the population field to appropriate agencies of the U.S. Government, such as the Public Health Service, to private organizations, to universities, and to foundations. And AID is prepared to support scientifically meritorious research on the economic and social determinants and consequences of population trends.

Finally, let me say a few words about one of the most distinctive of American resources: the rich diversity of private organizations which American citizens so generously support through their own efforts, organizational and financial.

I do not need to tell you who are assembled here at the annual dinner of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America how much imagination, dedication, and practical idealism has gone into the programs of voluntary organizations such as this.

Your immense contribution is drawing attention to a problem which, as I have already said, is of transcendent importance not only to the United States but increasingly to the world.

I salute you particularly for your work during the many years during which few, even among the best informed, recognized the true importance of the looming population problem.

And I urge you now to continue your contributions to understanding on a problem which, together with the problem of building a peaceful world, will determine the success of all our efforts in this century to secure the future of the human race.

The work and vision of people like you all over this shrunken globe will, I am confident, hasten the day when men will no longer live as strangers, or war against each other as hostile neighbors, but learn to live together in the world, to respect each other's differences, to heal each other's wounds, to promote each other's progress, and benefit from each other's knowledge.

Robert Frost wrote:

"Only where love and need are one,
And the work is play for mortal stakes,
Is the deed ever really done
For Heaven and the future's sakes."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a very fine editorial appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 20, 1963, relating to our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. The editorial relates to the Senator's efforts in securing legislation to prevent the Federal Communications Commission from giving preferential treatment, in the awarding of television and radio licenses, to applicant companies in which Members of Congress have a financial interest.

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

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

THE FCC'S CRITERIA

Senator PROXMIRE is on the right tack in urging legislation to prevent the Federal Communications Commission from giving preferential treatment, in the award of television and radio licenses, to applicant companies in which members of Congress have a financial interest. The Wisconsin Senator is disturbed by the 1960 award of a TV channel in Albany, N.Y., to the Capital Cities Television Corp. partly on the stated grounds that five Congressmen owned stock in it. He is concerned that the presence of Congressmen among stockholders may still be regarded by the Commission as among favorable criteria.

Senator PROXMIRE would do well to broaden his efforts and place them on an affirmative footing by addressing himself to the whole problem, which is that the FCC lacks a comprehensive, consistent body of criteria, in written form and available to all, upon which its awards may be either defended or attacked. Congress laid down no such guidelines when it enacted legislation in 1927 on a crash basis to deal with a crisis and has enacted none since.

The Commission has built up no firm precedents because its members do not write the decisions justifying awards, as they should, thus pinning down policy, but leave decision-writing to anonymous hired hands who pick out from among conflicting standards those that will support the decision already made.

The Commission's awards are too much affected with the public interest and worth too much money for it to continue improvising. Senator PROXMIRE will be performing a service that has continued in default for 36 years if he can persuade Congress to write down the notes for the commission to play by.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET COOPERATION IN OUTER SPACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday in New York the United Nations General Assembly's main political committee unanimously adopted a resolution designed to prevent another fearful dimension from being added to the arms race. Final formal approval by the Assembly itself is slated for today. The resolution calls upon all states to refrain from placing nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction in orbit around the earth, from installing such weapons on celestial bodies, and from stationing such weapons in outer space in any other manner. It was sponsored by all 17 active participants in the Geneva Disarmament Conference, including the United States and the Soviet Union. Our two countries reached agreement in principle on the subject after Foreign Minister Gromyko acceded to this country's longstanding proposal on September 19.

The United States has long advocated that outer space be devoted to peaceful purposes. As early as January 12, 1957, in a memorandum presented to the First Committee of the U.N. General Assembly, the United States urged that future outer space experiments be devoted to peaceful purposes only.

In 1958, the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament recommended in its final report on the "Control and Reduction of Armaments" that the United States take energetic action, within the compass of the United Nations Charter, to outlaw the use of space for military purposes. The report pointed out:

It is obvious that space vehicles, satellites, and other objects have tremendous military potential. Any comprehensive system of arms control could not be complete without taking space weapons into account.

President Eisenhower, in an address to the U.N. General Assembly on September 22, 1960, had this to say about outer space:

The emergence of this new world poses a vital issue: Will outer space be preserved for peaceful use and developed for the benefit of all mankind? Or will it become another focus for the arms race—and thus an area of dangerous and sterile competition?

The choice is urgent. And it is ours to make.

The nations of the world have recently united in declaring the continent of Antarctica "off limits" to military preparations. We could extend this principle to an even more important sphere. National vested interests have not yet been developed in space or in celestial bodies.

President Eisenhower's allusion to the Antarctic Treaty was an appropriate one. That continent, like outer space, had not been invaded by the horrible mechanisms of modern warfare. To our best knowledge, Antarctica is still being used exclusively for peaceful purposes. Now the world can take on additional hope from the U.N. resolution. Faced with the bizarre threat of nuclear annihilation, mankind must accommodate itself to the realization that an increase in security does not follow from the arms race. Indeed, as President Kennedy has said, "in a spiralling arms race a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase."

Progress is now being made and we must not let it slip from our grasp. If it does slip, let it not be said that the United States was at fault.

The U.N. resolution does not represent a new policy for the United States.

Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric stated on September 5, 1962:

The United States believes that it is highly desirable for its own security and for the security of the world that the arms race should not be extended into outer space, and we are seeking in every feasible way to achieve that purpose. Today there is no doubt that either the United States or the Soviet Union could place thermonuclear weapons in orbit, but such an action is just not a rational military strategy for either side for the foreseeable future.

We have no program to place any weapons of mass destruction into orbit. An arms race in space will not contribute to our security. I can think of no greater stimulus for a Soviet thermonuclear arms effort in space than a U.S. commitment to such a program. This we will not do.

At the same time that we are pursuing cooperative scientific efforts in space through the United Nations and otherwise, we will of course take such steps as are necessary to defend ourselves and our allies, if the Soviet Union forces us to do so. This is in accordance with the inalienable right of self-defense confirmed in the United Nations Charter.

Our intention not to place weapons of mass destruction in orbit was confirmed by the President and other U.S. spokesmen on a number of occasions. It has been confirmed by two Presidents, President Eisenhower and President Kennedy.

The distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], speaking as a member of the U.S. delegation to the 17th U.N. General Assembly on December 3, 1962, repeated it eloquently. He said:

The United States has no intention of placing weapons of mass destruction in orbit unless compelled to do so by actions of the Soviet Union. The draft treaty for general and complete disarmament, proposed by the United States and now before the Conference in Geneva, includes a provision against the placing of weapons of mass destruction into orbit during the first stage, let me emphasize the first stage, of the disarmament process. Nonetheless, while the difficult negotiations continue for the actual elimination of nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them, it is especially important that we do everything now that can be done to avoid an arms race in outer space—for certainly it should be easier to agree not to arm a part of the environment that has never been armed than to disarm parts that have been armed. We earnestly hope that the Soviet Union will likewise refrain from taking steps which will extend the arms race into outer space.

Although the resolution adopted by the United Nations Committee yesterday, and which is before the General Assembly today, does not have the same binding force as a treaty, its effect has been to get the Soviet Union to take a formal public position similar to our own. As has been stated, our publicly announced position was based on the decision that surface launched nuclear weapons are less expensive and more effective than those placed in orbit. Moreover, since the impact of weapons in space would be primarily psychological rather than military, the resolution will be a useful political barrier to such a Soviet extension of the arms race. If the Soviet Union were to place bombs in orbit for psychological purposes in violation of its declared intent, as expressed in the U.N. resolution, it would have to reveal their presence to the world in order to utilize them as "terror" weapons. The political consequences attendant upon such action carries its own sanction and we would be free to do what we deem necessary to protect our interests.

I should add that we have the scientific capability to place in orbit nuclear weapons capable of mass destruction. It can be done. We know how to do it. We merely say that we do not want to do it, and in this instance we have the unanimous support of the 17-nation disarmament committee of the United Nations, which has proposed the resolution. I therefore hope that these weapons will not be placed in orbit and that such an unfortunate development will not happen. It seems unlikely that it will.

If unforeseen events make it desirable to have additional assurances that the Soviet Union has not violated its declared intent, we would be free to seek such assurance as might be necessary and could take appropriate action if satisfactory assurance were not forthcoming. Since we did not plan to place weapons of mass destruction in orbit anyway, the resolution would not cause any alteration in our space activities. We can still continue our research and development on possible orbital systems in preparation of their deployment if we are forced to take such action.

What is equally important, possibly more important, is that we can concentrate our resources and attention upon the peaceful uses of outer space and peaceful research in the development of outer space. We do not, however, intend to let down our guard. At the same time, we have taken another significant step toward making the world a safer place in which to live.

I commend the 17-nation committee. I am hopeful that by today the United Nations General Assembly will have confirmed or ratified the recommendation which was made only yesterday by the General Assembly's main political committee in offering a resolution designed to prevent the placing in orbit, in outer space, of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the United Nations resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TEXT OF "BOMBS IN ORBIT" RESOLUTION—U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY, NEW YORK, OCTOBER 15, 1963

Recalling General Assembly Resolution 1721 (XVI) which expressed the belief that the exploration and use of outer space should be only for the betterment of mankind;

Determined to take steps to prevent the spread of the arms race to outer space;

1. Welcomes the expressions by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of their intention not to station any objects carrying nuclear weapons or other kinds of weapons of mass destruction in outer space; and

2. Solemnly calls upon all states: (a) To refrain from placing in orbit around the earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, installing such weapons on celestial bodies, or stationing such weapons in outer space in any other manner; (b) to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in the conduct of the foregoing activities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement of the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, as he delivered it to the United Nations on October 16, in support of the resolution, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.N. STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR STEVENSON, OCTOBER 16, 1963

Mr. Chairman, it is my happy duty today to speak to the draft resolution introduced so eloquently yesterday by the distinguished representative of Mexico. This resolution represents another decisive advance in the disarmament process, one which we hope will prevent the orbiting or stationing of weapons of mass destruction in outer space. We warmly welcome the cooperation of the Soviet Union in this endeavor. We are particularly pleased that this draft resolution is cosponsored by all of the participants in the 18-nation Committee on Disarmament.

While attempting to realize our ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament, we have sought continuously to implement less ambitious measures which could help to lessen international tensions and to facilitate our task. By the adoption of this resolution members of the U.N. will

be taking a positive step toward the goal of disarmament. Hopefully this step could lead us to further measures.

The resolution itself is a simple one. It does not require the cessation of governments of any present activity. To the best of our knowledge, no weapon of mass destruction has ever been placed in orbit around the earth. Rather, this resolution calls for abstention. It would represent international recognition that the arms race must not be extended into new environments, that while we are seeking ways of limiting and reducing existing armaments, we undertake to refrain from developing a new potential in the armaments field. Certainly it would seem easier not to arm an environment that has never been armed than to agree to disarm areas which have been armed.

The draft resolution on the table sets forth a policy which has already been unilaterally adopted by the United States. On September 5, 1962, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric, made the following statement of U.S. intentions respecting the placing in orbit of weapons of mass destruction:

"Today there is no doubt that either the United States or the Soviet Union could place thermonuclear weapons in orbit, but such an action is just not a rational military strategy for either side for the foreseeable future.

"We have no program to place any weapons of mass destruction into orbit. An arms race in space will not contribute to our security. I can think of no greater stimulus for a Soviet thermonuclear arms effort in space than a U.S. commitment to such a program. This we will not do.

"At the same time that we are pursuing cooperative scientific efforts in space through the United Nations and otherwise, we will, of course, take such steps as are necessary to defend ourselves and our allies, if the Soviet Union forces us to do so. This is in accordance with the inalienable right of self-defense confirmed in the United Nations Charter."

Our policy in this regard was made clear to the United Nations by Senator ALBERT GORE speaking as U.S. Representative to the First Committee on December 3, 1962. On September 20, 1963, President Kennedy reaffirmed our intention to keep weapons of mass destruction out of orbit.

Since that time, we have met with the representatives of the Soviet Union on this problem. We are glad that the intentions of the Soviet Union in this regard are the same as our own, and I am happy to report that the resolution which is before the Assembly has the support of both Governments.

Speaking on behalf of the United States, let me say what has been said many times before: The United States has no intention of placing in orbit around the earth any weapons of mass destruction, of installing such weapons on celestial bodies, or of stationing such weapons in outer space in any other manner. The United States intends to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in the conduct of the foregoing activities by others.

The United States fully intends to pursue this policy.

We recognize that it is not possible to foresee today all events which may at a future time occur in the newly emerging field of space technology and in the exploration and use of outer space. Nor can we foresee fully the outcome of continuing efforts to achieve disarmament. Naturally if events as yet unforeseen suggest the need for a further look at this matter we would acquaint the U.N. with such events.

I have set forth my Government's policy of refraining from orbiting weapons of mass destruction in outer space and have reiterated our firm endorsement of this resolution. I am certain that the members of this committee are fully aware of the value of this resolution and I would, on behalf of my Government, strongly recommend it to them.

My Government is gratified at this important step we are about to take. We believe it should help reduce international tension. The United States hopes that there will be unanimous agreement to this resolution. We believe that by faithfully following the policy expressed in it we will help make the world a safer place in which to live. By avoiding a nuclear arms race in space we will have taken one further step on the road to disarmament.

INCORPORATION OF THE CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1914) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans be reconsidered.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1914 and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1914) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America.

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

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

SPACE AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the question which Congress must answer in determining this year's appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is not whether we should or should not explore outer space, or even whether we should or should not try to land American astronauts on the moon. Space exploration is a great challenge to the human mind and spirit which may bring great benefits to humanity. The United States is uniquely endowed with the human and material resources to meet this challenge. It is within our means and in our interests to sustain a continuing effort in the exploration of outer space.

The real question before Congress is one of priorities, of how we are to allocate our great but not unlimited resources among many important national programs, of which space is only one. We must consider the NASA appropriation in the context of overall national needs, distinguishing between urgent and marginal goals, between programs which are essential and those which are merely desirable.

For reasons which I shall attempt to set forth, I believe that we are placing excessive emphasis on space in relation to other national programs, notably in the areas of education and employment. The benefits of space exploration may indeed be considerable, but they are remote and incalculable. The need for schools and jobs is immediate and pressing. The space program, we are told, is important for our security and especially our prestige. This is perhaps true, but the education of our people and the growth of our economy are far more important because these are the foundations of national power. To allow them to deteriorate is to undermine our national security as surely as would the dismantling of our military power.

There is, I believe, a dangerous imbalance between our efforts in armaments and space on the one hand and employment and education on the other. The proposed appropriation for NASA, in my opinion, reflects this imbalance. I believe that it should be substantially reduced. I further believe that any funds which are withheld from the space program should be reallocated to programs of education and employment which are before Congress this year.

The question before us, as I have said, is not whether we should or should not send a manned rocket ship to the moon but whether the project is so vital and so urgent as to warrant the indefinite postponement of other national efforts. This question has been debated at length in recent months, both in the Congress and in various publications. I have heard nothing to persuade me that it would be a national calamity if the landing on the moon were delayed until 1980 or 1990. I have heard and seen a great deal which persuades me that our continuing neglect of deteriorating schools and rising unemployment would be a national calamity.

The argument most frequently heard in support of Project Apollo is that if we do not pursue a crash program in space the Russians will get to the moon ahead of us. This argument can be challenged on two grounds: first, it is not at all clear that the Russians are trying to beat us to the moon; second—and more important—it is even less clear that it would be an irretrievable disaster if they did.

Sir Bernard Lovell, director of the Jodrell Bank Observatory in Britain, reported after a visit in July to Soviet space observatories that he saw no evidence of a high priority manned moon program. Sir Bernard was told by Russian scientists that they saw insuperable economic and technical problems to landing a man on the moon and that in any case they believed they could get nearly all the information they wanted by a soft landing of instruments on the moon. "I think, at the moment," said Sir Bernard, "the Americans are racing themselves concerning moon research."

What if Sir Bernard is wrong and the Russians really are committed to a race to the moon? What if they do get there first? Would that be an unmitigated disaster and disgrace for America? Would it make us a second-rate people, shamed in the eyes of the world, and in our own eyes, as well? I do not think so. I think it would be a temporary embarrassment and annoyance, but not a calamity. It would hurt our pride, but not our lives as free men in a free

society. Most emphatically, it would not change the course of history.

The issue, as I have said, is one of priorities. It would be a fine thing indeed to have an American landing party on the moon before 1970. The question which we must ask ourselves is whether it is really worth 20 or 30 billion dollars for the glory and prestige of being first. Sir Bernard Lovell, himself an advocate of a manned moon flight, admitted recently that "people everywhere now are getting so inured to the amazing success in space that by 1967 or 1970 the landing of a man on the moon might not cause more stir than the launching of another cosmonaut or astronaut does now." But even if the world were to react with enormous enthusiasm to a landing on the moon, is it really worth 20 billion dollars or more solely for the pleasure and satisfaction of dazzling the world with our prowess and our skill? Again, I do not think so.

The conflict between freedom and dictatorship is a great deal more than a competition in technological stunts. The real issue is between two conflicting concepts of man and of his life in organized societies. It is on this level that the contest between freedom and communism will ultimately be resolved. Does it not follow that our success in this struggle has a great deal to do with our capacity to employ and educate our people, to create the conditions for human happiness and individual fulfillment in a free society?

If, at the end of this decade, the Russians should have reached the moon, and we should not, but if we, instead, have succeeded in building the best system of public education in the world, in the renovation of our cities and transport, in the virtual elimination of slums and crime, in the alleviation of poverty and disease, whose prestige would be higher, who would then be ahead in the worldwide struggle for the minds and the allegiance of men?

The mind does not readily grasp the significance of a sum or $20 or $30 billion. Warren Weaver, vice president of the Alfred F. Sloan Foundation, has provided some dramatic comparisons between the cost of the moon race and that of some urgently needed projects here on earth. With $30 billion, he points out, we could give a 10-percent raise in salary, over a 10-year period, to every teacher in the United States, from kindergarten through universities—about $9.8 billion; could give $10 million each to 200 colleges—$2 billion; could finance 7-year fellowships at $4,000 per person per year for 50,000 new scientists and engineers—$1.4 billion; could contribute $200 million each toward the creation of 10 new medical schools—$2 billion; could build and largely endow complete universities with liberal arts, medical, engineering, and agricultural faculties for all 53 of the nations which have been added to the United Nations since its founding—$13.2 billion; could create three more permanent Rockefeller Foundations—$1.5 billion; and we would still have left $100 million for a program of informing the public about science.

It is frequently said that we did not provide adequate funds for education and other vital domestic needs before we had a space program, and that there is no assurance that we would increase our efforts in these areas if the space program were abandoned or reduced. This, I am bound to concede, may well be true, although the Congress has come close, several times, and very close, last year, to adopting a meaningful program of Federal aid to education, and it is possible that the reduction of our space expenditures would provide the impetus for the enactment of a really good education bill. In any case, I see little merit in the view that since we will not spend money, anyway, on things we urgently need, we might as well spend it on things we do not need. If it comes to that, I, for one, would rather not spend the money at all.

Another rather specious argument that is put forward for a crash program to reach the moon is that of inaccurate and oversimplified historical analogy. We are told, for example, that, like Spain in the time of Columbus, we are living in an age of discovery, and that, like Columbus, we must not fail to seize our moment of greatness. The analogy is a stirring and dramatic one, but it is hardly a sound basis for the shaping of public policy. If Columbus is to be brought into our discussion of outer space, it is worth noting that he raised a substantial part of the costs of his voyages from private sources, and that in any case he was not at all interested in discovering new lands, but only in discovering a shorter and less costly route to the Indies. It is also worth noting that the conquest of the New World brought Spain only a brief period of glory, which was followed by four centuries of political and economic decay. Finally, I am not at all sure that it would have been one of the great tragedies of history if America had been discovered in 1500, or even 1600, instead of 1492.

Another questionable argument that is made for Project Apollo is that instruments cannot be substituted for men in our exploration of the moon. There is, in fact, a very impressive body of scientific testimony to the contrary. Philip Abelson, for example, the editor of Science Magazine, and himself a noted physical chemist, pointed out recently that "The cost of unmanned lunar vehicles is on the order of 1 percent of the cost of the manned variety," and that "most of the interesting questions concerning the moon can be studied by electronic devices." And Dr. Vannevar Bush, who is well known in this city for his great work during the war, stated recently:

> There is nothing a man can do in space that cannot be done better and more cheaply by instruments. There is very little scientific knowledge to be gained by rushing to hurtle men into space. To me such exploits are little more than stunts that appeal to the gladiator instincts.

British physicist R. L. F. Boyd maintains that:

> For scientific purposes, man is a nuisance in space. The plain fact of the matter is that for one-tenth of the cost one could get 90 percent of the valuable information—without having to overcome the enormous difficulties of putting a man on the moon and getting him back alive.

Warren Weaver, of the National Academy of Sciences, wrote recently:

> I do not think that scientific considerations justify the proposed magnitude of the program, and even more emphatically I do not believe that scientific considerations justify its frantic, costly and disastrous pace.

If, in fact, as these eminent scientists believe, we can gain most of the information we want about the moon at one-tenth of the projected cost of Project Apollo, by using instruments instead of men, Congress could make a very substantial reduction in the space appropriation without impairing our national space effort in any important way. It becomes increasingly clear that the principal object of our moon program is the glory and distinction of being "first in space." I for one do not believe we can afford a program which, if we assume its minimum cost of $20 billion, will add up to $2 billion for science and $18 billion for prestige.

Perhaps more important than the costs of space research is the fact that it is drawing urgently needed scientific talent away from the civilian economy. In 1961, for example, of 400,000 scientists and engineers engaged in research and development work in the United States, 250,000 were doing it for space and defense. Since 1954, the number of research and development scientists and engineers in industry has increased by 160,000, but all but 30,000 of these have been drawn into Government-sponsored projects. As one research director of a private company commented recently: "We need good people, but my company can't compete with projects paid for by the U.S. Treasury."

Technically qualified manpower has become a critically scarce resource. The increase in the supply of research scientists and engineers this year is expected to be about 27,000, but some 25,000 of these—virtually the entire supply—will be drawn into space research and development. Prof. Barry Commoner of Washington University in St. Louis has said that the space agency will require the services of one in every four U.S. scientists by 1970.

There is thus a real danger that our national programs in defense and space will become a drain on the civilian economy and will jeopardize our position in world trade. At present only 25 percent of our total national research and development spending is going into industrial research for civilian purposes. Western European countries are spending twice as large a proportion of their gross national products as the United States for civilian research and development. The Japanese, largely as a result of progress through civilian research, have introduced the first transistorized television sets into the United States, are getting twice our rate of production from textile machinery, and are turning out automated ships that can carry more cargo than our ships with smaller crews.

Equally alarming is the prospective diversion of scientists and engineers from careers in university teaching. In the next decade there will be a great increase in our college population. If the present teacher-student ratio is to be maintained, the universities in the next

several years will have to retain two-thirds of their current output of new Ph. D.'s instead of the present one-third. Thus, the current flow of graduate research scholars to Government and industry would have to be cut in half. It is just at this critical point that the demand for scientific talent for the space program is rapidly rising. It is increasingly clear that the supply of scientists and engineers in the present decade will not be sufficient to meet the demands of a mushrooming space program, a rapidly expanding college population, and all the other needs of the civilian economy.

These, I believe, are some of the compelling reasons for bringing our space program into a more realistic relationship to pressing national needs. In the face of all the unsolved problems of our country—problems of inadequate education and rising unemployment, of urban blight and rising crime and many others—I cannot bring myself to believe that landing an American on the moon represents the most urgent need, the most compelling challenge, or the most promising opportunity before the American people in this decade. The incongruousness and distortion of priorities that is involved in a crash program in space is admirably expressed in a story that is told of a Russian pupil in a physics class, who, when told of the plans to land a Russian on the moon, agreed that this was a fine thing and asked: "But when may we go to Vienna?"

I believe, Mr. President, for the reasons I have set forth, that in its appropriation for NASA for fiscal year 1964 the Congress should substantially reduce the amount of the authorization. It should be made quite clear that such a reduction in funds for the space program in no way implies a lack of confidence in the space agency itself or in the competent and dedicated people who have made our space program so great a success over the last several years. The meaning and purpose of a reduction in funds, as I see it, is to register a judgment by the Congress on national priorities, a judgment that space exploration, though valuable and desirable, is only one of many valuable and desirable national programs, some of which, under existing circumstances, have a prior and more pressing claim on our limited national resources.

The highest priority need of America in the 1960's is the expansion and improvement of public education. While a vast proportion of the wealth and talent of America are expended on defense and space, our public schools, the ultimate source of our national strength and welfare, are deteriorating under the pressures of inadequate funds, inadequate numbers of teachers with inadequate training, and a rapidly mounting school-age population.

Horace Mann wrote: An undereducated nation is like an obscene giant who has waxed strong in his youth and grown wanton in his strength; whose brain has been developed only in the region of the appetites and passions. Such a republic, with all its noble capacities for beneficence, will rush with the speed of a whirlwind to an ignominious end.

Is America an undereducated nation? The answer lies all around us, in the growing number of our "unemployables," in mounting rates of crime and juvenile delinquency, in lingering vestiges of poverty within our affluent society. Consider, for example, a recent report by the Army Surgeon General's Office showing that one out of every four young Americans who were called before the draft boards in 1962 was rejected for failing the Army's intelligence test. In North Dakota, with the best record, only 7 percent of the draftees failed the mental examination; in South Carolina, with the worst record, 5 out of every 10 draftees failed the mental test. In the District of Columbia, one out of every three draftees failed the mental test, and even in New York, with one of the best financed systems of education in the Nation, one of every three draftees could not pass the Army's mental examination.

A recent report by the National Committee for the Support of the Public Schools shows that fewer than one-third of the people of my own State of Arkansas have completed 4 years of high school and that only a half have completed the eighth grade. According to the report, only 4.8 percent of the people of my State have completed 4 years of college and 15.4 percent of the population are considered functionally illiterate, having completed less than 5 years of schooling. The correction of this situation, in my opinion, and of similar situations in many other States, is far more urgent and important than the landing of an American on the moon in 1970 or at any time in this century.

There is no problem more pressing in our national life than the need for improving and expanding our public education. Although expenditures on public education have risen rapidly in the last decade, they have not nearly kept pace with the increase in our school age population, which since 1950 has been growing twice as fast as the total population. We have been economizing on education and for this false economy we cannot avoid paying a heavy price in the prosperity and happiness of our people and, ultimately, in the security and defense of freedom.

The correlation between lack of education and unemployment is high and continually rising. In March 1961 the unemployment rate among professional and technical workers was 1.6 percent; among clerical workers 4.9 percent; skilled workers, 9.1 percent; semiskilled workers, 12.1 percent; and unskilled workers, 19.1 percent. In the complex and increasingly automated American economy of the 1960's the unskilled and untrained worker is increasingly relegated to a life of intermittent or chronic unemployment, to a hopeless shuffling from one menial job to another, to a life of diminishing hopes and mounting disillusion. While the demand for highly skilled workers continues to rise, the unskilled worker is increasingly destined to be not only unemployed but unemployable.

The slow but continuing increase in unemployment among the work force as a whole, and the very rapid increase of unemployment among young people, is largely the result of grave shortcomings in our public education, especially for the 80 percent of American youth who do not go to college. The vocational education bill passed by the House and by the Senate will, if enacted, make a powerful contribution toward remedying this situation, but it will be only a valuable first step toward meeting an overriding national problem. It should be followed by further measures in the field of education, including the adoption of the President's program for basic education for the 8 million adult Americans who, lacking the ability to read, write, and do simple arithmetic, are "functional illiterates." At present, these people would be unable to benefit from vocational training programs even if they were available to them because they lack the basic educational tools for training and employment. Surely, a major national effort to remedy these problems, with their enormously destructive social, economic, and political implications, warrants a high priority in our public policy.

We live in a society which, though affluent beyond all others, has not yet succeeded in eliminating widespread poverty and deprivation. As President Kennedy pointed out in his last state of the Union message, some 32 million Americans "still live on the outskirts of poverty." Some authorities cite much higher figures. The Conference on Economic Progress has said that 38 million Americans live in poverty and another 39 million live in substantial deprivation.

Throughout the country there is a high correlation between poverty and dependency and lack of education. In my own State of Arkansas 89.4 percent of all the people on public welfare rolls have less than a fourth-grade education. The $4.5 billion which is spent on welfare payments each year by Federal, State, and local authorities is of course only a small part of the cost of inadequate education. Crime and delinquency, losses of economic productivity, and the destructive social and political consequences of inadequate education are also part of the equation, and their costs to the Nation are beyond calculation.

Until we have gone much farther toward the solution of these critical problems of our national life, I do not see how we can regard a voyage to the moon as one of the high priority objectives of our public policy. The conquest of outer space is a worthy and inspiring aspiration, but the education and employment of our people is a basic and immediate necessity. With will and dedication, it is entirely within our means to overcome the problems of poverty and unemployment and inadequate education. When we have done so, it will be time enough to direct our aspirations toward the moon and whatever lies beyond.

Mr. President, the Kwakiutl Indians of the great Northwest have made their mark on the world by the curious practice of throwing their most valuable possessions into bonfires. The purpose of such a "potlatch," as it is called, is to glorify one's self and humiliate one's opponent. How curious that a society would deliberately destroy its own riches on the assumption that it would somehow gain prestige in the process. How

curious, also, that a society would spend $5 billion in a single year in an effort to place one of its citizens on the moon. For those who wonder whether our space program may perhaps bear certain resemblances to the Kwakiutl potlatch, I recommend the excellent article written by Edwin Diamond which was published in a recent issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

THE RITES OF SPRING

(By Edwin Diamond)

The civilization of the Kwakiutl Indians, Ruth Benedict noted in her essay "Anthropology and the Abnormal," was "one of the most vigorous in North America" during the last decades of the 19th century. Two features distinguished the Kwakiutl culture: one was what Mrs. Benedict called "its ample economic supply of goods"; the other was a ceremony called "potlatch." "All the zest of life," Mrs. Benedict observed, "lay in a cutthroat competition in the giving away of goods * * * the object of the contest was to glorify one's self and humiliate one's opponent." In one form of the potlatch two clans would gather around a fire and their chiefs would vie with each other in throwing the clan's most valued property into the fire. If one chief, for example, threw a blanket into the blaze, the other would destroy a bigger one. Thus, the chief demonstrated that he was the better man; unless the rival chief did the same or better, his name was "broken."

A contemporary cultural anthropologist, viewing the hot fires that consume million dollar—and million ruble—rockets in this decade of the 20th century might, understandably enough, be reminded of the potlatch ceremony. No less an intimate participant than Dr. James Killian, who was President Eisenhower's chief science adviser in the critical period after Sputnik I, told a group of alumni from Massachusetts Institute of Technology in a 1960 speech: "The pressures are very great to engage in an item-by-item race with the Soviet Union. Unless decisions result in containing our development of man-in-space systems and big rocket boosters, we will have soon committed ourselves to a multibillion-dollar space program."

Today, in the spring of 1963, less than 3 years later and scarcely more than 5 years after the space age was inaugurated, Dr. Killian's forecast has been fully realized, though perhaps to an extent that even he could not have foreseen. A new and vigorous administration, one dedicated to getting the country moving again, has replaced the Eisenhower team; one of its first acts, in the words of President Kennedy, was to "shift our efforts in space from low to high gear." The shift was indeed vigorous: the infinitely ambitious idea of landing Americans on the moon and returning them safely to earth was made an avowed national goal—to be achieved in this decade. To reach this goal, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on February 25, 1963, requested for the fiscal year beginning July 1 a budget of $5.7 billion, $2 billion more than for the previous fiscal year and $5 billion more than was spent on space during Dr. Killian's tenure in the "early days" of the space age. Of this sum, NASA Administrator James E. Webb told the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, some $4.3 billion, or about 75 percent, would go into manned space flight programs—a level of expenditure which, if it plateaus as expected, will bring the total cost of the lunar landing program to an estimated $30 billion by the tentative target date of 1968. Nor does the moon mark the limit of NASA's enterprise. Given the complexities of such vast endeavors, NASA has already been planning ahead for missions beyond the lunar landing. One week after Mr. Webb's testimony, Dr. Hugh Dryden, the agency's Deputy Administrator, told the same congressional committee that the next major NASA space project in this decade would be—assuming of course the necessary budgetary approval—a manned orbital space station. Two designs, he explained, are currently being considered: one is a huge 60-ton satellite that would be assembled in orbit to house as many as 20 men for months at a time. It would cost perhaps $2 to $3 billion and would require a shuttle system of rockets to ferry up supplies and relief crews. The other is a more modest 10-ton design for four crewmen that would cost between $300 and $400 million. A decision on these alternative plans probably will be made within NASA this fall for the space stations in turn are viewed as means to still grander goals in the 1970's and 1980's. "It seems to us," Dr. Dryden advised the committee, "that an orbiting laboratory is a necessary preliminary to manned planetary expeditions." In line with this reasoning, the incurable optimists in the space agency have already penciled in one such manned planetary expedition, a mission to Mars at a cost of perhaps $100 billion, and has invited American industry to participate in the planning. At a NASA programs plans conference, held in Washington, February 11 to 12, 1963, and attended by over 2,000 representatives of aircraft and missile makers, electronics firms, and other aerospace companies, Joseph F. Shea, Deputy Director for Manned Space Flight, gave a newly revised timetable for the mission to Mars. The years of 1973 and 1975, he said, both times when Mars and Earth would be in favorable positions and when solar storms would be at a minimum, now appear to be overly optimistic. The mission has now been put off until 1983.

The Moon. Orbiting laboratories. Mars. Who can quarrel with such lofty aims? Who can fault this exalted era? We live in a time when man has realized the archtypical dream of Icarus and soared free of his terrestrial bonds, a time of exploration of the space around the Earth, the Moon, and the planet Venus which rivals the age of Columbus and Magellan. The discoveries of the luniks and the explorers and the mariners are widely, and justifiably, heralded. A few years ago, textbooks stated that space was a serene and empty void; today physicists know that near space is filled with radiation belts, solar winds, and great plasma clouds. The temperature of Venus has been measured and its opaque cloud cover charted.

Yet, down on earth, much of the space age—its politics, its economics, its sociology—remains uncharted. The debates and decisions which send us careening off in this direction or in that, are opaque to the public eye. Despite all the advance technical planning and fine detail work, the space program has a curiously jerry-built, improvised aspect; the planners seem to know where they are going but not why. To the hoary question "Why go to the moon?" President Kennedy in a speech last year (Sept. 12, 1962) in Houston, Tex., gave an equally hoary answer. He quoted the words of the British explorer, George Mallory, who was once asked why he wanted to climb Mount Everest: "Because it's there." But the United States, unlike Mallory, does not rest its case on this entirely reasonable answer. We must also go, we are told, because space is a potential military area, because it is a challenge to our technology, and because it creates jobs and contracts. (In the same Houston speech in which he quoted Mallory, Kennedy also said: "During the next 5 years, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration expects to double the number of scientists and engineers in this area; to increase its outlays for salaries and expenses to $60 million a year; to invest some $200 million in plants and laboratory facilities.") These diverse motives cause some of the confusion; but the major difficulty lies elsewhere, in the fundamental assumption that space exploration, really, is a race—with heats that are won or lost and with prestige as a prize that is daily won or lost.

This attitude has several unfortunate consequences. First, it reduces lofty endeavors to a game. The reductio ad absurdum is perhaps expressed in a house ad for Life magazine: "winning a football championship; the space race; the cold war—each week Life reports on the victories (and on the defeats) that shape our lives."

Second, it helps create the unwarranted impression that rockets and hardware—which are, after all, only one small and highly specialized segment of technology—can be made the preeminent standards for judging national achievement. While the skills and technical know-how needed in a lunar landing program do, in fact, embrace many disciplines, they leave untouched whole areas of science. The most exciting and perhaps the most important progress occurring in science today, for example, is in the field of molecular biology and biochemistry; but space activities provide hardly any scope for these achievements. And beyond science and technology, how does the space race reflect and further the values of a free society—respect for human rights and individual freedoms? It was such considerations as these which Dr. Alvin Weinberg of Oak Ridge National Laboratory may have had in mind when he observed that most Americans would rather belong to the society that first gave the world a cure for cancer than to the society which put the first astronaut on Mars.

Third, the notion of a race tends to shut off discussion and criticism of both the techniques and the goals of a national space program—lest we lose precious time to the opposition. Recently, when Kennedy was asked at a Presidential news conference about the possibility of substantial cuts in his overall budget proposals, he replied: "Are we going to make a determination that we are going to be permanently second best in space? Because if you cut the space programs substantially, that is what you are writing into law." In the administration's defense, it should be pointed out that the President also defended his proposals for school aid and for other social services "essential to a better life for our people." Given the mood of the cost-conscious Congress, however, these measures are the first to feel the whack in appropriations.

Fourth, as a corollary to the need for speed, the normal governmental procedures for funding and programing have frequently given way to wartime-style "crash programs" and a doctrine of "concurrency," in which design is only one step ahead of construction which is only one step ahead of procurement. At the same time, an increased degree of secrecy also becomes necessary to prevent the opposition from knowing too much.

The fifth consequence of the space race psychology is what might be called scientific immodesty. For example, the flight plan calls for a 2- or 3-day journey to the moon. But up to the scheduled flight of Astronaut Cooper in May, no American had spent more than 9 hours in space, and while Soviet Cosmonaut Nikolayez remained up for over 94 hours, his orbit was well below the Van Allen radiation belts and he did not have to contend wth bursts of solar radiation. Even in these flights, some minor medical problems were encountered. Astronaut Walter Schirra, after 9 hours in space, suffered from orthostatic hypotension (abrupt lowering of blood pressure) when he left his capsule.

Nikolayez showed symptoms of calcium mobilization (an abnormal loss of bone calcium). Weightlessness was probably responsible for these two conditions and an artificial gravity can be provided in future capsules. But the point is that, despite the many unknowns and uncertainties involved, the Ameican program has rocketed ahead on assumptions that were set rather early, and little margin for change has been allowed.

Finally, the cumulative effect of the space race psychology is to enshrine the Kwakiutl potlatch rites into national policy. This is a fascinating chapter in American political practice which still remains to be explored and described. After Sputnik I, the instinctive response of the conservative, business-minded Eisenhower team was to dismiss the entire notion of satellites as a stunt and an "outer space basketball game." The frugal George W. Humphrey, Mr. Eisenhower's Secretary of the Treasury and a figure hopelessly out of step with political reality (as Emmet Hughes' new book, "The Ordeal of Power," makes plain), apparently was convinced that space exploration was a Russian plot to make the United States spend itself into bankruptcy. The Kennedy administration, to its credit, has given a thrust and dynamism to space science that is in step with the times. But in the process, it may have turned Humphrey's quaint notion upside down. The reasoning that went into the U.S. administration's decision in May of 1961 to make a lunar landing the prime target of its space program has never been adequately exposed to public knowledge. But one factor seems to have been the realization that this step conceivably could escalate the stakes of the race to a level too high for a Soviet economy already known for its constant shortages. The potlatch, in other words, will bankrupt the others first. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara summarized this situation with his usual precision and clarity in testimony on the Department of Defense budget in January of this year: "The Soviet leadership is confronted with a very severe resources allocation problem and must strike a balance among its various objectives. * * * The Soviet could, over the next few years, build a large force of hardened second-generation ICBM's; they could develop and deploy an ICBM delivery system for the large yield nuclear warheads they have been testing since 1961; they could expand and improve their MRBM–IRBM systems; they could continue to maintain and improve their active defenses against manned bomber attack; they could maintain a large and modernly equipped army; they could develop and deploy some sort of a system of active defense against ballistic missile attack; they could modernize and improve their large fleet of submarines including ballistic-missile-firing types; they could continue the space race; they could expand both military and economic aid to the nonalined nations; they could make the great investment needed to create an efficient agricultural economy; they could continue to push the development of heavy industry; or they could increase the standard of living of the Soviet people—but they cannot do them all at the same time."

This statement is remarkable on several counts. On the level of grand national strategy it suggests that the arms race itself can also be a form of the potlatch. Modern weapons systems are enormously costly—a Polaris nuclear submarine costs about $100 million—and they tend to proliferate under the military's pressure to have a great variety of weapons suitable for waging wars ranging from jungle skirmishes to all-out thermonuclear war. Thus, each upward spiral in the arms race may be a staggering one economically, and a nation's decision to give the spiral another turn in part involves an assessment of how well it can afford the step and how well its opponent can afford to match it.

Specifically, the Kennedy administration's decision—independently arrived at—to press forward with a buildup of second generation missiles (like Minuteman and Polaris) and to embark on a lunar landing program could have a complementary effect—forcing the Soviet Union to choose between hardened, mobile ICBM's and space boosters (as well as between its need for farm tractors and the upkeep of its expensive friends in Cuba). At the same time, the astronomical cost of such competitions can have an important inhibiting effect on them: in an important though little-noticed policy statement made in mid-1962, Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric suggested that the United States would refrain from developing space weapons if the Soviet Union would do so too. (All this, of course, is not meant to discount the role played by such other factors as a genuine desire to reduce tensions.)

Given the need, in McNamara's phrase, "to strike a balance," what have the two space powers done? The United States, with its great wealth and talent, has been blasting off in all directions. Though it suffered the handicap of starting the race late, between January 1958 and April 1, 1963, it placed in orbit around earth no less than 55 satellites, sent probes to the moon or into solar orbit, and dispatched the splendid Mariner spacecraft to Venus. In the opinion of close observers of the space program, every satellite proposal of merit has found a carrier rocket to take it into space, with the possible exception of biological experiments. The feeling that NASA prefers astronauts to animals or instruments chafes many eminent scientists; Dr. Vannevar Bush, for example, maintains that an instrument package on the moon would yield as much knowledge, at a fraction of the cost, as the manned landing program. But, even if this should prove to be the case, there is still some question whether Congress would vote to channel any of the money thus saved to other areas of science, much less to the President's welfare programs.

As for the Soviet Union, it still has an economy of scarcity, yet spectacular space feats would seem to clearly demonstrate its deep commitment to space exploration. But appearances can be deceptive; a careful analysis of some little-appreciated engineering facts about the Soviet space program reveals that it bears a certain Potemkin village look to it. All of the Soviet's epochal achievements, it seems, have been carried off with the same basic booster system generating a thrust of between 800,000 and 1.2 million pounds. This lifting capacity is considered sufficient to accomplish another round of "firsts" in the mid 1960's—perhaps two men in one satellite, then week-long orbits, and finally, manned circumlunar missions—but it is not deemed enough to land men on the moon. And though the lunar landing mission is beyond the capabilities of the present Soviet booster, to date there have been no indications that the Soviets have undertaken the development of a new booster big enough to do the job.

Grant that Western intelligence about the Soviet Union's technological prowess has been notoriously bad in the past; grant that some morning in 1965 Radio Moscow may announced the arrival of a cosmonaut on the moon. Nevertheless, the possibility that the Russians are not going to the moon in a hurry, or at all, suggests a highly surrealistic situation over the next few years: each spring, when the Congress is weighing the hefty NASA budget, the Soviet Union uses its dwindling supply of old reliable boosters to score another first in orbit and the United States responds dutifully by throwing more blankets in the fire.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe there is a very interesting and curious parallel between the concept of prestige as enjoyed by the Indians and what we are engaging in now, a contest with the Russians as to the prestige of getting to the moon first.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I agree with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas, who is chairman of the great Foreign Relations Committee and formerly served as the head of a great university. He is an authority on education, and speaks well for its needs. I believe it is time to put first things first.

I was interested in what the Senator had to say about the prestige argument which we keep hearing in connection with this question of putting a man on the moon.

I happened to have been in the Philippines, in India, and in southeast Asia at the time the first sputnik was launched, and there was prestige involved. We suffered perhaps and we heard much comment in this country to the effect that the United States was about to become a second-class power. The decision to diminish the program which might have enabled us to put the first satellite in orbit was motivated by the fact that the then President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson believed that the money should be spent for more sophisticated defense weapons and a defense system.

I wish to express my agreement with the junior Senator from Arkansas, and to make this further observation: If we should be the first to put a man on the moon, it might cost us even more money, because if we should find any life there we would be responsible for the foreign aid.

Mr. MILLER obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the Senator from Montana, with that understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE ROLE IN U.S. PUBLIC AFFAIRS OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in today's Wall Street Journal appears an article entitled "The League of Women Voters Widens Its Role in U.S. Public Affairs." This article is an interesting and rather in-depth type of reporting on the progress which the League of Women Voters in recent years has been making in its political impact on the United States and on the various State and local governments.

In my own State of Iowa my relations and contacts with the League of Women

Voters have for the most part been excellent. By and large, the ladies who are members of the league do their homework, and do it well.

I must confess amazement at a statement appearing in this article attributed to a leading Kennedy political aid, who said that the league apparently had no influence, not even on their husbands, and he attributed this to the fact that they never take sides in an election; that they are so nonpartisan that they are completely useless.

I think the nonpartisan approach of the league is one reason why it is indeed effective.

The article points out that a booklet published by the League of Women Voters last year, relating to foreign trade policy, was so well written that it was assigned as study material in an economics course at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration. I had the privilege of reading that pamphlet, and I attest to its thoroughness, its completely bipartisan approach, and its effort to present both sides of the issue.

If I were to make a suggestion for the future operations of the league, I would suggest that the league continue this nonpartisan approach in questions political, and that it bend over backward even a little further in presenting both sides of issues, as it did with respect to foreign trade policy.

I regret to say that there are a few cases in the league's position on some issues that appeared, at least, to present one side rather than both sides; but, by and large, I compliment the League of Women Voters on the job they are doing.

I ask unanimous consent that the article I have referred to be printed in the RECORD.

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

LADY LOBBYISTS: THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS WIDENS ITS ROLE IN U.S. PUBLIC AFFAIRS—GROUP LEADS BATTLE TO WIN NEW MICHIGAN CONSTITUTION, FIGHTS POLL TAX, AID CUTS—A KENNEDY AID POOH-POOHS

(By Vernon I. Griffin)

Early next month, Texans will vote on a State constitutional amendment to repeal the State's long-standing poll tax.

Lone Star politicians may long argue whether the $1.50 tax really disenfranchises Negroes and other low-income groups, as its opponents claim. But few will deny that if the poll tax is killed, a primary reason will be the all-out campaign against it by a group of women.

That group is the Texas chapter of the League of Women Voters. Today's league bears little resemblance to its predecessor, the flamboyant National American Woman Suffrage Association, whose members perched on flagpoles and marched through saloons to win women the right to vote in 1920. But despite the league's more dignified approach and relatively small size (125,000 members) many politicians think its campaigns on State and local issues are making it an increasingly important force in American politics.

COMPLAINTS FROM A GOVERNOR

The league's successes have ranged from pushing through tax reassessment in Oak Lawn, Ill., to leading the winning fight for a new constitution in Michigan. It recently won praise of sorts from New Jersey Gov. Richard Hughes when he blamed league opposition for seriously damaging chances for his pet fiscal plan to win voter approval next month. The Governor wants to finance needed capital improvements with a massive $750 million bond issue. The league contends interest costs will make this method too costly and advocates a broad-based tax instead.

Political observers attribute the league's rising influence partly to its following among women, including nonmembers, who are playing an increasingly important role in public affairs. They also credit the league's technique of involving its members in detailed studies of complex issues to the point where they sometimes have more facts at their command than professional politicians. And some political pros look with wonder and frustration on the league's ability to assume a mantle of nonpartisanship (chapters are not allowed to side with parties or candidates) and yet wade into highly controversial issues.

"To differ with the league is to differ with motherhood and the flag," sighs Thomas Downs, legislative agent and attorney for Michigan's AFL–CIO Council, which vigorously opposed the league's drive for a new Michigan constitution. "You try to debate with them and the woman comes in late. She says she's sorry but she had to change the baby or see her daughter married. After this, it's hard to argue on the merits of the issue."

MORE THAN FEMININE WILES

But a look at the Michigan campaign shows that a great deal more was involved than feminine wiles. The league argued mainly, along with other proconstitution groups, that the old constitution had created political deadlocks responsible for a series of legislative crises. Leaguers obtained 209,000 of the 320,038 signatures on a petition to call the constitutional convention and presented reams of testimony to convention committees. Three league members served as convention delegates and 26 of 38 league-sponsored items were incorporated in the new constitution.

When the proposed Michigan constitution finally came before the voters, the league worked with other groups to distribute 38,000 booklets and 100,000 bumper stickers to support it. The final days of the campaign last March saw such sights as leaguers parading through Dearborn on an antique firetruck decorated with proconstitution slogans.

When the constitution won voter approval, it was only by 10,000 votes, indicating that a less zealous campaign might have failed. Michigan politicians were impressed. "The State league had little impact on Michigan before this issue," says Zoltan A. Ferency, chairman of the Democratic State central committee, which opposed the constitution. "You heard about them locally, but they hardly were visible at the State level. Now the record speaks for itself."

The league has 1,164 local chapters in 50 States. The chapters are broken up into small units, which meet in members' homes to pursue league study programs. There also are State and National headquarters. To prepare and disseminate study information, organize campaigns and the like, there are 35 full-time employes at national headquarters in Washington and 35 full-time and 14 part-time employees in 27 of the State headquarters. Half a dozen of the larger local chapters also have at least one paid worker.

MAJORITY VOTE DETERMINES STANDS

League stands on issues at all levels are determined by a majority vote of members. Dr. Rensis Likert, a University of Michigan social researcher, found in a 1957 study of the league that 65 percent of the members are wives of men in managerial or professional jobs. Fewer than 5 percent are wives of blue-collar workers. Fundamentally, he said, the league "is made up of people from what we might call the upper social-economical-cultural groups" who have a high educational level. He concluded that "League people, on the whole, are persons who feel that the world has problems about which something can be done." Over 85 percent of the league's most active members are married, have children and have been to college.

More than half of the league's nearly $2 million annual budget is spent by local chapters. A major expense is publishing nonpartisan, preelection "voter's guides," listing issues and candidate biographies, and distributing them publicly. About 37 percent of the organization's money comes from outside contributions, often from male businessmen. Says a league manual on how to approach such sources: "Dress in your tailored best. * * * Be positive, direct, and businesslike * * * you are trying to part a man and his money for a women's political organization."

Typical of the league's rising activity at the State level is its anti-poll-tax campaign. Five of the eleven Southern States that adopted poll taxes after the Civil War Reconstruction period still have them on the books. An amendment to the U.S. Constitution to ban poll taxes in Federal elections is currently coming before State legislatures, with a good chance that it will be ratified by the States. Both the Texas and Virginia leagues have chosen the opportunity to try to knock out such taxes in State elections.

An anti-poll-tax amendment already has received legislative approval in Texas and will go before the voters November 9. The Texas league is providing speakers and distributing pamphlets in 25 cities to persuade voters to vote for repeal. Gov. John Connally launched the repeal drive at a league-sponsored rally at Austin and has offered to make television appearances on its behalf.

In Virginia, Mrs. John W. McDonald, State league president, fears State officials will try to retain the State poll tax even if the State has to comply with the Federal change. To forestall such action, the league in recent weeks has flooded the State with 50,000 pamphlets advocating abolition of the tax and has held four workshops to prepare members for lobbying.

PACING OFF LOTS

Other league activities range widely. League members once donned low-heeled shoes and paced off the Chicago suburb of Oak Lawn lot by lot to help supply evidence that much of the property was underassessed or in some cases not even on the tax rolls. The league's revised assessment added more than $1 million in taxable property.

The New Orleans league 3 years ago spoke out against closing Louisiana's public schools to avoid integration, a highly controversial issue. "When we took our stand only two members resigned and one of those left because we weren't moving fast enough," says Mrs. Jean Reeves, New Orleans president. The schools were not closed.

At the national level, the league has campaigned for more liberal tariff and trade agreements since 1937. It engaged in one of the most extensive campaigns in its history on behalf of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which became law in October that year. A booklet on U.S. trade policies written by the league was so thorough it was assigned as study material in an economics course of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.

Currently, the league is lobbying against curtailment of U.S. foreign aid. The group also supports the "greatest possible protection for the individual under the Federal loyalty security programs" and opposes extension of such programs to nonsensitive positions in Government. And it campaigns

for long-range planning for conservation and development of water resources.

Of course, leaguers don't always succeed. The organization's Berkeley, Calif., chapter flooded their city with thousands of pamphlets and letters urging approval of a new antidiscrimination housing ordinance in a city referendum last spring. But the measure failed by a narrow margin.

LACK OF "MUSCLE"?

In the eyes of some politicians, the league is least effective at the national level. Asked how much influence the organization has on national legislation, a top Kennedy political aid snaps: "None—not even on their husbands." He doubts that the league campaign had much bearing on passage of the Trade Expansion Act, and attributes the weakness largely to the league's reluctance to use "muscle" on politicians.

"They never threaten reprisals," adds the aid. "They never take sides in an election. They're so nonpartisan they're completely useless. Why they're even chary about advertising to their members which Congressmen voted with the league and which voted against it."

But this view is by no means unanimous, as one conservative GOP Congressman reveals in stating his opinion of the league: "The league is a very insidious organization as far as I'm concerned," he declares. "It parades around as a nonpartisan, good government group but the truth of the matter is that all of its policy positions are very liberal. * * * If their staff people presented both sides of an issue and encouraged the local groups to form their own positions, I'd say the league was a very good thing. As it is, though, the organization sucks in a lot of civic-minded women who lack political orientation then deluges them with Democratic propaganda."

Replies a league official: "We're used to being called Democratic or Republican by members of the opposite party who don't happen to agree with us on a league position."

Mr. MILLER. I yield the floor.

WOODBRIDGE'S SENIOR CITIZEN CLUBS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the major concerns in the America of today is the happiness and well-being of the growing number of our senior citizens. All over the country programs have been instituted to make livelier and more interesting lives for older members of our communities. New Jersey has shown a great deal of concern for these people, and I would like to point out an editorial from the Daily Journal, of Elizabeth, N.J., October 2, 1963, describing the efforts in this field of the town of Woodbridge and in particular those of Rodney E. Mott, the township's park and recreation consultant. Mr. Mott was the organizer of Woodbridge's program and its major inspiration. His initiative was admirable and effective. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

WOODBRIDGE'S SENIOR CITIZEN CLUBS

Woodbridge, which constantly surprises itself and its neighbors by its rapid growth, its resources, and its accomplishments, has begun a program to brighten the lives of the 8,000 senior citizens among its 80,000 residents. Not all of them need assistance, but a series of neighborhood clubs already has become active and 1,000 members is the forecast for next year.

The township's park and recreation consultant, Rodney E. Mott, is the activating force. He discovered that Woodbridge had no program for its senior citizens and began working through luncheon clubs, church groups, and direct appeal to those residents who had drifted out of touch with community activities.

Elderly folk seldom voluntarily disassociate themselves from the life about them, but are lulled into inactivity by lack of contact, by the absence of leadership, by the waning of incentive to continue in recreational or cultural pursuits. The clubs being formed in Woodbridge are the means of awakening interest and providing focal points.

With the work already begun and the expected support from other sources the program in another year should meet or exceed expectations. It is a needful approach to a condition infrequently recognized.

B'NAI B'RITH'S ANNIVERSARY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, last Sunday—October 13—the B'nai B'rith celebrated its 120th anniversary. This organization was founded by 12 men who saw the necessity of forming a group that would unite in social brotherhood and fraternal affection, those who valued their cultural and ethical inheritance of Judaism. However, since its founding this organization has gone far beyond the fraternal benefits that come to its own members. It maintains orphanages and homes for the aged in more than a dozen cities. Today the B'nai B'rith has extensive programs of education, social service, youth activities, vocational counseling, intergroup relations, and oversea aid. This fine patriotic organization has offered much to the strength of America.

On the occasion of this 120th anniversary celebration, the Asbury Park Press of Asbury Park, N.J., paid a well-deserved tribute to this fine organization.

Mr. President, I ask that this editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

B'NAI B'RITH'S ANNIVERSARY

A nation grateful for the many services it has performed salutes B'nai B'rith on the occasion of its 120th anniversary today. Through 12 decades it has been in the forefront of disaster relief, secular and religious education, and the development of nonsectarian hospitals, orphanages, youth centers, schools, and scores of equally valuable services.

B'nai B'rith, the first national service organization founded in this country, began in New York City as a rallying point for the Jewish community. It has retained this role and helped preserve the Jewish heritage while at the same time contributing in large measure to breaking down the walls that divided Americans of diverse origins and welding them into a united nation.

In its attacks on anti-Semitism B'nai B'rith fought bigotry in all areas and preached the doctrine of brotherhood that is essential to the American tradition. Its Anti-Defamation League has helped rout the ignorance that asserts itself in vilification for its own sake. Those among us who are grateful for the improved understanding that is erasing divisions among the American people acknowledge B'nai B'rith's contributions in this field.

The organization has good cause for celebration today. Its endeavors are far ranged but they all point in the direction of progress toward a better community, a better nation, and a better world. And they can be summarized in promoting not only freedom but the responsibility that it demands.

INCORPORATION OF THE CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1914) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is S. 1914.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, if it were possible, I would call up both S. 1914, a bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans, and S. 1942, a bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans. However, that is not possible under the rules of the Senate; but I wish to make it plain that when the Senate is considering one of these bills, in effect it is considering both of them; and what happens to the first bill will no doubt determine the fate of the second bill.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, inasmuch as I am in direct opposition to passage of both of these bills, I want to say that what the majority leader has said is satisfactory. I think the issues are exactly the same as presented by the two bills. I would anticipate that what happened to one bill would happen to the other. Any way arrived at to shorten the discussion is satisfactory. The discussion can be had on one bill, and, so far as I am concerned, the second bill may receive the same fate as the first bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The only difference is in the title.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Both these bills passed the Senate, and a motion is pending.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should have informed the Senator from New York that I entered a motion earlier this afternoon, and it was agreed to. I must apologize for not notifying the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It was agreed to?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The motion to reconsider was agreed to, and the bill is now pending.

Mr. KEATING. The bill is now pending?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. The question is on the passage of the measure?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. Is it the intention of the Senator from Montana, the distinguished majority leader, not to have the vote today, but to have the vote on Monday, and discuss the bills today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to see the debate or discussion completed today. Then I would like to get approval,

subject to the concurrence of the distinguished minority leader, who just left the Chamber briefly, to have a vote on this bill, which will be in effect a vote on the other bill, immediately after the vote on the higher education bill on Monday.

Mr. KEATING. The distinguished minority leader is the author of the bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans, of which I am a cosponsor; and I am the author of the bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans, of which the distinguished minority leader is a cosponsor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; and in the subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator is a member these bills were approved unanimously.

Mr. KEATING. Yes; and in the full committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And in the full committee as well.

Mr. KEATING. If the bill is before the Senate now, I shall be very brief.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the majority leader a question and make a parliamentary inquiry. The Senate is now in the position of proceeding as if the bills are now before us for affirmative action. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. A motion to reconsider was approved by the Senate. In actuality, only one bill is the pending business. In reality, both are pending.

Mr. KEATING. May I inquire of the majority leader which bill actually is the pending business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. S. 1914, a bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans. I may point out that the bills provide only to give the Catholic War Veterans and the Jewish War Veterans Federal charters.

JEWISH WAR VETERANS—CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as sponsor of S. 1942 and as cosponsor of S. 1914, I deeply regret that any further debate is necessary to convince all the Members of this body that the small but meaningful tribute of granting Federal charters to the Catholic War Veterans and the Jewish War Veterans of America should receive approval.

These fine organizations have throughout their existence been in the forefront of this Nation's struggle against totalitarianism in all its forms, and have consistently promoted zeal and devotion to God, country, and home, regardless of race, creed, or color. Throughout the history of our country there have been innumerable voluntary organizations whose members may have been of a particular background, but who were joined together to promote thoroughly American causes. The United States has been strengthened, not weakened or divided, by the existence and activities of these many organizations. Each of them has come into being because of a particular appeal to a number of citizens with special ties, but all Americans have benefited from their contributions. The Jewish War Veterans and Catholic War Veterans are outstanding examples of just such organizations. Many of their members are also members of such other outstanding organizations as the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. They have a sharpened sense of what freedom really means, since they know what it means to fight and to risk death for something you hold dear.

Opponents of the granting of Federal incorporation to these outstanding organizations have stressed the point that a Federal charter should not be granted to an organization composed of veterans of a specialized background. They base this point on grounds that the test for service in those organizations was not service to the United States. This is clearly an erroneous conclusion. Certainly the essential basis for eligibility in either of these veterans organizations is service to the Nation.

The Catholic and Jewish War Veterans organizations, since the date of their creation, have rendered invaluable service not just to their members, but to the whole Nation. In this respect it should be noted that the Catholic War Veterans was founded in 1935 by the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Higgins and that the Jewish War Veterans was established in 1896 by Civil War combatants and is today the oldest active war veterans group in America.

Precedent does not stand in the way of the enactment of these measures. Congress has bestowed Federal charters on many organizations based upon religious denominations: the First Presbyterian Church of Washington, the First Congregational Church of Washington, and the Brotherhood of St. Andrew are a few examples of such action. In addition, I wish to point out that on September 2, 1958, Public Law 85-903, granting incorporation to the Jewish War Veterans Memorial, was enacted into law. That law granted incorporation to an organization to construct and maintain a memorial and museum dedicated to commemorating the service and sacrifice of Jewish war veterans. The precedent for the enactment of these bills has been established, and rather than stepping out of line we will merely remain in step by their passage.

We are dealing here with organizations which have dedicated themselves to the welfare and betterment of our Nation. Through the granting of a charter they will achieve a sounder base and establishment, and even more important, will receive proper recognition by the Congress of the United States for a job well done. They both represent a mortal enemy to prejudice and bigotry, and certainly are deserving of the prestige which is part and parcel of a Federal character.

The question here is not one of precedent, but rather one of considering the merits of the organizations involved. There can be no argument against the plain fact that on their merits the Catholic War Veterans and the Jewish War Veterans are worthy of receipt of a Federal charter acknowledging their nationwide significance.

The Senate has already approved these bills once. I sincerely hope that this body will not make the serious error of turning its back on these fine organizations. We have already waited far too long in bestowing this richly deserved honor upon them and there is no valid reason for delaying any longer.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall not take a great amount of time. I am definitely opposed to specialized action by Congress in such instances as this, because I believe it violates the basic principle and philosophy of equality.

I find myself in a rather difficult position to rationalize the position of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], who is an outstanding opponent of segregation, when he proposes a bill which creates segregation in this country based upon religion, and using for its broad purpose service to the country.

The pending bill and the other bill, one for the incorporation of the Catholic War Veterans and the other for the incorporation of the Jewish War Veterans, propose to set up a special national charter for these organizations, composed of certain people, not because they have served their country—that is only a part of it—but because they belong to a special religious denomination.

It is just as fair to say that we should grant a Federal charter for white veterans of wars of the United States or a special charter for Negro veterans of the wars of the United States, as it is to say we should have a special charter for any particular religious group which had the honor and privilege to discharge its responsibility of serving our country in war.

I happen to be a Mason. I know there have been movements in the past by certain people who I believe had not thought this matter through—and requests have been made, although not pushed to the ultimate—for the incorporation of a Masonic war veterans' association or group under a Federal charter. I have been just as opposed to such a movement as I am opposed to this one. I would oppose a Methodist war veterans' organization federally chartered. I would be opposed to giving a Federal charter to any group of that kind.

This is an attempt to ask for segregation at a time when we are trying to move away from segregation, and trying to consider all people on the basis of being Americans; not Catholics, or Jews, or Methodists, or Masons, or what have you.

It is wrong in principle. It should not be supported, and the charter should not be granted.

I regret that it is late in the day, that apparently there will be no session tomorrow, and that only a few Senators remain in the Chamber while we are discussing a bill of this kind.

I have been opposed to this kind of legislation for years. The first time I took the floor of the Senate against it was about 15 years ago, when there was a proposal to grant a charter to the Franco-American War Veterans Association. I opposed that proposal just as vigorously as I do the one today, because I do not believe in a Franco-American War Veterans Association. I believe in American veterans' associations, whose membership is based on community of service and service to the country. If we grant charters of this kind, we shall be creating competitive groups, which will compete against the broadly based groups, weakening all of these organizations.

I should think that the groups themselves would not want to do such a thing. The very groups which outstandingly oppose segregation, in these two instances are asking for segregation. It is a most regrettable step in the march that we are apparently all trying to make toward the elimination of specialized or particularized groups, and in the move toward the broad basis of Americans as Americans, not based on religious conviction, or the pigment of their skin. These matters should not be based on whether a person's skin is black or white, yellow or red, or whatever an individual's desires may be. The test should be community of service, and that should be the broad basis for such action.

If a Federal charter is granted based upon religious convictions, there is just as much reason for granting a charter to a group on the basis of color. I am against that, too.

We have met this idea before, on several occasions. The first one, I recalled a moment ago, was about 15 years ago, when we defeated a move by the Franco-American War Veterans Association to get a charter. I have the greatest respect for these people. I have some understanding of why Jewish war veterans might want to have their own club or organization for their own social affairs, based on their religion. That is all right. Any other religious group also has a right to associate privately if they wish to do so. I have the utmost respect for that privilege and that right. However, when it comes to giving the sanctity and blessing of a Federal charter to a specialized group, I believe we are going too far. A man who was advocating a Federal charter for one of these organizations tried to convince me that it should get a Federal charter. I asked, "Why should you have a Federal charter? You have your organization already. You have your social activities. You have your community association. Why do you want a Federal charter?"

This is what he said to me, although I have no proof of the truth of his statement, because I have not checked it. He said, "In several States, if we do not have a Federal charter, it costs $250 to get a liquor license for our club. If we have a Federal charter, we can get a liquor license for $20, because Federal organizations can get such licenses for that amount."

I said to him, "That is a poor excuse for establishing a definitely segregated group based upon religion or any other similar background in this country."

Mr. President, I think this proposal is basically wrong in principle. I hope I am just as willing as anyone else to accord to every individual his freedom of action in these matters. But I think this is a wrong move. The bill should be defeated, with all due respect to the estimable people who are seeking its passage. But I am not so sure that even they, if they have considered the long-range effects, would be in the rank and file, so enthusiastically for it, because, as I have said, what they are seeking is something fundamental, that is, the blessing of the Federal Government, through a Federal charter, for segregation—and that is exactly what it is. They are seeking to segregate American military servicemen on the basis of religion. I believe that is wrong. I cannot support such a proposal, and I do not intend to support it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had intended to say a word in behalf of these measures. I am a cosponsor of both, and I believe they should pass. I am particularly moved to speak for them now.

First, I yield to no other Member of this body in my respect for the sincerity of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. I yield to no one in my feeling that no Senator has more sincere convictions than our distinguished colleague from Iowa. It is in that spirit that I speak, because I deeply believe that this is not a subject which should be discussed in any way other than with the greatest objectivity.

The point about segregation is fundamental and the first one that should be answered. The record is extremely important.

What is proposed is not segregation, and for this reason: Wherever there is freedom of choice, there is no segregation. I am very ardent in the advocacy of measures against segregation on any ground. The whole point of such measures is to prevent or prohibit segregation which is enforced under cover of law, enforced in practice, enforced by regulation, or, in the case of public accommodations, enforced within the protection of law. In such instances, people may be prevented for example, from going to a motel, a hotel or a theater that they wish to go to—and I underline "that they wish to go to."—and are willing to pay for, where they try to get in the door but are turned away.

That is not the case in this situation. The Jewish War Veterans and the Catholic War Veterans are voluntary organizations. Many Senators belong to veterans' organizations. If my memory serves me correctly, I belong to five.

One could just as well argue on that ground that Congress should not have granted a Federal charter to the Veterans of Foreign Wars because Congress had granted a charter to the American Legion. Personally, I belong to both organizations, but there are men who belong only to one or the other. If they choose to do so, that is their privilege. So I do not see how the classic argument of segregation obtains in this instance, because these are voluntary organizations. I think that is fundamental, after all, to the argument which has just been made so eloquently by the Senator from Iowa.

I shall speak as to the classification by religion. Whether Congress grants or denies this charter, it will not change the classifications by religion. They will persist just the same, whether Congress grants a charter to the Jewish War Veterans or the Catholic War Veterans or does not. Those organizations will continue to function, and they will attract thousands of members.

Incidentally, the Jewish War Veterans is the oldest veterans organization, having been founded in 1896, long before the American Legion, and it has many thousands of members throughout the country. So let us not blind ourselves to reality.

As to the reason for the existence of these veterans' organizations, I think I have a right to speak out of personal knowledge, certainly with respect to the Jewish War Veterans, for, as is well known, I am Jewish, practice my faith, and am very proud of it. There are some things which are distinctive about the Jewish War Veterans, and they are very much in the line of national service. For one, they exercise great care about the practice of their faith; they make certain that facilities are available in hospitals, especially in veterans' hospitals; that rabbis are in attendance for those who wish them; that the ritual objects such as the Torah, and other symbols, are present, including prayer books, prayer shawls, and so forth. They exercise great care in respect to our national cemeteries, where distinctive markers are provided for the graves of Jewish veterans. The graves of Jewish veterans are marked with the Star of David, and the graves of non-Jewish veterans are marked with the Cross, but those soldiers died in a common cause. The present practice is understandable, and we accept it; indeed, we take great national pride in the fact that we defer to these distinctions.

There are some causes which are great national causes, in which, for example, the Jewish War Veterans have been very militant. One of them I have personally lived with and experienced and participated in. That was immediately before World War II when the streets of New York were overrun, in the name of Adolf Hitler, by anti-Semites of the worst character. The Jewish War Veterans turned out militantly to call to the attention of the country how repugnant such a demonstration was to the national tradition. The Nation owes the Jewish War Veterans a debt of gratitude for that.

On other occasions, if the need arises, the Catholic War Veterans will join with the Jewish War Veterans or will themselves act in the same way. The Catholic War Veterans, likewise, have a reason, in their faith, for wanting to be certain that all of the means to practice their faith are present—for example, that Friday, a day which Catholics honor by not eating meat, is respected in dietary terms.

Thus, there are special reasons why men who are veterans, many of them belonging to the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the American Veterans Committee, and other organizations, are also members of the Catholic War Veterans or the Jewish War Veterans, where they have a common bond of community. This is understandable. As I said a moment ago, distinctive markers are placed in military cemeteries. Separate chaplaincies are provided. There are separate ways of observing war veterans' occasions.

These organizations are well-tested, respectable organizations, and render their full measure of national service. This is not segregation, because membership in such organizations is entirely a matter of voluntary association.

As an ardent antisegregationist in terms of Negroes, this occasion gives me an opportunity to point out something I have always contended: There is nothing in any Federal law or in anything I have ever advocated which holds that anybody—either I or the Chair or my colleagues—is required to have dinner with a Negro if he does not want to, or has to invite Negroes to his home, or has to join a club of which Negroes are members. There is nothing of that kind that is inherent in being against segregation. That relates to something which is compulsion. Here we are talking about something that is strictly voluntary, having basis in fact, in practice, and in the precedents, as my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] has described it, and to which I myself have referred.

What is proposed in these bills is nothing but a recognition of reliable, substantial, longstanding, patriotic veterans' organizations, and gives them a measure of recognition through Federal charters, which is equivalent to the measure of recognition which Congress has extended to other veterans' organizations, quite freely, where they have undertaken work of national service.

There is no question about the work of both organizations in hospitals, cemeteries, and all the other activities in which they engage. It seems to me that they have been held, as it were, outside this rather select group, notwithstanding the fact that everybody agrees that they are worthwhile organizations. I believe even the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who thinks so strongly about these bills, will agree that these are respectable, responsible, patriotic organizations, and that there is no question about that in terms of his opposition. I am positive of that; and I will state it; he does not have to state it for himself.

As to the other arguments, it seems to me there is no valid reason why these voluntary organizations should be denied the same recognition by the Nation for the same quality and character of service and proof of dedicated Americanism that they have given during all these years, that is given to other veterans' organizations which have Federal charters.

Therefore, I hope very much that this matter—which has languished a long time because people are a little concerned over the very argument about bringing it up again—will now be righted. I think it something of an injustice to have left these groups off the roll of those having Federal charters. So I hope the Senate will now pass these two bills.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall appreciate it if the Senator from New York will comment on one question I raised. Would he support a Federal charter for Negro veterans of this country, and would he support a Federal charter for white veterans of this country? I would be pleased to have him comment on that point.

Mr. JAVITS. I would not support a bill for a Federal charter for an organization which excluded Negroes because they are Negroes, or one for a Federal charter for an organization which excluded whites because they are whites, because that would be contrary to my own principle and belief of what is and what is not segregation.

But if a group of Negro-Americans wished to organize a veterans' organization as an entirely voluntary organization with complete freedom of admission to everyone—and I think both the Jewish War Veterans and the Catholic War Veterans have complete freedom of admission to everyone who might wish to join and who feels he has a common purpose in joining, I can see no reason why I would object on principle, except, again, I believe we should require proof of service and establishment—as we have in this case—and ability and usefulness in terms of the national interest, which constitute the only reason for granting a Federal charter. So I see no reason why any group cannot organize itself for the purpose of performing the functions of a veterans' organization.

New groups have been organized, and they include the Veterans of World War II. If my memory is correct, that group has a Federal charter; it is my recollection that the Veterans of World War II were successful in their attempt to obtain a Federal charter, whereas these other organizations were not successful. In any case, the principle of segregation is not violated in a voluntary organization in which there is no exclusion. If there is exclusion, I would not lend my approval to it. That is my answer to the question the Senator from Iowa has asked.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from New York has stated about his understanding of my liberality of thought and my sincerity of purpose. I suppose I can join in that statement, insofar as my intentions are concerned, for I intend to be fair to everyone, and to approach these matters with a completely impartial attitude.

I have nothing but respect for the Catholic organization of veterans which exists in this country today, and I think it does magnificent work. It has a special reason for organization among the Catholics, as a religious matter, and it does have the common purpose of serving the country. I raise no objection to that organization; in fact, I honor anyone who belongs to it or who wishes to belong to it.

Likewise, I have no objection whatsoever to the voluntary Jewish War Veterans organization. I respect it. I have met with units of that organization; I know many of the members. That is not at all what I am objecting to. I have no objection to several other organizations of servicemen who band together in a voluntary group, based upon things entirely separate from military service—such things as their own religious beliefs, or the part of the country from which they come, or the particular division in which they served in the war, or the particular Army group in which they served. There are many similar organizations in the country, and I have no objection to them; such organizations are perfectly within the American tradition and the American right.

But I would object to giving Federal charters to them when they require a special qualification that all veterans of the same class cannot meet. I think a Federal charter for such organizations would be wrong in principle. If a Federal charter is issued to one organization of that type, I believe our act in issuing it will rise up to smite us and to plague us, because if I vote in favor of granting a Federal charter to this or that religious group of veterans, then in all conscience I would have to be willing to vote thereafter in favor of granting a Federal charter to every other group, whether composed of cross-eyed veterans, left-footed veterans, bachelor veterans, or any other similar group; I would have to vote in favor of granting Federal charters to all of them, too, because the principle would be that the group wished to organize as a group of servicemen, and also because they happened to belong to a special group or happened to have some other classification—color or otherwise. That is the principle to which I refer; and thus I would have to vote in favor of bills to grant to each group of that sort a Federal charter; but I am not about to do so.

If there is not a community of service and a community of contribution and if the organization makes an arbitrary distinction because of other and collateral associations, Mr. President, if the organization violates that rule, then I must oppose the request for the granting of a Federal charter; and I hope we do not establish a precedent of that sort, to the point where we find we have developed a juggernaut of a multiplicity of Federal charters which will swamp us. In fact, I believe in some instances, Congress has granted Federal charters which I would not approve if I had an opportunity to vote on those measures.

Be that as it may, the fact that at some time in the past, we may have done something that is not sustainable does not mean that for that reason we should keep on doing so. At some time, there should be a halt to these things.

I have every respect for these organizations. I know what they have done. They are fine organizations, and I have no criticism of them as organizations.

The only argument I am trying to make and the only principle upon which I am trying to stand is based upon the belief that it would be wrong to grant a Federal charter to this organization, in which, in effect, membership is an exclusive privilege of certain groups, and is not based upon military service; on the contrary, it is based upon their outside or their collateral or otherwise associated philosophies or beliefs or purposes.

So far as the Catholics are concerned, they have their ritualistic beliefs. So far as the Protestants are concerned, they have their ritualistic beliefs. So far as the Masons are concerned, they have their ritualistic beliefs; so far as the Jews are concerned, they have their ritualistic beliefs. I respect all of them, and I think all of them are fairly well taken care of in the military service and in the consideration of veterans. I do

not think there has been any discrimination in that field.

But when we begin to hand out Federal charters because of religious or philosophical beliefs, aside from the military service of these people, I think it is fundamentally wrong, Mr. President, and I believe it will rise to smite us and to plague us more and more as the years pass, and will contribute in this country to a division and a segregation which we have been trying to get away from, and which I hope we shall keep moving away from, rather than moving toward.

So, no matter in what way we look at it, the effect would be to create, with Federal Government blessing and with a certain amount of legal prerogative, additional segregated groups with the power and the authority of the Federal Government, by way of recognition in this case. I do not believe that would be in line with the purposes all of us are striving to attain, and which I hope each year we shall move closer toward attaining.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be only 2 minutes longer. First, I wish to say that AMVETS, the American Veterans of the World War, received their charter on July 23, 1947. So we cannot take the position that we do not desire to create more Federal charters for veterans' organizations where the association is voluntary.

I should like to narrow the point of difference, because that is sometimes very useful. There is no question that I would oppose with the same vigor as the Senator from Iowa—his customary vigor and conviction—a veterans' organization of bachelors, people who are left handed, and so forth, in a situation in which the qualifications which the great veteran organizations have were lacking. While we are debating the question of whether or not a charter should be granted to the Catholic War Veterans or the Jewish War Veterans, we must not forget that they meet every other test, as the Senator has quite generously and properly said. They have had national service of long-standing existence, widespread membership, substantial representation in terms of the body politic and, other than the difference which the Senator, I, and others have, deserve a charter fully as much as the other great veterans' organizations which have received them.

Narrowing the issue to that point of debate, I am satisfied that I have exposed the point of view of myself and my colleague. I am sure that the Senator from Iowa, with his usual ability, has expressed his point of view. The decision is up to the Senate. I thank the majority leader for calling up the bills.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to say now, because we may be leaving shortly, that I appreciate very much the fine cooperation and fairness which the majority leader and the minority leader have shown me in the reconsideration of the bill, which unfortunately was reported to the Senate one day and passed the next. It was on the calendar with practically no one knowing about it. I raised a question at that time, and the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], the majority leader, and everyone else who is interested in the subject were most courteous and most helpful. I appreciate their thorough consideration in not attempting to take advantage of a situation in which a bill was passed without prior notice.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I realize that the discussion had proceeded for some time before I was able to leave a meeting of the Subcommittee on Aviation and reach the floor of the Senate. I left the committee hearing because of the deep interest which I have in both of the bills which have been discussed. However, I arrived in time to hear much of the exchange between the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. With characteristic directness, the Senator from New York discussed fully my point of view. I hope that the Senate will act favorably on the incorporation of the Jewish War Veterans and the Catholic War Veterans. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I assure the Senate that great care is exercised by the Committee on the Judiciary in reporting favorably on any of the proposed incorporations. The subject was not treated lightly. For very good—and, indeed, to me obvious—reasons the Catholic War Veterans and the Jewish War Veterans are fully entitled to Federal charters. In granting the charters the Congress will honor itself at least as much as it acknowledges the contributions of service of those two organizations to all of America.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent request and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, following the disposition of H.R. 6143, the so-called higher educational institutions bill, 30 minutes of debate, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. JAVITS and Mr. HICKENLOOPER, respectively, be permitted on the question of final passage of the following bills:

S. 1914, a bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; and

S. 1942, a bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America;

Said bills to be voted on en bloc by yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 21

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 11 o'clock a.m. on Monday next.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Do I correctly understand that at the conclusion of the debate and the vote on the higher education bill, 30 minutes will be set aside for further debate on the bill (S. 1914) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans, and the bill (S. 1942) to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans, which will be considered concurrently; that the time is to be divided 15 minutes to a side, one-half of the time to be under the control of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the other one-half to be under the control of the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

ORDER FOR CONCURRENT YEA-AND-NAY VOTE ON TWO BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the unusual circumstances—and this is not to be considered a precedent—I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered on the bill (S. 1914) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans, and the bill (S. 1942) to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans, which will be considered concurrently, and concerning which a unanimous-consent agreement has just been entered into.

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

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1963, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, took a recess until Monday, October 21, 1963, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 17 (legislative day of October 15), 1963:

COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The following-named person to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy as an associate professor with the grade of commander:

Otto E. Graham, Jr.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Mallery, Joseph A., Jr.	Madigan, William J.
Slack, Robert K.	DeSchuytner, Victor R.
Gehrsitz, Richard N.	McBrayer, William L.
Slater, Richard B.	Wynn, Neal B.
Glazer, August A.	Gillis, James E.
Daigle, Chester J.	Bogg, Charles F.
Yourishin, George P.	Cox, Stanley D.
Wilson, Donald W.	Petersen, Frank E.
Stewart, Billy F.	Valentine, Herbert J.
Graham, Raymond H.	Green, Billy R.
Otott, George E.	Payne, Norman E., Jr.
Cook, Howard L.	Ihli, Leo J.
Dent, Robert H.	

Brown, Carroll E.
Couch, Wallace M.
Kendrick, Harold L.
Wickman, George A.
Swayne, Robert W.
White, Robert E.
Smith, Conway J.
Gregerson, Johnny O.
Rice, Wesley H.
Coates, Franklin W.
Stark, Robert W.
Austgen, Donald R.
Weber, John E., Jr.
Clark, Frank A.
Pierson, Earl F., Jr.
Gillum, Donald E.
Quick, Daniel J.
Catt, Jack R.
Miller, Robert B.
Goodson, George O., Jr.
Van Den Elzen, James R.
Miller, Hubert E.
Higgins, James H.
Harkey, Herbert J., Jr.
Kinniburgh, John A.
Nesbit, Charles L.
Romine, Richard E.
Harlan, Gale
McCauley, Bertram W.
Shaklee, Harold G.
Heesch, Robert W.
McDonald, Richard C.
Fry, Raymond S.
Kirkpatrick, Richard H.
Dittmann, Wayne R.
Boyd, Clarence A., Jr.
Farris, William E.
Love, Ernold G.
Garrett, Elmer T., Jr.
Hossli, Carl C.
Morrin, Wardell C.
Wilson, Billy E.
Fish, Thomas E.
Cuppy, Will C., Jr.
Beach, Andrew D.
Ward, George W.
Laporte, Alphonse A., Jr.
Ford, Daniel J.
Roberts, Richard T.
Henley, Robert J.
Fink, Arden L.
Dean, Roland H.
Berthoud, Kenneth H., Jr.
Ruete, Alfred W. Jr.
Cohn, William A.
Drescher, Herbert W.
Casey, Francis M.
Lawendowski, John J.
Went, Joseph J.
Field, Harold J., Jr.
Kelly, David A.
Gray, James C., III
Howarth, Darrell L.
Dolan, Eugene T.
Regan, Edmund J., Jr.
Fein, Louis I.
Abernathy, Thomas R.
Comer, Andrew G.
Shore, Bruce J.
Gartrell, Craig B.
Perry, Victor A.
Ilig, Harvey G.
DeLaine, Louis, Jr.
Wiita, John W.
Perry, Aydlette H., Jr.
Gerichten, William S.
Brownell, Richard L.
Phillips, Bernard P.
Badamo, Frank J.
Ballek, Fred J.
Cheatham, Willard E.
De Long, George J.
Booth, Charles L.
McCormick, James G.
Cull, Albert L.
Thornbury, Billy D.
Harris, James B.
Madera, Leroy A.
Robertson, Duncan J.
Florence, John W.
Ostlund, Donald P.
Keller, Albert W.
King, Charles A., Jr.
Skagerberg, Alan E.
Schlarp, Jack E.
Roque, Ilow M.
Graney, Thomas E.
Woodring, Willard J., Jr.
Butler, Larry R.
Pullar, Walter S., Jr.
De Long, Clyde S., Jr.
Willcox, Clair E.
Kramer, Milton C.
George, Gus J.
Gott, Michael J.
Townsend, Donald B.
Jellison, Harold M., Jr.
McKay, Conrad L.
Henderson, Walter J.
O'Rourke, James K.
Boles, Robert D.
Riseley, James P., Jr.
Whitmer, James A.
Fenenga, Gerit L.
Robbins, Morris G.
Como, Joseph A.
Charon, Larry P.
McCann, Henry J.
Vanek, Kenneth D.
Gillen, John P.
Sutter, Rudolf S.
Rasdal, Robert W.
Robinson, James C.
Willis, Lawrence J.
Tilly, Robert C.
Battistone, Carl L.
Young, Earnest G.
Ashby, William C., Jr.
Lenihan, John D.
Luckett, Jackson R.
Andrews, Clifton B.
Dawson, Carl F.
Rexroad, Donald N.
Barker, Warren H.
Dowd, John A.
Gubany, Michael W.
Hite, Harry W.
Downs, Roy
Goodale, Richard W.
Huizenga, Elmer F.
Lumpkin, Aubrey L.
Friedman, Arthur D.
Bradley, Thomas E.
Bancroft, Richard A.
Cooper, Francis W.
Vitali, Henry R.
Dunn, John H.
Wright, Dennis W.
Morrow, Thomas E.
Shaffer, John C.
Dawson, Forest G.
Mills, Lewis L.
Beno, Joseph P.
Munter, Weldon R.
Newbill, Merrill S.
Blair, Anthony L.
Modzelewski, Edward R.
Thompson, Joseph H.
Disher, William H.
Cummings, John M.
Sallade, Paul H.
Austin, John H.
Scyphers, Ruel T.
Carroll, Charles W.
Smith, Buck D.
Lubin, Irvin
Shimanoff, Morris S.
Axton, Robert H.
Keyes, Gerald W.
Stewart, James H.
Rush, Wesley M.
Windsor, Billie W.
Maxwell, Glenn K.
Read, William A.
Cassedy, Logan
Matheson, John R.
Allweiler, Joseph O.
Werz, Francis J.
Berglund, Warren T.
Gormley, John D.
Vey, Willis D.
Carothers, James H., Jr.
Henson, William E.
Shaffer, Raymond A.
Harris, George C., Jr.
Phillips, Jimmie R.
Toms, Edward H.
Kain, Edward W.
Sanborn, Earle L., Jr.
Soper, Melvin A., Jr.
Rutherford, Robert J.
Spencer, Ralph B.
Sloan, Richard E.
Gregory, Malcome G.
White, Jean P.
Morgan, William H.
Turner, Charles F.
Rappe, J. C.
Backus, Edward E.
Eggleston, Joseph N.
Ledbetter, Archibald C.
Cook, Marcus H.
Kneale, Charles R.
Johnson, Herschel L., Jr.
Walters, Raymond D.
Resnik, Edward D.
Welch, Homer L.
Clark, James E.
Rishel, Austin C.
Ritter, Otto W.
Nielsen, William J.
Adams, Sammy T.
Duncan, Billy R.
McConnell, Warren M.
Simmons, Jack A.
Arquiette, John B.
Irons, Milton E.
Marques, Preston P., Jr.
Evans, Donald C.
Koppenhaver, Howard M.
Klein, Robert D.
Thurber, William M.
Sparks, John A.
Cantieny, John B.
Cox, Donald L., Jr.
Julian, Martin D.
Brindell, Charles R.
Ryan, James, Jr.
Powers, William T.
Cook, Edward C.
Dunn, Walter F.
Bomgardner, George I.
Jerabek, Milton H.
St. Clair, Fred W.
Bray, Richard P.
Des Jardines, Lawrence J.
Hines, Jack D.
Lugger, Marvin H.
Carruthers, Robert E.
Harp, James J.
Glasgow, Harold G.
Fites, Malcolm V.
Studt, John C.
Hatch, Richard L.
Van Sant, Frederick N.
Garrett, Donald J.
Duck, John E.
Helsher, Paul M.
Maxwell, Hurdle L.
Tighe, Paul J.
Kehoe, James P.
Shuttleworth, James E.
Wonhof, Alan E.
Warren, Frank R.
Montague, James H.
Seiler, David F.
Fritschi, George W.
Smith, Bernard B., Jr.
Owen, Billy M.
Plamondon, Robert A.
Henry, Clark G.
Young, Dale E.
Daly, Daniel C.
Hauck, Walter R.
Gradl, Herbert M.
Miller, John H.
Realsen, Arvid W.
Coffin, James H.
Mann, Bennie H., Jr.
O'Brien, Charles H.
Harvey, Donald L.
Dunbaugh, Charles R.
Statzer, Merlin V.
Hutchinson, Robert N.
Walker, Joe G., Jr.
Smilanich, William E., Jr.
Rhine, Wesley E.
Murphy, Donald L.
Drennan, Lawrence T., Jr.
Smith, Kenneth L.
Gragan, David E.
Dickey, David K.
Thompson, Robert B.
Horne, Ivan F.
Poitevent, Walter O.
Fridell, John R.
Koelper, Donald E.
Guay, Robert P.
Fisher, Farris C.
Calder, James D.
Challgren, Stanley A.
Solliday, Robert E.
Needham, Michael J.
Reilly, Donald J.
Courtney, Richard G.
Raines, Thomas E.
Liddle, Chester A., Jr.
Parish, Lowell W.
Kelly, John F. J.
Slack, Gerald J.
Mann, John W.
Rainbolt, Richard E.
Beal, Don D.
Clark, Fred E., Jr.
Ratcliff, Percy D.
Dutton, Thomas A.
Barton, Willis W., Jr.
Holt, Ralph P.
MacDonald, Herman A., Jr.
Wahlfeld, Howard W.
Bell, George N.
Sanford, Herbert C.
Medis, James W.
Frisbie, H. Reed, Jr.
Smigay, Daniel B.
Perez, Richard
Rapp, John M.
Cooke, Richard M.
Fennell, Patrick J., Jr.
Wagner, David H.
Daley, John J., Jr.
Hammel, Charles F.
Hieber, George A.
Duff, John C.
Fritzlen, James W.
Pagano, Vincent B.
Gallagher, John H.
Murray, Francis R.
Forrey, Wilmer H.
Porter, George A.
Treble, Charles
Morgan, Donald C.
Rueckel, Frederick A.
Clatworthy, John
Whalen, Robert P.
Cavallo, Louis J.
McAdams, Donald J.
Pitchford, Charles F.
Davidson, Darrel U.
Sayce, Donald H.
Twining, David S.
Craig, Winchell M., Jr.
Rowlands, Cledwyn P.
Campbell, John W.
Christy, Robert A.
Eagan, Arthur J.
Caudill, Curtis E.
Layne, Donald Q.
Wells, Ullie C.
Jones, Robert W.
Smith, Joseph N.
Blair, John H.
Balius, David H.
Conlin, John C.
Simpson, Thomas H.
Leftwich, William G., Jr.
Johnson, Clifford H.
Truesdale, Bruce A.
Comfort, Clayton L.
Watson, LeRoy E.
Hearn, Thomas M.
Wiltsie, Russell E.
Stephens, Ray A.
Smith, Kenneth E.
Williams, Robert G.
Delcuze, Godfrey S.
Baker, Clarence M.
Bradley, William C.
Heering, David P.
Coyle, Thomas J.
Lee, Richard J., Jr.
Clark, Bernard E.
Sinclair, John E.
Boyd, Frank M.
Rovegno, Donald C.
Sulik, Richard A.
Sullivan, William M.
Hutchins, Walter P.
Madden, Byron E.
Greer, Roger W.
Bowen, James T.
Darron, Robert R.
Spurlock, David A.
Savoy, Ernest R.
Salzman, Frederick P., Jr.
Nelson, Ronald E.
Smith, Craig S.
Nugent, Thomas F. E.
Cockey, John M.
Greene, John W.
Houston, Stanley S.
Smith, Haywood R.
Haskins, Francis W.
Ayers, Thomas J.
Prebihalo, Robert G.
Foster, Richard M.
Pitcher, Bert R., Jr.
Miller, William S., Jr.
Starnes, Cullen G., Jr.
Christensen, Don R.
Ringler, Jack K.
Brown, Guy L.
Muhlig, John R., Jr.
Platea, Anthony P., Jr.
Pate, Gerald S.
Ganey, Thomas P.
O'Toole, John L.
Blair, Richard R.
Bloom, Allan H.
Johnson, Mannon A., Jr.
Thompson, Robert H.
Boyd, Daniel Z.
Pfeifle, Richard C.
Smith, John H.
Haviland, Harold D.
Tyksinski, William A.
Maas, Bertram A.
Tiede, Herbert R.
Bujan, Charles D.
Selby, Donald F.
Poindexter, John E.
Martin, Robert W., Jr.
Swinney, James T.
Lawrence, Rodney O.
Hillyard, Gordon L.
Dresely, John W.
Rivard, Ronald I.
Jaksina, Stanley C.
Lockard, Edwin W.
White, Robert D.
Sullivan, William J.
Jacobson, Douglas T.
Dininger, Charles F., Jr.
Deem, Richard G.
Andersen, Andrew E., Jr.
Roe, John M., Jr.
Simpson, William A.
Allen, Thomas H., Jr.
Andersen, Ernest J.
Bany, John B., Jr.
McDonald, Daniel V.
McCreight, Jack D.
Dorffeld, Charles E.
Eitel, Robert J.
Eleazer, William R.
Hyatt, John K., Jr.,
Ryan, Philip J.
Walling, Robert P.
Burk, Thomas K., Jr.
Simpson, Donald R.
Zimolzak, Frank
Peterson, Bob K.
Durham, John A., Jr.
Marquette, Jacob H.
Blakslee, Robert R.
Post, Raymond A.
Wall, Warren G.
McLellan, Robert
Forman, James R.
Stevens, Glenn B.
Thomas, Robert L.
Brown, Robert M.
Pryor, Richard E.
Turner, Roland L.
Newton, Orbin D.
Cusimano, Joseph
Cervin, Michael V.
Rook, James A.
Rafi, Paul H.
Schultze, Edward W.
Sagar, Harry L.
Strahan, John
Giovingo, Salvador
Steiner, Clifford D.
Edmunds, Merritt S.
Dowell, Sidney C.
Vickery, Wallace E.
Davis, Harold R.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 17 (legislative day of October 15), 1963:

U.S. Marine Corps

The following-named person to the position indicated in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5201:

Lt. Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, to be Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of general for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of January 1964.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

John 9: 4: *I must work the works of Him that sent me, while it is day; the night cometh, when no man can work.*

O Thou God of grace and goodness, may we daily be deeply concerned about accomplishing something that will contribute to the welfare of all mankind.

We humbly acknowledge that at times we are tempted to feel that our hopes and dreams of a better world, with more of peace and good will, is merely an illusion.

It seems as if the dominating and controlling relationship among men and nations is one of hatred and hostility rather than one of friendship and fraternity.

Help us to hasten the dawning of that glorious time when the compassionate and charitable spirit of the lowly Man of Galilee shall touch and transform the life of burdened and broken humanity with its healing ministry.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 102. An act to provide for additional commissioners of the U.S. Court of Claims;

S. 649. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; and

S. 920. An act to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may issue authorizations, but not licenses, for alien amateur radio operators to operate their amateur radio stations in the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico provided there is in effect a bilateral agreement between the United States and the alien's government for such operation by U.S. amateurs on a reciprocal basis.

ADM. ALAN G. KIRK, FIGHTER AND DIPLOMAT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, with sadness I should like to inform the House that Adm. Alan G. Kirk, Chief of Staff of American Naval Forces in Europe during World War II and former Ambassador to the Soviet Union, died on Tuesday last, October 15, at Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center in New York. Memorial services will be held tomorrow at St. John's Episcopal Church in Washington. Following the service the burial will take place at Arlington National Cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, Admiral and Mrs. Kirk have been constituents of mine in the 17th Congressional District of New York for many years. I have prided myself on their presence in the district.

Admiral Kirk was a great and distinguished man. His long record of public service is well known to all. As stated in the obituary in the New York Times:

> The high point of Adm. Alan Goodrich Kirk's 41-year naval career came on June 6, 1944, on the turbulent waters of the English Channel. From the bridge of his flagship, the cruiser *Augusta*, he commanded the Western Task Force of nearly a thousand warships, transports, and landing craft that put the U.S. 1st Army ashore at Omaha and Utah beaches in Normandy.
>
> The complex operation, part of the largest amphibious invasion in history, was carried out in winds of nearly gale force. Its success was regarded as a supreme feat of seamanship.
>
> During the opening days of the fighting in Normany, the heavy guns of Admiral Kirk's task force helped to clear the way for the advancing infantrymen. In the 12 days after D-day the ships under his command landed 314,514 troops, 41,000 vehicles, and 116,000 tons of supplies.

Mr. Speaker, following the war Admiral Kirk had distinguished service as Ambassador to Belgium and to the Soviet Union.

As stated again in the New York Times:

> Persons who were in Moscow at the time recall, that the stocky blond, blue-eyed Ambassador was an old sea dog who didn't bark often and seldom bit.

Admiral Kirk did a remarkable and effective job in Moscow. He held the line during a difficult and dangerous time. He prepared the way for successors and successes to follow.

More recently, Mr. Speaker, Admiral Kirk became Ambassador to Nationalist China. Again he was at the front, lending his great experience and effective diplomacy toward the solution of difficult and sensitive problems. He was required finally to leave because of ill health.

Mr. Speaker, Admiral Kirk was not of my party, but he had a wide interest in public affairs, from the broadest international problem to the smallest local problem that transcended all party politics. Up until the very day of his death, at age 74, Admiral Kirk exerted his every effort toward the advancement of the public welfare and attention to what he conceived to be his duty. His duty was, in short, the betterment of America, and the furthering of the cause of peace throughout the world.

Admiral Kirk leaves a devoted and lovely wife, the former Lydia S. Chapin. Her hundreds of friends and admirers everywhere send her their heartfelt sympathy. All throughout the admiral's active career, Mrs. Kirk has stood at his side. No fighting man and no ambassador of peace ever had a better helpmate.

The admiral leaves also a son, Roger Kirk, who continues his father's good work in the public interest by beginning a life of service to the United States. Roger is currently a Foreign Service officer with the U.S. Department of State and is stationed in Moscow.

The admiral leaves also two daughters, Mrs. Peter Solbert of Huntington, L.I., and Mrs. John W. Appel of Villanova, Pa. It is gratifying to know that Admiral Kirk's son-in-law, Mr. Peter Solbert, has just joined the Federal Government as an official of the Defense Department. It is clear that Government service runs in the family.

The sympathies of Mrs. Lindsay and myself, and all friends of the Kirk family extend also to the Kirk children.

Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I should like to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the beautifully written obituary of Admiral Kirk that appeared in the New York Times on Wednesday, October 16, and also a New York Times editorial the same day entitled "Sailor and Diplomat."

The Times editorial, commenting on the many positions held by Admiral Kirk, sums up what all of us think; namely, that:

> In all of these positions his sense of duty to his country was a guiding light. Admiral Kirk's finest epitaph is that he deserved well of his country and his country honored him with high responsibilities, ably performed.

The article from the New York Times follows:

ADMIRAL KIRK DIES; LED NAVY ON D-DAY

Adm. Alan G. Kirk, Chief of Staff of American naval forces in Europe during World War II and former Ambassador to the Soviet Union, died yesterday at Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center.

Admiral Kirk, who would have been 75 years old on October 30, had been Ambassador to Nationalist China for almost a year when he retired last April because of ill health. He had entered the hospital September 1 for treatment of a heart ailment.

The high point of Adm. Alan Goodrich Kirk's 41-year naval career came on June 6, 1944, on the turbulent waters of the English Channel. From the bridge of his flagship, the cruiser Augusta, he commanded the Western Task Force of nearly a thousand warships, transports and landing craft that put the U.S. First Army ashore at Omaha and Utah beaches in Normandy.

The complex operation, part of the largest amphibious invasion in history, was carried out in winds of nearly gale force. Its success was regarded as a supreme feat of seamanship.

During the opening days of the fighting in Normandy, the heavy guns of Admiral Kirk's task force helped to clear the way for the advancing infantrymen. In the 12 days after D-day the ships under his command landed 314,514 troops, 41,000 vehicles and 116,000 tons of supplies.

After his retirement from the Navy in February 1946, Admiral Kirk turned to diplomacy. His first post, to which he was named in 1946, was as Ambassador to Belgium and Minister to Luxembourg.

On the basis of friendships made at that time, he undertook unofficial missions for President Kennedy during the Congo crisis in the winter of 1961.

ERA OF STARK SUSPICION

In 1949, when Admiral Kirk was transferred from Brussels to Moscow as Ambassador, it seemed that relations between the United States and the Soviet Union could hardly become worse. But in little more than a year the Korean war began, leaving the Embassy at Spaso House more isolated than ever by the enmity and suspicion that characterized the final years of the Stalin era.

It was not a period favorable for conventional diplomacy. Admiral Kirk made only two official visits to the Kremlin during his 2 years and 3 months in the post and he conferred with Premier Stalin only once. His talks with Foreign Minister Andrei Vishinsky were more frequent but almost always unfruitful.

Finding himself in what was essentially a holding operation, he concentrated on keeping efficiency and morale high at the Embassy. Persons who were in Moscow at the time recall that the stocky, blond, blue-eyed Ambassador was an old seadog who didn't bark often and seldom bit.

He traveled as widely as possible. His trips, which totaled 10,000 miles in all, took him to Stalingrad, now Volgagrad, and to Lake Baikal in Siberia.

ACCOMPANIED BY AGENTS

A squad of Soviet secret police agents accompanied him everywhere. In time Admiral Kirk became moderately friendly with them, but he once said with regret that their presence seemed to make it difficult to meet ordinary citizens during his travels.

Even so, he found the opportunity to become the gorodki champion of Saltikova, a village near Moscow that he occasionally visited. Gorodki is an ancient Russian game in which a stick is thrown at objects in a circle.

In November 1951, a month after ending his tour of duty in Moscow, Admiral Kirk said in a speech here that the United States would have to have "actual strength in being" to negotiate successfully with the Soviet Union.

He also spoke of the ruling echelon of the Soviet Communist Party in terms that were prophetic of Premier Khrushchev's denunciation 5 years later of the excesses of Stalinism.

"We should realize that these are men, humans, not supermen or superhumans," Admiral Kirk declared. "They have made mistakes, but these are concealed from the people. For this Politburo is responsible neither to any parliament, nor to any congress, nor to the people. There are no questions, no investigations, no airing of abuses for all the people to see."

HEADED RADIO COMMITTEE

The following February Admiral Kirk became head of the American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia, which established Radio Liberation in Munich to broadcast behind the Iron Curtain. He was credited with bringing together previously dissident Soviet exile groups. That August he was named chief of the Psychological Strategy Board, an organ of the National Security Council.

He left Government service early in 1952 and became a director of several business concerns, including the Mercast Corp., an affiliate of the Atlas Corp., and the Belgian-American Bank. From 1955 to 1959 he also was the unsalaried chairman of the New York State Civil Defense Commission under Gov. W. Averell Harriman.

In June 1961, Admiral Kirk became the first president of the Belgo-American Development Corporation. The concern had close ties with the Union Minière du Haut-Katanga, which controlled mineral production in secessionist Katanga Province.

The former Ambassador was criticized in some quarters for accepting the position. In rebuttal, he recalled in a letter to the New York Times that Union Minière had been the major supplier of uranium ore to this country during the war and immediately afterward and that he was still grateful for its help.

AMBASSADOR TO TAIWAN

Admiral Kirk, a lifelong Democrat though of generally conservative bent, was summoned back to the diplomatic service by President Kennedy in 1962. He was appointed Ambassador to Nationalist China, a post as difficult in many ways as Moscow during the early 1950's.

His naval background, which included early service in Asian waters, his easy personality and his own advanced years helped him in dealing with the regime of the aging Chiang Kai-shek. However, last April, 9 months after presenting his credentials, the arterial ailment that was to lead his death forced him to return to this country for surgery.

Admiral Kirk was born in Philadelphia, the son of a prosperous wholesale grocer. His uncle, Rear Adm. C. F. Goodrich, was responsible for the boy seeking a naval career However, his father, also a Democrat, was unable to gain an Annapolis appointment for his son from any of the city's Republican Representatives. The appointment finally came from a New Jersey Congressman and the young midshipman became known as Hoboken Bill.

BEGAN AS GUNNERY OFFICER

He was graduated in 1909 and soon made a reputation in gunnery and ordnance. During the 1920's he served for a time as executive officer of the Presidential yacht *Mayflower*. In June 1939, after 2 years in command of the cruiser *Milwaukee* he became naval attaché in London.

He returned to Washington in March 1941, to become director of naval intelligence. He left the post in October, 2 months before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. He might have shared the blame for that debacle had not Joseph P. Kennedy (the father of President Kennedy), who was then Ambassador to Britain, announced that Admiral Kirk had circulated a confidential memorandum calling attention to naval unpreparedness.

In March 1942, Admiral Kirk returned to London as chief of staff to Adm. Harold R. Stark, commander of the European fleet. The following February, as a rear admiral, he took command of the Amphibious Force of the Atlantic Fleet, and began drilling the Sicily invasion flotilla in the waters of Chesapeake Bay.

He commanded the "Cent Force" in the Sicily attack, putting the 45th Division ashore near Scoglitti under heavy fire and in turbulent seas days ahead of schedule and without the loss of a ship.

PRAISED BY BRITISH CHIEF

"We were damned lucky," Admiral Kirk said later.

Adm. Andrew Browne Cunningham of the Royal Navy, the supreme commander in the Mediterranean, disagreed. He termed the American officer's performance one of the finest he had ever seen, and it led to Admiral Kirk's selection for command in the Normandy invasion.

Among his decorations were the Distinguished Service Cross, received from both the Army and Navy, and the Legion of Merit. He was invested as an Honorary Knight Commander of the Order of the Bath by King George VI and was an officer of the French Legion of Honor.

Admiral Kirk was a member of the Century Club of New York and of the Metropolitan, Alibi, Chevy Chase and Army and Navy Clubs of Washington.

He is survived by his widow, the former Lydia S. Chapin, with whom he lived at 1 West 72d Street; a son, Roger K. Kirk, a State Department officer stationed in Moscow; two daughters, Mrs. John W. Appel of Villanova, Pa., and Mrs. Peter Solbert of Huntington, L.I., and 12 grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held Friday at 2 p.m. at St. John's Protestant Episcopal Church in Washington. Military burial will follow at Arlington National Cemetery at 3.

SAILOR AND DIPLOMAT

Adm. Alan Kirk rose to the peak of one career in World War II and then achieved the summit of another profession in the postwar years.

He was that relatively rare combination—the sailor-diplomat, who could cruise with equal facility the stormy North Atlantic or the turbulent waters of international politics. He commanded the U.S. naval task forces that put our troops ashore in Sicily and in Normandy and he served with distinction in important diplomatic posts—as Ambassador to Soviet Russia, Belgium and Nationalist China. In all of these positions his sense of duty to his country was a guiding light. Admiral Kirk's finest epitaph is that he deserved well of his country and his country honored him with high responsibilities, ably performed.

THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, October 16, my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK], delivered a speech on the floor of the House critical of the U.S. Attorney General and the Nashville Tennessean newspaper. Although this speech was not printed and made available for public consumption in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until October 17, the speech was actually delivered on October 16.

In his zeal to condemn the Attorney General and the Nashville Tennessean newspaper, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] failed to check the record before making his speech. He stated that the Nashville Tennessean printed a story relating to the filing of a motion by the Department of Justice with the Supreme Court on the day before it was actually filed. This is simply not the fact.

This morning I checked with Mr. Burt Withington, who is the public information officer for the Supreme Court, and was informed that the motion was delivered from the Department of Justice to the proper receiving officer at the Supreme Court on the afternoon of October 4, 1963. The story appeared in the Nashville Tennessean October 5, 1963.

Apparently, in his haste to defend Mr. James Hoffa of the Teamsters Union, my colleague failed to take the usual precaution of checking the authenticity of the story, that he probably received second hand.

Also, in his haste, my colleague has impugned the motives and questioned the integrity of one of the country's outstanding newspaperwomen, Miss Nellie Kenyon, from his hometown of Chattanooga, now with the Nashville Tennes-

sean, who wrote the story. Miss Kenyon has had a long and illustrious career in the newspaper world, and is known far and wide for her impartial reporting and complete fairness in securing news sources. I should think that my young colleague from Chattanooga would want to apologize to the Department of Justice, the Nashville Tennessean newspaper, and particularly to Miss Kenyon, for this injustice.

WEEKLY CRIME REPORT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this ponit in the RECORD and include a copy of the weekly crime report of the District of Columbia.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the latest weekly crime report for the District of Columbia. The House of Representatives, as you remember some time ago passed an omnibus crime bill which is now pending before the Senate District Committee.

The House District Committee held extensive hearings on the crime conditions in the District of Columbia at the joint hearings with the Senate District Committee. We heard U.S. district judges, U.S. district attorneys, the chief of police, and individual citizens groups in the District of Columbia in addition to expert officials on crime from Cleveland, Ohio, Chicago, and statements from other officials throughout the United States were included in the hearings.

As chairman of the House District Committee, I am of the opinion that Congress should not adjourn without passing some legislation which would be sufficient enough to give the police department, the lawyers, and other law enforcement officials in the District of Columbia the tools they should have to reduce crime in the Nation's Capital.

Pt. I offenses reported Oct. 6 through Oct. 12, 1963

Classification	Week beginning Sept. 29, 1963	Week beginning Oct. 6, 1963	Change	
			Amount	Percent
Criminal homicide	4	1	−3	−75.0
Rape		1	+1	+100.0
Robbery	37	39	+2	+5.4
Aggravated assault	74	50	−24	−32.4
Housebreaking	124	157	+33	+26.6
Grand larceny	23	24	+1	+4.3
Petit larceny	157	175	+18	+11.5
Auto theft	93	85	−8	−8.6
Total	512	532	+20	+3.9

FOREIGN AID HAS EXCELLENT LENDING RECORD

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, there have been some criticisms, during discussions of the foreign aid program, that foreign aid loans are not being repaid.

I wish to point out that the record of the foreign aid program shows that quite the contrary is true. The loan record is excellent.

Of the $24.4 billion of U.S. credits provided foreign governments, $9.6 billion have been repaid as of the end of 1962.

Of the $14.8 billion outstanding, only $100 million has been due and unpaid for 90 days or more. And the bulk of this is owed by countries which are not now receiving any foreign aid.

This is an excellent lending record by any standards.

These are important facts because we keep hearing about how difficult it is to get countries to pay back what we have lent them.

A nationwide publication contained an article recently which stated that "loans are being made year after year to governments that have not paid a nickel—of past loans." This is the kind of misleading and inaccurate statement which leads people to believe that the foreign aid program is a giveaway.

The truth is, as these facts show, that repayment on loans made under the foreign aid program has probably been just as good as repayment on loans made by the average hometown bank, and the delinquency in foreign aid loan accounts has probably been less than in local community loan accounts.

As for the charge that the terms of our foreign aid loans are so soft that they are really grants in disguise, it helps to recall that under the Eisenhower administration when 90 percent of our foreign aid program was in the form of grants, none of the money came back to us. In contrast, now we are getting back some of the money while at the same time contributing to a feeling of self-respect in recipient countries.

For what they are intended to accomplish, foreign aid loans are a very effective means of assisting economic development in the underdeveloped countries.

I think we can all be encouraged by these facts on the excellent loan record of our foreign aid program. They speak well for the prudence with which the loans were made, as well as for the responsible way the recipient countries are carrying out their end of the agreements. I think we have reason to be reassured that the money we are now lending will be repaid in future years.

SEIZURES OF POWER IN THE CARIBBEAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the State Department has made a strong case against seizures of power in the Caribbean. This is due to the fact that elected governments have been overthrown in the Dominican Republic and in Honduras. In these cases, diplomatic recognition has been withdrawn and American aid terminated.

Seizures of power present a difficult problem for the United States. This Nation is on the side of constitutional government. It seeks the preservation of constitutional process. I would point to the fact, however, that we also have an interest in the political leanings of the governments with which we deal. Sometimes elected governments are soft on communism. This is a natural tendency since Communists are extremely vocal groups which demand and get concessions from representative government.

In one instance, and possibly in both, the New Caribbean administrations are more strongly opposed to communism than their predecessors. It would seem to me that the most important thing is to be sure that the people who are in power are our friends. Dictatorships pose a lesser problem for the future security of the hemisphere than does communism. I question the wisdom in remaining aloof when the people in power are solidly on our side. We can make it plain that we prefer constitutional government without withholding recognition and without terminating aid when it is really necessary.

I do not consider that our policy is sound.

THE BRITISH GUIANA DILEMMA: AN ALERT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, Gen. David M. Shoup, retiring Commandant of the Marine Corps, is reported to have told reporters in Tokyo on October 6 that if U.S. Marines are called to fight in regular combat units in the next 4 years, it probably will be in Latin America. General Shoup told reporters that despite explosive situations in Asia and elsewhere, the greatest potential for dangerous revolutions probably is in South America.

It is to be profoundly hoped that measures short of force can prevent the situation in the Western Hemisphere from deteriorating to the point which General Shoup foresees.

The Alliance for Progress was designed to avert Castro-type revolutions by providing the impoverished and impatient peoples of Latin America with an alternative course. Unhappily, the recent rash of military coups in Latin America threatens to undermine the Alliance, a basic premise of which is that economic and social reforms shall take place under democratic rule.

The State Department is now reevaluating our Latin American policy, searching for ways to avert General Shoup's gloomy prediction.

While attention is riveted to the search for an effective Latin American policy,

developments crucial to the region are unfolding in a neighboring territory which is not part of the inter-American community.

I refer to British Guiana. As a British colony, British Guiana still comes under the jurisdiction of the Western European branch of the State Department. Yet the outcome of events in that colony can have a potent impact upon the Latin American Republics.

British Guiana is a small, poor territory, headed by a Communist-leaning Premier and rent by racial conflict. The British presence has exercised a restraining influence both upon the racial tensions in the colony and upon the Communist proclivities of the party in power. But Britain, in line with its post-World War II decolonization policy, is on the verge of pulling out.

With Britain gone, both civil war and communism are possibilities.

Either prospect bodes ill for the United States. The entrenchment of a Communist government on the northeast coast of South America would make a mockery of the declared U.S. policy of impeding the spread of communism in the Western Hemisphere. At the same time, civil war in British Guiana would create ideal conditions for Communist meddling.

The British do not want to leave behind either a Congo or a Castro as testament to a failure of their colonial policy. But the British have promised Guiana independence, and they want to get out. British Guiana is a political liabilty to the United Kingdom, which is under heavy pressure in the United Nations to grant its colony independence.

Unless Great Britain can assure a responsible, democratic government in British Guiana before it abandons the colony, the United States stands to inherit a colossal headache.

I am not at all sanguine regarding Great Britain's understanding of our serious hemisphere problems. Indeed, in our efforts to cope with Castro, Britain has by no means shared our interpretation of the danger which Castro's Communist regime poses for the hemisphere.

In the August 1963 edition of the Royal United Service Institution Journal—a publication of the British armed forces—a British observer expresses similar doubts, writing:

> American anxieties on the present state of international politics in the Caribbean have received, on the whole, a far from sympathetic hearing in this country. Possibly this is due to a failure of imagination of the British commentators. Partly it is due to the persistent feelings of malice and envy toward our American friends and allies which so disfigure the contemporary British scene.
>
> Today, when British and American interests are inextricably interwoven, it is curious and disturbing to this author at least to find that British opinion is as insensitive to American anxieties in the Caribbean as American opinion used to be accused of being toward our own strategic anxieties in the Middle East, for example.

It is imperative that the British comprehend our deep concern lest their premature withdrawal create incalculable mischief for U.S. foreign policy in the hemisphere. It is equally essential that the American people understand the British dilemma in British Guiana, and our stake in its outcome.

The time for meaningful dialog leading toward mutual understanding is now. Neither the United States nor Great Britain can afford the luxury of post mortem recriminations should British Guiana become another explosive element in the Latin American tinderbox.

It is my understanding that U.S. apprehensions with regard to British Guiana have been presented to the British Government. Nevertheless, the lack of public discussion in the United States, and especially in Congress, may create the erroneous impression that deep concern does not exist. For that reason, I would like to present a review of the complex factors involved in the present situation as the basis for further discussion.

THE LAND

Despite Guianese nationalist claims to the contrary, the colony has become more of a burden to Britain than an asset. British Guiana's natural resources are few, its geography largely hostile to human habitation. The territory, about the size of Idaho, is part of the watershed system of the Amazon and Orinoco Rivers. As such, British Guiana is traversed by rivers carrying huge quantities of water to the ocean. Heavy rains result in extensive flooding all over the country. Unfortunately the extensive river system is not much use either for transportation or as a source of hydroelectric power.

About 85 percent of the land is thick, hilly jungle and forest, with sandy infertile soil. Another 10 percent is upland savannah.

Here again the soil is of poor quality; used for grazing, it supports only a small number of cattle per acre.

About 90 percent of British Guiana's people live in the remaining 5 percent of the territory, on a ribbon of land seldom 8 miles deep, running along the coast. The coastal strip, cleared from mangrove swamp in the 18th century, lies 4 feet below sea level. Intersected by great rivers, it suffers from both deluge and drought. The land is maintained habitable and cultivable by a costly system of dikes and drainage canals—a heavy and permanent burden on agriculture. In this zone are grown the two principal crops, sugar and rice.

Sugar and sugar preparations account for almost half the colony's export earnings, rice for about 13 percent. The sugar industry has always depended upon preferential treatment in the United Kingdom and Commonwealth markets to keep it operating at anything like a fair level of prosperity.

Rumors abound of rich mineral resources in the interior, but to date only bauxite mining has been of much importance. Bauxite exports currently account for about 25 percent of export earnings.

Small-scale industries—brewery, margarine, soap, biscuit, match, and soft drink factories—supply some of the domestic market.

In view of the small domestic market, lack of readily accessible, good farmland, and the unpromising hydroelectric potential, there is not much optimism for increasing British Guiana's economic position in the near future.

THE PEOPLE

British Guiana has only 600,000 people, or 150,000 less than the District of Columbia. About 48 percent of the population are East Indians, one-third are Negroes, 12 percent mixed, 4.5 percent Amerindians, 2 percent Europeans, and Chinese less than 1 percent of the total.

Unlike some of the Latin American countries; for example, Peru and Guatemala, British Guiana does not possess great blocs of native people who are unassimilated in the national culture. One language—English—is almost universal, and the people, 80 percent of whom are literate, are largely attuned to the goals and activities of a modern society.

However, the historical evolution of British Guiana has created a peculiar dichotomy between the majority races, the East Indians and the Negroes.

African slaves were first imported by the Dutch to work their plantations and to construct the complicated system of dikes, drainage, and irrigation. The British, after succeeding the Dutch, outlawed the slave trade in 1807 and abolished slavery in 1834. To assure a labor force, the planters imported large numbers of East Indians as indentured laborers. Smaller numbers of Portuguese and Chinese also entered the colony to work on the sugar plantations.

The freed Negroes at first attempted to establish independent villages. Without proper drainage and irrigation, their farms produced little. Moreover, they had no markets in which to sell their produce to earn cash to purchase other necessities. Many Negroes had to work part time on the plantations for wages.

As Central Government spread to fill the vacuum created when the slaves abandoned the self-contained estates, the Negroes availed themselves of opportunities for education in religious schools and for employment in the growing civil service and professions. Most of the Negro rural settlements were abandoned. The Negro, for the most part, became an urban dweller, attempting to scale the social ladder by emulating the behavior of his former British master.

The East Indian, on the other hand, remained primarily on the land. As eager to escape the plantations as the Negroes had been, the Indians used their savings to acquire land. Circumstances brought them success in individual farming ventures where the Negroes earlier had failed. A rising demand for rice on the world market, followed by the difficulties in obtaining flour and other imports during World War I, gave the East Indians an opportunity to become established on the land.

The Indians tended to cluster in areas of their own. For some time they remained aloof from native society. Many considered their residence in British Guiana only temporary. Furthermore, because of their Hindu or Moslem religions, they shunned the education provided by Christian denominational schools. Gradually a marked difference in occupations developed between the

two races. The Indians worked in the rice and sugar fields, while the Negroes predominated among sugar factory workers, in submanagerial positions in the bauxite mining operations, in the civil service, police force, and the legal and teaching professions.

More recently, however, there has been a movement away from traditional East Indian values. As the Indians learned English, acquired an education, and began to accept British Guiana as their homeland, they began also to compete with Negroes for positions in public service and the professions which they had not hitherto sought.

Overtones of racial tension began to creep into British Guiana. As an official report of the British Government put it in 1954:

> It cannot be denied that since India received her independence in 1947 there has been a marked self-assertiveness amongst Indians in British Guiana.

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS

The geographic division between the two major races has of late been matched by a deepening political split along racial lines.

Until the close of World War II, the franchise in British Guiana was extremely limited due to stringent property qualifications. Hence, broadly-based political parties were unknown. In 1945 the vote was extended to include all literate adults, subject to a small income or property qualification.

In 1950–51, Britain took a step toward fulfilling its decolonization policy by sending a Constitutional Commission to British Guiana to make recommendations as to the form of government appropriate to advancing the colony toward independence.

A number of politically conscious Guianese began to prepare for the upcoming elections. Foremost among the parties to emerge in this period was the People's Progressive Party, or PPP. The PPP was led by Dr. Cheddi Jagan, an East Indian, and Forbes Burnham, a Negro.

The PPP's militantly anticolonial and socialistic program found a widespread reception among the Guianese laboring class. Many had come to believe that their constructive efforts have been stifled under foreign domination.

The structure of the economy invites nationalist sentiments. Especially notable is the consolidation and control of most of the sugar industry in one company. Booker's Sugar Estates, Ltd., a subsidiary of a London-based corporation, operates 15 out of the present 19 sugar estates. Booker's also engages in rum and gin manufacture and distribution, foundry operations, all sorts of shops and stores, drug manufacture, printing, petroleum marketing, coastal and transatlantic shipping, and holds numerous interests in smaller enterprises.

Bauxite mining operations are also foreign controlled. The major bauxite development is owned by Aluminum, Ltd., of Canada, with Reynolds Metals Co. producing a much smaller amount.

With Booker's management recruited in London and the top civil service positions filled by the Colonial Office, Guianese have felt that their aspirations to high status positions are unjustly limited. Furthermore, Guianese increasingly have come to resent the fact that economic decisions important to the colony are reached in London, by a private corporation whose responsibilities are primarily to its stockholders.

Dr. Jagan, the son of a relatively well off sugar plantation supervisor, appears to have been deeply resentful of the conditions of the laborers on the sugar estates during the depression years in which he grew up. Jagan spent 7 years in the United States, studying first at Howard University then taking a degree in dentistry from Northwestern. In the United States he married an ardent American Marxist, Janet Rosenberg.

As Jagan, Mr. Burnham is intensely anti-imperialistic. An urban man and London University trained barrister, Burnham's hatred for colonialism and the sugar interests stems from a different source than Jagan's. Some attribute it to the color discrimination he experienced while studying in London. In Burnham's view, the British exploited Guiana by giving all the good jobs to Englishmen and deliberately keeping the natives uneducated.

The Constitution introduced by the British in 1953 provided for a bicameral legislature, with a partially elected lower house and nominated upper house, a quasi-ministerial system designed to provide administrative experience, and universal adult suffrage at the age of 21. The Governor retained the power of ultimate veto.

The PPP contested the election against 4 quickly formed minor parties and some 79 independent candidates. The PPP's militantly nationalist and Socialist campaign, along with its strong organization, won the party 18 of the 24 elective seats in the lower house.

From the outset of the introduction of the Constitution of 1953 the PPP seemed intent upon demonstrating that the Constitution, with its checks on popular self-government, was unworkable. For 4 stormy months the elected members of the Government refused to cooperate with the appointed officials, fomented strikes for political purposes, and tried to gain control of the several independent boards and commissions and of the police and civil service. In October 1953, the British Government suspended the Constitution and jailed the Jagans and several other PPP leaders for 6 months.

In a white paper defending the suspension of the Constitution, the British Government pointed to the many connections between the PPP and international communism. Among these were the affiliation of the PPP youth movement—the Pioneer Youth League—to the Communist-controlled World Federation of Democratic Youth and the World Peace Council; the connection of the local Women's Progressive Organization, organized by Mrs. Jagan, with the Communist Women's International Democratic Federation; frequent contacts between PPP leadership and Communists and Communist front organizations abroad; and the importation and circulation of Communist propaganda by the PPP.

The 1954 report of a Constitutional Commission sent by the British Government to investigate the crisis is explicit with regard to Communist leanings of the PPP leadership. According to the Commission:

> On the evidence as a whole, we have no doubt that there was a very powerful Communist influence with the PPP. At the time of the elections at least six of the party's most prominent leaders—specifically Dr. Jagan, leader of the legislative group; Mrs. Jagan, general secretary and editor of Thunder; Mr. Sydney King, assistant secretary; Mr. Rory Westmaas, junior vice chairman; Mr. B. H. Benn, executive committee member and secretary of the Pioneer Youth League; and Mr. Martin Carter, executive committee member—accepted unreservedly the "classical" Communist doctrines of Marx and Lenin; were enthusiastic supporters of the policies and practices of modern Communist movements; and were contemptuous of European social democratic parties, including the British Labor Party.
>
> We are convinced that these people had been restrained by expediency rather than by principle from forming and leading an openly Communist Party. They had decided on balance that they could more speedily achieve their most important and immediate objectives—that of ridding British Guiana of British rule and influence—by remaining associated with others who had a similar objective in a party with a wide popular appeal.

Certainly Thunder, the official organ of the PPP which was edited by Mrs. Jagan, made clear its Communist proclivities. Thunder frequently vilified the United Kingdom, the United States, and France, while heaping praise on the Communist countries. The periodical's review column was devoted entirely to praising current Communist publications, while stating that those books and pamphlets could be obtained from the PPP offices.

Here are some samples of Thunder's dissemination of the party line:

> 1. The imperialists and their numberless lackeys fear the progressive people's forces of the world. But today the antiimperialist and progressive forces are unprecedentedly strong. The Chinese People's Republic led by Mao Tse-tung is a shining beacon from the East sending hope to the oppressed colonial toilers of the world and lighting the way they must inevitably follow for "Liberty, equality, fraternity" among men (April 1950).
>
> 2. Human beings the world over are today threatened by a modern cannibal—American imperialism. Ever since 1914 when America was in the grip of economic depression, this cannibal has been living and thriving on war munition manufacturing and the rehabilitation of war damage in ravaged countries. Now, in our days even the rehabilitation of war damaged areas cannot fill the maw of this gross imperialist parasite. Today American imperialism can only exist by creating war economy (May 1951).
>
> 3. The present Government of South Korea, subservient to the policy of the American Government, is carrying out a policy which is maintaining the workers in the most terrible poverty and subjecting them to pitiless repression (August 1950).
>
> 4. The Americans are using germ warfare on the colored Korean population just as they used the atom bomb on the colored Japanese. World democratic opinion is opposed to war. Who in fact wants the war? The American bankers and makers of armaments have time and again hailed the war as "good business" and "the best thing" that could have happened (October 1952).

5. In the Soviet Union people work for themselves and not for exploiters. This book comparing conditions in the United States of America with those in the U.S.S.R., says that during 1920–33 "over 31 million farmers were unable to make a living and fled to the cities. During the same period almost 23 million unemployed left the cities to work on the farms." That is America. And these are only two groups of facts of the many that the author brings forward to prove that the Soviet State with its planned economy is superior to the anarchic economy of the capitalist countries like England and the United States of America. All conscious workers should read this book so that there will come more definitely in their action a knowledge of what is worth fighting for, and against what the progressive movements of the enslaved world are rebelling (June 1950).

6. Message from Comrade Jagan.—During my recent trip abroad I have been lucky to travel extensively both in the capitalist sector and the Socialist sector of the world. A lot of propaganda and lies have been spread about the eastern people's democracies—about forced labor, the denial of freedom of religion and what not. I have seen the people at work with my own eyes and on many occasions by myself and not "led by my nose" as we are made to believe. I have not seen any evidence of forced labor. Rather, everywhere there was enthusiasm and spiritedness. This was no doubt born of the knowledge that the Government was their Government, that the factories were their factories, that they were building a new and bright future for themselves. I did not witness the same enthusiastic spirit among the British working class (December 1951).

7. The third annual congress of the PPP observed 2 minutes of silence on the sad occasion of the death of J. V. Stalin, the leader of the Soviet people, the liberator of free Europe and the acknowledged pathfinder of peace (May 1953).

The investigating Commission drew a distinction between the doctrinaire Communists and the more vaguely Socialist wings of the PPP leadership. Of the latter group, the Commission states:

Their dislike of imperialism and capitalism was based less on Marxist interpretations of history than upon their own understanding of the history of colonial rule and the interpretations which they placed upon their own experiences of capitalist enterprise in British Guiana. They were certainly extremists even by colonial standards, and we are not surprised that many of our witnesses were unable to distinguish between their socialism and the communism of some of their colleagues. Yet we had no doubt that the Socialists in the PPP were essentially democrats and that left to themselves their preference at all times would have been that the party should pursue its constitutional objectives by straightforward and peaceful means.

In this group the Commission placed Forbes Burnham. The distinction was to lead to a fateful split in the PPP.

In 1955 Burnham either was pushed out or broke off from the PPP. According to the Jaganite version, Burnham's break was purely opportunistic: armed with the label of comparative respectability pinned on him by the investigative commission, Burnham saw his chance to advance his own political fortunes. Burnham, on the other hand, claimed that the Jaganites were endangering the party's nationalist goals by emphasizing the PPP's Socialist goals.

For some time thereafter, both the Jagan and Burnham factions called themselves the People's Progressive Party and each published their own version of Thunder.

In 1956 the British Government announced that the time had come when some progress might safely be made toward reestablishing democratic institutions in British Guiana. A revised constitution in 1957 provided that 14 of the 24 seats in a unicameral legislative council were to be chosen by popular vote.

The 1957 elections revealed an ominous racial cleavage. Although both Jagan and Burnham publicly proclaimed their desire for national unity, both used racial appeals in their campaigns. Dr. Jagan's faction won 9 of the 14 seats, largely in rural East Indian constituencies; Mr. Burnham's group won 3 seats in urban districts with African majorities. Two small parties won a seat each.

After the elections, Burnham's faction assumed the name People's National Congress—PNC. The PNC became the parliamentary opposition to the PPP government.

In 1960 a new party, the United Force Party, was formed by Mr. Peter D'Aguiar, a businessman of Portuguese descent. The UF draws its strength principally from the business and middle classes and wealthy landowners.

When the term of the legislature ended in August 1961, the British introduced a new constitution advancing British Guiana yet a step closer to independence. The 1961 constitution provided British Guiana with full internal self-government. Defense and external affairs remained the responsibility of the British Government.

In the elections of August 1961, the PPP obtained 42.6 percent of the votes cast, the PNC 41 percent, and the UF 16.4 percent. Voting again split substantially along racial lines, areas with heavy East Indian populations supporting Jagan's PPP, the Africans voting for Burnham's PNC. D'Aguiar's UF appealed to a more heterogenous racial group of conservative voters. Although the popular vote between the two major parties was close, the fact that the East Indian element is more scattered over the countryside resulted in the PPP winning 20 of the 35 seats in the legislative assembly, the PNC 11. The conservative UF, which has little popular appeal, won 4 seats. Thus, the PPP formed the government, with Cheddi Jagan as Premier.

As the government under the 1957 and 1961 constitutions, the PPP has exercised more moderation than during its first experience in 1953 which led to the suspension of the constitution.

Dr. Jagan, while admitting that he is a Marxist, insists that it is his intention to build a "Socialist economy within the framework of parliamentary democracy." He claims that the PPP is committed to a mixed economy in which private and public enterprise exist side by side. In a statement to the British trade and industrial mission which visited British Guiana in March 1962, Dr. Jagan insisted that the expropriation of private property was not in the Government program and that it was not the Government's intention to nationalize the sugar and bauxite industries.

To reinforce their defense against charges that the PPP wants to establish a Soviet-type government, PPP leaders point to their sponsorship of a land registration law which clarified titles of many small farmers, and their granting of nearly 100,000 acres of land to peasant farmers between 1957 and 1961. They point, too, to the demonstrations of confidence in the PPP government by leading foreign enterprises, particularly Booker's, which has continued its heavy investment in its Guianese holdings. They further argue that after the 1961 elections, the new Premier sought economic assistance from the United States.

The PNC and the UF, however, claim that Jagan's protestations of democratic intentions are merely an expediency to mask his communism until full independence has been achieved. Jagan's enemies charge that the land reform program was to gain PPP adherents among the East Indian rice farmers. They claim that Jagan's appeal for economic aid from the United States is not inconsistent with his Communist objectives; if he received the aid, he could use it both to strengthen British Guiana's economy and his own reputation among the people; if the United States refused assistance, Jagan would have a good excuse to turn to the Soviets, with a plaintive, "What else could I do?" Furthermore, charge Jagan's enemies, the Premier has not yet appealed to the Soviet Union for direct economic assistance only because he would need Great Britain's approval, since Britain constitutionally controls the colony's foreign relations and Dr. Jagan does not want to jeopardize independence by stirring up cold war issues in Britain.

In the realm of international affairs, the PPP has not been ambiguous. Dr. Jagan claims he is neutral on cold war issues. But both the Jagans are uncritical admirers of Castro and Khrushchev. The PPP organ, Thunder, while its tone is not so shrill as in the earlier excerpts which I have quoted, continues to echo faithfully the Communist line in international affairs. During the missile crisis in Cuba, Thunder thundered a headline: "The War Criminals. The American Government Stands Convicted by Its Action Over Cuba." Frequently Thunder prints pictures of Guianese students in Communist bloc countries—a not-so-subtle attempt to propagandize the reader concerning the blessings of closer Soviet-British Guiana ties. The December 1, 1962, edition, for example, shows a picture with the caption:

People's Progressive Party general secretary, Mrs. Janet Jagan, chats with Guianese students in Moscow shortly after a meeting on Latin America. Picture shows from left, the head of the Latin American department (note: a Russian), Mrs. Janet Jagan, A. McPherson, Iris Latchman, Jairam Karran, and P. Scott.

The letters in the letters-to-the-editor column invariably excoriate the United States and praise the Soviet Union and Cuba. One has no alternative but to assume that the letters re-

flect the views of Thunder's editor, Mrs. Jagan.

On the domestic front, the PPP's action raises doubts as to the party's devotion to democratic procedures. Particularly questionable was Jagan's attempt to get passage of a labor bill which would have put the entire control of the labor movement in the hands of his Minister of Labor. The provisions of the bill empowered the Minister of Labor to decide which trade union was to represent any group of workers as a bargaining unit and would have compelled employers to deal with that union alone. The PPP could then have eliminated all unions which were not subservient to the regime.

Realizing that the legislation spelled the end of the free trade union movement in British Guiana, the Trade Union Council—which consists of most of the unions representing workers in the sugar industry, transport, mining, civil service, and clerical and commercial occupations, and which is affiliated with the non-Communist International Confederation of Free Trade Unions—declared a general strike on April 18, 1963.

What began as a struggle between the trade unionists and the Government soon turned into a political effort to topple the Jagan government. The opposition parties along with the trade unions distrusted Jagan and were determined that British Guiana should not become independent under what they regarded as another Castro.

The general strike stretched on for 11 weeks, one of the longest in history. Georgetown, with its large Negro majority hostile to Jagan, erupted in violence, including attacks on Premier Jagan and other members of the Government, numerous bomb explosions, and the burning and looting of property. On June 10, Jagan appealed for British troops to put down the continuing wave of violence.

On June 15, after the death of a PPP member of the legislative assembly, the Premier appointed his wife, Janet, to fill the vacant seat. At the same time, she was also appointed Minister of Home Affairs. In that position Mrs. Jagan has responsibility for internal security, hence of the largely Negro police force whose individual political sympathies could be expected to favor Burnham's PNC. The appointment of Mrs. Jagan, who the year before had traveled through the Soviet Union, East Berlin and Red China and whose Communist sympathies are a matter of record, heightened the opposition's fears.

As the strike dragged on, a critical shortage of essential supplies developed. Cuba and the Soviet Union came to Jagan's rescue with the shipment of petroleum supplies, flour and other staples.

The opposition claimed that Jagan was using the pretext of the strike to increase his ties with the Communist nations. Jagan retorted that the government had the duty to procure essential supplies from wherever it could. Jagan claimed that he had no alternative, in view of the fact that countries outside the Communist bloc who normally meet British Guiana's needs had cut off shipments at the insistence of the Trades Union Council.

As a matter of fact, the Jagan government's attempts to bring about closer ties with the Soviet bloc neither began with the strike nor ended with it. As early as March 1961, a British Guiana mission traveled to Havana to promote trade with Cuba and returned with an agreement for the Cuban purchase of 36,000 tons of rice. A second rice agreement was negotiated with Cuba in September 1962, and a third in June 1963 during the general strike. On the last occasion, PPP Senator Mooner Khan also got the Cubans to agree to the purchase from British Guiana of 250,000 railroad ties.

Russian and Czech trade missions have also been active. For instance, a four-man Russian trade mission visited Georgetown during December 1961, and January 1962, bought 7,000 tons of rice—probably for Cuba—and arranged for the importation by British Guiana of two tractors from the Soviet Union to test their feasibility for local use. The tractors have been turned over to a recently opened agricultural school. If they prove useful, Russia has offered to sell more on extended credit terms to the British Guiana Credit Corporation, a government agency which makes loans to small farmers.

In January 1962, a curious entity called GIMPEX—short for Guiana Import Export Corporation—was founded. While GIMPEX professes to be a private company, it is run by the PPP, a connection which raises some reasonable doubts as to its private nature.

GIMPEX's peculiar status became even more apparent last July when it loaned the PPP government $1 million needed to meet administrative expenses because revenues had not been collected during the general strike. Where did GIMPEX get the $1 million to lend Jagan? From Cuba, as a down payment for the railroad ties which had not yet been shipped.

GIMPEX has devoted its energies exclusively to increasing trade with the bloc countries. It has become the agent for Soviet bloc ships which call at Georgetown—one estimate puts the number at 31 in the last 20 months—and for the shipment of Guianese products to the bloc. While bloc trade with British Guiana is still only a fraction of the colony's overall trade, GIMPEX strives hard to change British Guiana's traditional trade lines.

PPP stalwarts hasten to point out that GIMPEX's lopsided devotion to increasing trade with the socialist countries is only because Western markets are already represented by private interests. Perhaps. But as time goes on, GIMPEX's operations look, in the words of Alice in Wonderland, "curiouser and curiouser."

The situation during the general strike was paradoxical. AFL-CIO representatives—whom Jagan denounced as agents of the U.S. Government—were in British Guiana helping the strikers. On the other hand, British bayonets stood between Jagan's government and a spread of disorder that almost certainly would have brought about the fall of that government. Britain, while true to its traditions of upholding constitutionality, found itself maintaining in power a regime which it had earlier condemned for Communist connections. Meanwhile the Negro police, whose sympathies lay with the strikers, had the distasteful duty of helping to restore the peace which Jagan needed to avert the collapse of his regime.

On July 6, 1963, after mediation of a representative of the British Trades Union Congress, Premier Jagan and the Trades Union Council reached an accord for ending the strike. The government agreed not to reintroduce the controversial labor bill and to consult with the TUC on any future labor legislation.

The economic cost of the strike to British Guiana has been estimated at about $40 million, or more than its annual budget. Loss in Government revenues alone is calculated at about $4.5 million.

If the financial toll was high, the racial consequences of the strike are perhaps even more serious. Since Dr. Jagan is the hero of the East Indians, the attempt to bring down the PPP government took on racial overtones. Mr. Duncan Sandys, the British Secretary of State for Commonwealth and Colonies, made some telling observations after an inspection trip to British Guiana in the wake of the strike. Said Mr. Sandys:

> From one end of the country to the other, from the highest to the lowest, the people of British Guiana are gripped with fear and cleft in two by mutual suspicion. The Africans fear the Indians, and the Indians fear the Africans. They live in constant dread of assault, murder, and arson; and this has got to the point where even neighbors of long standing in the same village no longer trust each other.
>
> The police, who are mainly African, are doing a fine job, despite the fact that their impartiality is quite unjustifiably questioned by the Indian community including, I am afraid, Ministers.
>
> In addition to the immediate fear of violence, each race has a deep-rooted fear of the prospect of living under a government controlled by the other, after independence.

This racial antagonism has produced a political paradox. Dr. Jagan, despite his avowals of Marxism, is the hero of the East Indians who in the main are independent farmers and shopkeepers and thus the least likely to be attracted by Communist doctrines. On the other hand, the Negro proletariat—which might be expected to respond to Jagan's political orientation—is strongly for the PNC, which attacks Jagan for his espousal of Communist theories.

THE ROAD TO INDEPENDENCE

Despite racial tensions and fears that Jagan may take British Guiana into the Fidelista camp, only a small minority in British Guiana—principally those of European extraction—would prefer that the United Kingdom maintain control of the colony. The vast majority of Guianese are united in their desire for independence. In the 1961 elections both Jagan's PPP and Burnham's PNC—which together gained over 80 percent of the votes—campaigned ardently for independence.

To clarify the status of the negotiations for independence, perhaps a brief outline of the steps to date would be useful.

The United Kingdom accepted the principle of independence for British Guiana at a constitutional conference in March 1960.

In November 1961, both houses of the British Guiana Legislature passed overwhelmingly a resolution asking the United Kingdom Government to name a date in 1962 for granting of independence. In reply, the Secretary of State for the Colonies announced in January 1962 that he was willing to hold a conference in London in May 1962 to discuss the date and the arrangements to be made for the achievement of independence.

Due to riots in Georgetown in February 1962, the May conference was postponed to await a report of a British Commission of Inquiry. The Secretary of State for the Colonies also wished to defer the conference until all interested parties in British Guiana had time to formulate their ideas for an independence constitution, with initial ideas of disagreement narrowed as far as possible.

Finally, from October 23 to November 6, 1962, the British Guiana Independence Conference was held in London. The conference was attended by representatives of the British Government and delegates from the three parties represented in the British Guiana Legislative Assembly: Jagan's People's Progressive Party, Burnham's People's National Congress, and D'Aguiar's United Force. After 18 sessions, the conference ended without reaching agreement on the major issues involved.

Three major questions led to the stalemate. These were: First, whether elections should be fought on the basis of proportional representation; second, whether the right to vote should be accorded at the age of 21, as at present or at the age of 18; and third, whether fresh elections should be held before independence.

The PPP advocated single-member constituencies, voting at 18, and no elections before independence. Both the PNC and the UF demanded proportional representation, voting at 21, and new elections.

The PNC and the UF argue that proportional representation would reflect the electoral support enjoyed by each party more accurately than the present system. They also claim that proportional representation will assure the rights of minorities and prevent the establishment of authoritarian rule after independence. They further reason that since both the PNC and the UF advocate fresh elections and proportional representation, these are favored by the elected representatives of 57.3 percent of the electorate as against 42.7 percent.

PPP leaders counter with the following arguments. First, it had been clearly understood at the time of the 1961 election that whichever party won the elections would lead the country to independence. Furthermore, the system of proportional representation had not been an issue in the 1961 elections; second, the opposition argument that the PPP is a minority party because it represents only 42.7 percent of the vote is inaccurate, since the PPP had not put forward candidates for 6 of the 35 constituencies in the 1961 elections, and had it done so, would have won still a larger percentage of the total vote; third, the effect of a system of proportional representation on a multiracial and multireligious community such as British Guiana would be to intensify the tendency toward separatism and intolerance; and fourth, proportional representation would also have disastrous political and economic consequences since it would destroy the balance of power between two equally strong parties in favor of a small minority group, and make a strong, stable government impossible. It might also introduce a multiplicity of parties and hence, weak, ephemeral governments.

Obviously, the PNC and the UF believe that proportional representation would give them the best chance to block from power a PPP government. Had the system been in force in 1961, no party would have had a majority, so Burnham and D'Aguiar could have formed a coalition government. However, whether a workable and lasting combination between these two men is possible remains doubtful. United only in being anti-Jagan, Burnham's socialist views and intense anti-imperialism clash with D'Aguiar's advocacy of practically unbridled capitalism. In any case, a system of proportional representation as a stop-Jagan measure would probably prove futile in the long run, since the Indian electorate is growing faster than the rest.

With the leaders of the three Guianese delegations to the London Conference unwilling to agree to arbitration by the British Government on the questions at issue, it was decided that the conference should be adjourned to allow for further discussions between the parties in British Guiana.

Mr. Sandys emphasized that continued political uncertainty would inevitably prejudice the social and economic progress of the country, so the present state of affairs must not be allowed to continue much longer. He stated that if, after an interval, no agreed solution could be found, the United Kingdom Government might have to impose a settlement to enable British Guiana to go forward to independence.

The PPP accuses the British of insisting on unanimity among the parties as a tactic to delay independence. The PPP further avers that British "vacillation" has led the opposition to believe that the British Government will delay or withhold independence on the slightest excuse, and has thus emboldened the PNC and the UF in their attacks on the PPP government.

The charges and countercharges were aired before the United Nations Special Committee of Twenty-four on Colonialism in the spring and summer of 1963. The committee heard the views of the representative of Great Britain, and of petitioners representing various political parties and trade unions in British Guiana.

In the debate which followed, many U.N. delegates held that the disagreement in British Guiana over electoral processes should not delay independence. For instance, the delegate from Uruguay was convinced that British Guiana had achieved the de jure right to immediate independence, and as to the determination of what should be the preferred electoral system, he believed that each country should have its own experience and benefit from its own errors. The delgate of Syria stated that if the thesis was admitted that independence would not be granted so long as the differences existed, "then we might well acquiesce in the continuous subjugation of the people concerned." The delegate from India expressed the belief that the differences, even major differences, between the various political parties in any democratic system were neither wholly unknown nor entirely unexpected; in his view, the vital fact was that both major parties had agreed on the independence of British Guiana. Similarly, in the opinion of the delegate of Mali, only one question was involved—the granting of independence to British Guiana; in his view, no preliminary condition needed to be imposed before the territory became independent.

On June 27, 1963, the special committee issued a consensus of the views of its members, which reflected the prevailing sentiment of the delegates. The consensus states:

> The committee firmly believes that every effort should be made to insure that the country accedes to independence immediately, without any preliminary conditions, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

Paragraph 5 of the General Assembly resolution referred to declares:

> Immediate steps shall be taken, in trust and nonself-governing territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed, or color, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom.

At the suggestion of both the PPP and the PNC, the special committee recommended the appointment of a subcommittee:

> To seek, together with the interested parties, the most suitable ways and means of enabling the country to accede to independence without delay.

The United Kingdom, however, turned down any factfinding or good-offices visit by the U.N. subcommittee to British Guiana. The British representative reminded the special committee, moreover, that it was not within the competence of Premier Jagan to authorize such a visit since Great Britain constitutionally retained responsibility for the colony's external affairs.

In September Premier Jagan was again at the United Nations, this time advocating "an Austrian solution" for independence, with big powers guaranteeing British Guiana's neutrality.

The British task is not enviable. The British Government is under pressure of public opinion at home as well as from the United Nations to grant British Guiana independence. Yet independence under Jagan raises the specter of another Castro in the Caribbean, while proportional representation is at best a shaky and temporary expediency.

A third alternative, suspension of the Constitution and reversion to British rule, is equally hazardous. Independence is the rallying cry of both the major political parties in British Guiana. Suspension of the Constitution, when independence is just over the horizon, is likely to strengthen the rabid anti-imperialist, proleftist forces. Even strongly anti-Jagan elements in British Guiana argue that such a move would only make a martyr of Jagan and enhance his appeal.

Colonial Secretary Duncan Sandys in a statement to Parliament on July 17, 1963, said that he intended to reconvene the independence conference not later than October. On October 4 the Colonial Office announced that it has invited Premier Jagan and the two opposition leaders to bring delegates to a conference opening in London on October 22. Mr. Sandys has made it clear that, failing agreement by the Guianese on the outstanding constitutional issues, the British Government will have to settle the matter on its own authority.

THE U.S. PROBLEM

If British Guiana presents a knotty problem to the British Government, the little South American state raises a tough question for the United States. The left-leaning actions and utterances of the Jagans and their lieutenants are not reassuring. There seems to be little room for doubt that an independent British Guiana, headed by Jagan, would head for the Fidelista camp.

We have long contended that no people, given freedom of choice, will vote themselves a Communist regime. Yet in British Guiana, for whatever complex racial and historical reasons, the majority may very well use the ballot box, however unwittingly, to vote in a Communist regime. Moreover, as one of the foremost exponents of anticolonialism and self-determination of peoples, the United States would indeed be in an ambiguous position should we oppose independence for British Guiana.

A Communist regime in British Guiana would pose little physical threat to the United States or the hemisphere. The country is poor, isolated, and quite unimportant. It has never had any intercourse with Latin America. Its language and lengthy colonial attachment to Great Britain have set it apart from its Latin American neighbors. Furthermore, given the vast expanse of untracked jungle that separates Guiana from Brazil and Venezuela, it is highly unlikely that British Guiana can serve as a useful jumping-off place through which to infilter Communist agents and supplies.

Nevertheless, the psychological impact of another Communist regime in the hemisphere would be disastrous. Our Government has emphatically declared that further Communist incursions in the hemisphere will not be tolerated. To permit a Communist regime on the South American mainland would seriously erode U.S. credibility, already weakened by the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion, the continuing presence of Russian troops in Cuba, and our apparent helplessness to forestall unwelcome right-wing military coups in the Caribbean.

Within Latin America powerful forces are urging their nations toward a neutral course in the cold war. Any sign of weakness on the part of the United States heightens Soviet prestige and, consequently, adds fuel to the argument that siding with the United States might place the Latin American countries on the losing side.

Hence, for the United States to acquiesce in another Communist takeover would be a severe blow to U.S. leadership in the hemisphere.

CONCLUSION

Nothing would suit Soviet purposes better than for the fate of British Guiana to degenerate into a bitter Anglo-American dispute. On the eve of the Independence Conference in London, I have presented a review of the factors involved in the British Guiana situation in the hope of clarifying the British dilemma for Americans, and U.S. anxieties for the British.

It is my hope that the British and United States Governments, working in concert, will make it abundantly clear to the Guianese leaders and people that we will not tolerate a Communist-affiliated regime in British Guiana.

LONGEVITY RECORD OF SPANISH WAR VETERANS AMAZES MEDICAL WORLD

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today to bring to the attention of my colleagues an illuminating address by Samuel Rose of the Veterans' Administration at the 65th annual encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans at Lansing, Michigan.

In this address, Mr. Rose seeks to explain the longevity record of the veterans of the war with Spain that is the wonder of the medical world.

As long ago as the spring of 1959 I extended my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 2, 1959, to include an article from the highly regarded Medical News that Miss Dorothy Taylor, formerly one of the keen brains of Capitol Hill and now the invaluable administrative assistant to the eminent Dr. Dwight Adams of the famous Billings Hospital at the University of Chicago, had thoughtfully sent me. For the benefit of my younger colleagues who were not here at the time, and to fill in the background of Mr. Rose's remarks, I am repeating that article in the Medical News of January 14, 1959:

OLD SOLDIERS

Eleven hundred Massachusetts veterans of the Spanish-American War have succeeded in putting out of joint the current actuarial predictions on life span. They are living too long.

According to estimates based on mortality tables, only about 500 of these veterans should be alive today in Massachusetts. The fact is there are 1,600.

The Veterans' Administration outpatient clinic in Boston is making a detailed study of their physical and emotional condition, diet, and history to help explain their longevity and find out why some look 20 to 25 years younger than their actual ages.

Mr. Speaker, that was 4 years ago, and the Spanish War veterans are continuing to punch holes in the medical records. How so many men past 80 can continue to look and act 20 or 30 years younger continues to be the wonder of the doctors and the subject of serious research and study.

Mr. Rose in his address quotes from the researchers who have examined at depth why veterans of the war of 65 years ago have made such a record in setting back the clock and he ventures to give his own reasons. I am sure my colleagues will find its reading worth the while, whether their interest stems from the kinship of all veterans or from a universal concern in the broadening of the span of human life. Mr. Rose's address follows:

I want to take my text this afternoon from a publication I'm sure you've never heard of, and yet it is a very popular publication around the Central Office of the Veterans' Administration, in Washington, D.C.

This publication is called, "A Reproduction of the Administrator's Bulletin Board," and that's exactly what it is. It consists of a cross section of the Nation's most interesting news stories about VA activities.

In one recent issue you Spanish-American War veterans were prominently featured, in two clippings indirectly and by inference in one of them, directly in the other.

The first one where you appear by inference has the headline: "Do Our Bodies Have Age Timeclocks?" This news story tells about two Veterans' Administration medical researchers who are seeking a common denominator for a number of different diseases.

Does the human body, these doctors ask, set off a self-destructive process by itself and within itself, at some point along the path toward old age which all of us tread?

The doctors think so. They think that the body, in trying to fight changed cell patterns or secretions that often come with age, may introduce certain elements which can actually hasten disease; that if they can suppress this harmful antibody formation, they may increase the lifespan.

Now, right next to that news story in this issue of the Administrator's Bulletin Board is another one, headed "Rough Riders Reunion." And the pictures for that story show three of you Spanish-American War veterans. All are from Massachusetts. One, age 82, is poised ready to belt out a tune on his clarinet. Another, a year younger, is tinkering with a radio receiver that picks up signals from any part of the world. The third, 85, is showing off some prize flower blooms from his garden.

These three veterans are just a few of the many Spanish-American War veterans who report to the Veterans' Administration outpatient clinic in Boston every second and fourth Thursday for physical checkups, and

to astound doctors there. They are reporting—the whole group is reporting—not because they need any outpatient treatment. They're reporting because the VA asked them to. Men like you sitting in this audience today—and maybe some of you are actually part of this Boston study—are being examined by VA periodically, to see what makes you tick so marvelously.

The VA doctors want to find out why the timeclock of the other story hasn't gone off in your case.

For that is what they have found out—and are continuing to find out—as I'm sure you know. As a group, you Spanish-American War veterans are fooling the timeclock. And you do tick in a way that is the envy of many men many years your juniors. You are happy. You have outside interests. Above all, you are vigorous.

That's such a fine old word I think I'll repeat it and define it. Noah Webster says the noun of the adjective "vigorous" means "active strength or force of body or mind; capacity for exertion, physical, intellectual, or moral; effective energy or power; strength; potency."

As a group, you Spanish-American War veterans have shown you possess powers to win biological battles others less endowed often lose.

We in the VA talk a lot of service-connection. Usually we're referring to a disability related to a veteran's active service. I have a twist on that for you today. I'm sure there is a very definite connection between your ability, your present health and vigor, the good health factors and attitudes you possess, and your patriotic service to our country in 1898, in the Spanish-American War.

Each year, on the anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, one of your most active and distinguished members, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, and the only Spanish-American War veteran now in Congress, stands up in the House of Representatives and "talks to history" as he calls it.

Representative O'HARA recently said: "I want to set the record straight for these researchers of the future. The war with Spain was a war of pure idealism. It was the only war in history fought entirely, as far as the United States was concerned, by volunteers. The Spirit of 1898 was an expression of old-fashioned American patriotism, of faith in God and country. It was a rededication of all the American people, in cities and hamlets and on the farms, to the pledge of the signers of the Declaration of Independence of their 'lives and fortunes and sacred honor.'

"The Spanish-American War was proclaimed and waged and terminated in the finest spirit of self-abnegation ever shown in recorded history.

"The war that brought so much to the world, that ushered in events that changed the life of every human being, that cost the United States so much in money and men, and for the waging of which the United States neither asked nor received one cent or one acre, was one of the great epochal adventures in pure unselfish idealism in the long story of mankind. It reflects the true image of Uncle Sam."

That is the end of the quote from a stirring speech of one of your members, and it is almost the end of my speech.

Just as the war you fought and the united efforts of Americans in that war reflect the true image of Uncle Sam, so do you as individuals reflect images we as individuals should like to live up to.

Today, more than ever, we need constant reminders of the old-fashioned patriotism you so eloquently stand for * * * just by being among us. The difficulties we face as a nation may change in character, but they are not going to lessen. We need courage for the successful confrontation of whatever difficulties may come, and we need it as never before. We need to stand fast in our courage, to remember the fine upsurge of your idealism * * * to cherish the sweep of it in our own hearts whenever we hear of freedoms threatened throughout the world. For that is both the spirit of 1898 and of America.

There are other reasons we admire and respect you * * * and would emulate you insofar as we can.

We have praised your idealism, but it both partook of the fruitful spring of American idealism and contributed to it. You have enriched our American traditions with gifts that came to you through your own heritage. You came of good stock, and we are all the richer for it, remembering your swift acceptance of the challenge of war * * * and your gallantry in it.

In the report of the Boston study of Spanish-American War veterans, I mentioned earlier, are some sentences which I am sure have never had the wide publication I give them now. The researchers, trying to guess why the few of you who are left are, generally speaking, so happy, vigorous, and interested, had this to say:

"It must be remembered that all these men volunteered to fight. Their ranks probably never included any with traits that would make them unfit for the job to be done, or who lacked the powers of muscle and bone that were needed. The men who have contributed their time and cooperation to this study probably represent a significant remnant of those aggressive, energy-packed, well-muscled and firm-boned men who not only could but also wanted to fight in a good cause."

You remember that speech of King Henry the Fifth, when he was rallying the English Army before the battle with the French, the one that pulled you out of your seats when you heard Laurence Olivier deliver it in the movie? It contains the oft-quoted line, "We few, we happy few, we band of brothers."

You can apply that to yourselves. And like those other more than willing warriors of another time you, too, shall long be remembered.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. John S. Gleason, Jr., asked me most especially to convey his very best wishes to you, and I add my heartfelt salute to his own. It has been so good to meet with you again, and I am grateful for the opportunity.

One final remark: I have found your adjutant general, James H. McElroy, to be a man of action—a man who knows how to get things done and a man of true devotion to duty. You are most fortunate to have a man like General McElroy on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration and I congratulate you.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend by remarks, and to include a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday one of the distinguished and able Members of this House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] responded to a letter which some of us had circulated to the Members of the House of Representatives dealing with the question of pipeline funds in the foreign aid program. I respect the efforts of our distinguished colleague, but it has seemed to me that in dealing with the foreign aid program he has unduly stressed the significance of pipeline funds. Full cognizance has not been given to the fact that these pipeline funds have been committed and are not available for reassignment to other areas of the foreign aid program.

In order to set the record straight, Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a copy of a letter dated October 15, 1963, which sets out in some detail the answers to the letter which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] inserted in the RECORD yesterday.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 15, 1963.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Once again, Mr. PASSMAN, the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations, has circularized the Members of the Congress with his periodic compilation of unexpended balances in the foreign aid program. It is possible that some Members may have been confused by this communication.

We are compelled to answer Mr. PASSMAN's letter. Economic and military assistance to other nations involves questions of the gravest urgency in our search for national security. False impressions must not become the basis for action by the House of Representatives.

The argument about unexpended balances—commonly known as the pipeline—is a simple one. Mr. PASSMAN refuses to accept the fact that these funds are committed and attempts to persuade us that these funds are available for new loans and new projects when they are clearly and obviously not available.

Unexpended balances build up in every agency of Government, and in every financial institution, public, or private, when projects are undertaken that cannot be completed within a single year. Until the projects to which these funds are committed are completed and the last bills paid, the unspent balances will show up in the pipeline. For example, the Department of Defense had an unexpended balance of about $30 billion at the end of fiscal 1963.

There is nothing new in the figures which Mr. PASSMAN has presented in his letter. These are figures reported to the Congress by the Agency for International Development, a public record. Nor is there any surprise in the fact that unexpended balances in the foreign aid pipeline have risen slightly. AID told the House Committee on Foreign Affairs last year that the pipeline would rise this year as a result of the shift to the use of loans rather than grants.

In his recapitulations, Mr. PASSMAN has tossed in a miscellany of unexpended balances from programs ranging from the Peace Corps to the relief of Cuban refugees. This makes it appear that the pipeline total is larger than the $6.9 billion reported by the Agency for International Development.

Depending on what is lumped in as foreign aid, this kind of pipeline figure can be inflated still more. At least one Member of the Congress has built it up to $21 billion by adding in unexpended balances from a variety of international banks and other institutions.

Mr. PASSMAN's letter criticized the practice of funding in advance of expenditures. Has anyone suggested a different way of doing it? Should funding follow expenditure? The answer seems obvious.

It has been stated before, and apparently it is necessary to state it again, that the foreign aid pipeline has risen because of the increased emphasis upon development loans, which are drawn upon more slowly than

grants. It is significant that the grant portion of the pipeline has declined, making the increase clearly attributable to loans.

It has also been pointed out many times that the AID pipeline is proportionately comparable to that of the international banks, and that other agencies of Government have much larger unexpended balances.

But most of this is beside the point. The real question is whether the funds in the unexpended balance are available for use for new projects and programs. Despite any assertion to the contrary, the fact is that they are not.

The figures cited by Mr. PASSMAN may indicate that it would take at least 2 years to liquidate the foreign assistance program, but they have little, if any, bearing on the amount of new funds necessary to finance foreign aid in fiscal 1964.

The United States is confronted with a variety of unsolved foreign policy problems which require new commitments.

Funds obligated to pay for heavy machinery now under construction in Schenectady or Milwaukee to equip specific hydroelectric plants cannot be diverted to pay for railway equipment or highway construction to be used somewhere else.

Military assistance funds committed for tanks and artillery to be delivered to an Asian country cannot be used to finance missiles and complex electronic equipment for one of our NATO allies. Tanks cannot be substituted for missiles or electronic equipment for artillery.

The United States cannot afford to abandon the free world to its cold war enemies by letting the foreign aid program run out of gas. There are things about the foreign aid program that can be criticized, and there are difficult foreign policy judgments involved which should be explored by the Congress.

But the argument that funds committed to specific purposes can be used for new purposes adds nothing to the intelligent resolution of these problems and serves only to confuse thinking on this important subject.

Very truly yours,

JOHN BRADEMAS, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, DONALD M. FRASER, CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, THOMAS P. GILL, SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, ALEC OLSON, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, NEIL STAEBLER, W. DONLON EDWARDS.

P.S.—In at least one instance, a comparison of two figures is invited which do not appear to be strictly comparable. The unexpended funds as of June 30, 1962, are reported as being $6,889,186,000 and the unexpended funds as of June 30, 1963, are listed as $7,465,926,000, indicating an increase of $576,740,000.

The June 30, 1963, figure includes an unexpended balance of $232,320,000 of the International Development Association and an unexpended balance of $200 million of the Inter-American Development Bank. The $200 million is, in fact, U.S. participation in callable stock of the Inter-American Development Bank rather than an unexpended balance as such.

A review of the unexpended balances of the various agencies appears to indicate that the total of $6,889,186,000 reported as of June 30, 1962, does not include the unexpended funds of either the International Development Association or the Inter-American Development Bank. A possible reason for this difference is that the appropriations for the two agencies in earlier years were not included in the legislation appropriating funds for foreign aid.

The composition of the $6,889,186,000 total of unexpended funds as of June 30, 1962, appears on pages 386–387 of the Foreign Affairs Committee hearings on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. The combined unexpended balances of the International Development Association and the Inter-American Development Bank is cited in a footnote but not included in the total of $6,889,186,000.

If the $432,320,000 for these institutions is deducted from the June 30, 1963, total of unexpended funds to make it comparable to the June 30, 1962, figure, the increase during fiscal 1963 would be reduced from $576,740,000 to $144,420,000. While an increase of this amount deserves consideration, it may be questioned whether such an increase should be designated as "pyramiding."

TITO

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a day of shame for Americans everywhere. Today in the Nation's Capital we heard 21 guns salute Communist Tito. Today, the President of the United States officially greets Tito.

This is an insult to every veteran of our wars, to every citizen of every captive nation, to every loyal American, and to every defender of our freedom everywhere in the world. This violates the proud memories of loved ones lost in battles for freedom since 1776. It subverts the great deeds that led to allied victory in the last war. What we have always been led to believe in this Nation's wars was a struggle for peace with honor is being tossed aside by an amazing American Presidential performance that is appeasement in the name of expediencey.

I am ashamed for our country, ashamed that the American President would put out a red carpet to a Communist.

Indeed, this is a sick America. No better illustration can be found than in official greetings to Tito, who as a Communist is devoted to the overthrowing and destruction of this country as are all Communists everywhere.

We should be at least grateful that the U.S. Supreme Court has not yet denied to each of us the individual right to pray. Mr. Speaker, at the rate this administration is surrendering both principle and power, we had better start praying. If this administration's surrender on the installment plan keeps on longer there will not be much left for us but prayer and those of us who know that God helps those who help themselves are terribly and deeply concerned.

THE CRACK IN THE FOUNDATIONS OF U.S. NATIONAL DEFENSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's best minds on defense strategy is that of Dr. Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace. In the October 7 issue of the American Security Council's Washington Report, Dr. Possony discusses the perilous state of our defense and ascribes the difficulty to a nuclear neurosis on the part of Kennedy administration planners. Amongst other things, Dr. Possony contends:

First, that Western Europe is defenseless against a Soviet missile attack because it does not have nuclear tipped MRBM's with which to make an adequate response.

Second, that Western Europe is defenseless against Soviet armed aggression due to Soviet superiority, by annihilation ratios, in both manpower and tactical nuclear weapons.

Third, that should the Soviets strike America first, NATO forces, weak largely because of U.S. nuclear weapons policies, would be incapable of effectively coming to our assistance.

The full text of Dr. Possony's article, which should be read by every American, in Government and out, is as follows:

THE INTERDEPENDENT DEFENSE

(By Dr. Stefan T. Possony)

"The United States will risk its cities to defend yours because we need your freedom to protect ours." President Kennedy spoke these forceful words on June 26, 1963, at Frankfurt, in the Paulskirche, the cradle of German democracy. The President's pledge of continuing U.S. support to the defense of Europe was urgently needed to counteract the doubts which many Europeans have been expressing about the American firmness of resolve.

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that the more astute Europeans ever really questioned our understanding of the basic fact that the defense of North America and Western Europe "was and still is indivisible." The true debate has been raging about the implementation of our purposes. Indeed, dependability is just one of the ingredients needed to give the alliance its cohesion. Effective military policies are equally as indispensable—and it is painfully obvious not only that our strategy has become increasingly deficient, but also that the President has failed to announce his willingness to consider new and more promising approaches. The United States still asserts that it is an Atlas who intends to carry the key responsibilities all alone. Let us look at just three key problems.

1. The Soviet Union is generally credited with the possession of about 700 medium range ballistic missiles, most of which are threatening our European allies directly. Should war come, Soviet MRBM's will have beforehand been doubled or tripled in number. The brutal fact is that, against this overwhelming threat, Europe presently is utterly defenseless. True, American deterrent forces are countering this specific threat through the general menace of retaliation. However, our present deterrents are unable to protect Europe physically.

To survive, the Europeans need counterforce capabilities: If missiles were to be used they would need about twice the number of Soviet MRBM's, or more than 2,000 missiles with instantly usable nuclear warheads. If Europe should decide to neutralize the MRBM threat through antimissile missiles, a full-fledged missile defense system would have to be built. We have been opposing the specific counterforce system, offering instead a ship-based deterrent system which is far too small and vulnerable, and which does not satisfy the requirement. We are holding back the development of antimissiles even in the United States. The plain fact of the matter is that while we may be willing to risk our cities, this sacrifice would not protect the cities of Europe. The President

should have announced a crash program to build a NATO-wide antimissile defense system in order to preserve the cities of both Europe and America.

2. The Soviet Union has stationed in East Germany more than 20 divisions that are armed with nuclear weapons. In case of attack, the Soviet ground force undoubtedly would consist of 40 to 60 nuclear combat divisions. Against this strength we are maintaining in Europe five American divisions which do have nuclear weapons, but which presumably would be deployed initially for conventional battle. Due to their lack of nuclear weapons, the other NATO divisions do not represent effective military power. Hence we are facing insuperable, 4 to 12-fold odds.

The administration asserts that instead of arming our allies with tactical nuclear weapons, an increase in conventional strength would enhance the security of Western Europe. Yet Washington has not seen fit to refute the evaluation of the French general staff, according to whom conventional and nuclear combat are mutually incompatible. The French believe, on very solid military grounds, that it is impossible during battle, to switch from conventional to nuclear fighting. They also are convinced that conventional forces would be annihilated rapidly and that, therefore, increases in conventional strength would merely lead to massive increases in military casualties. The French argument is strengthened by the age-old experience that advanced technology wins over retarded technology, especially when the technologically inferior side also lacks initiative and numbers—and by the fact that the Soviets are not planning to fight a conventional war. Yet, for all practical purposes, this French argument is given the silent treatment. Most Americans do not even know that the French have a solid military case. Yet how can we achieve unity if we do not allow a fair and open discussion about the real issues?

3. In all of this, very vital American national interests are at stake. The President told the Germans that they are "in the first line of defense." The gist of his message was that, if Europe were attacked, the United States could come to its help. The President thus addressed himself to one specific war situation. But it is quite likely that in the future the United States, instead of Germany, will be in the "first line of defense" and that the Soviets, in order to seize Europe intact, may forgo an initial attack on the Continent. If so, the American national interest would require that the European nations come to our defense by launching an offensive against Soviet forces. But how could they help us without nuclear weapons?

What about political strategy? The President said that "no administration in Washington can fail to respond to * * * a threat to the freedom of Europe," because this would be "a threat to the freedom of America." The cold legal facts are that the President cannot commit future administrations; that the NATO pact does not stipulate an automatic military response by any of its members; and that the NATO treaty did not abrogate the constitutional provision that war be declared by Congress and not by the President.

The President, nevertheless, is entirely justified in suggesting that the Atlantic Community should progress from independence to interdependence. But the organs of interdependence have not been created and won't exist for years. The "Atlantic partnership," which is legally nonexistent, certainly is not yet "an entity of interdependent parts." NATO which has legal standing, remains an alliance of independent nations; and not a single member of the alliance is yet planning to abrogate its national independence. This is still the central political fact on which all defense planning must be based.

The President is looking forward to the time when all partners "linked together in the task of defense as well as the arts of peace," will be "sharing equally both burdens and decisions." The fact is that the United States still is carrying a far heavier burden than any ally: European NATO is spending on defense 5.4 percent of its overall gross product—no European state is spending more than 6.5 percent of its GNP—but the United States is paying out 9.8 percent. With a European "GNP," that is 58 percent of ours, Europe's defense outlays are 32 percent of the U.S. defense budget. In per capita terms: The average European taxpayer is spending annually on defense $53; the American taxpayer $277. This discrepancy is utterly unjustified. Per capita incomes in Europe have more than doubled since the end of the war (except in Britain) but military expenditures have failed to keep pace and in several cases are far below pre-World War II levels. The United Kingdom and particularly the United States have increased their military expenditures disproportionately, and in both countries the growth rate is lagging.

But just as the Europeans are unwilling to share the economic burden, so the United States has been unwilling to share the strategic decisions. Our European Allies have no choice but to go along with Mr. McNamara's diktats. The Pentagon's decisions on weapons systems affect the very lives of Europeans, and surely there should be no blood tax without representation. America's technological and notably nuclear strategy have remained strictly isolationist. The President wants Europe to reemerge as "a world power capable of meeting world problems as a full and equal partner." But how is Europe going to become a "world power," when the decisive weapons are to remain an American monopoly?

While we want to keep Europe unarmed with nuclear weapons we are seeking, as Mr. Kennedy intimated in his speech of June 10, "agreements" which "are in the Soviets' interest as well as ours." There is a presumption that to preserve peace, we must, above all, achieve accommodation with Moscow and help the "leaders of the Soviet Union adopt a more enlightened attitude." Yet, the President said in Frankfurt that "the first task of the Atlantic community was to assure its common defense." "The future of the West lies in Atlantic partnership." What then is our first priority—to "make the world safe for diversity," or to secure peace by making freedom complete?

If we concentrate on seeking, through a balance of terror, and accommodation with the Soviet Union, we shall ultimately destroy NATO and get into a war. If, on the other hand, we concentrate on establishing NATO as a truly effective defense and economic community, thus accomplishing durable deterrence on the basis of massive superiority, we shall change the world situation in such a way that the danger of Soviet aggression will be neutralized in a lasting manner. Then, and only then, will the precondition for a beneficial internal evolution within the Soviet Union have been created.

Actually we are pursuing three policies: In nuclear and most other relevant strategic matters, we apply strict nationalism—a policy of which the French attitude is a mirror image; together with Britain, we try to accommodate the Soviets; and for the Germans we parade interdependence. It does not necessarily follow that these three policies are incompatible. But they are incompatible if they are given simultaneously the same top priority. It is the NATO policy which demands the highest priority by far, because otherwise neither the relaxation policy, nor our own national independence can be made to work. Our hesitations with respect to the requirements of an effective policy of interdependence are due to an overrating of our own independent strength and strategic capability on the one hand, and on the other, to an overly optimistic interpretation of events behind the Iron Curtain and to an erroneous estimate of Soviet strategy, notably of Moscow's psychological warfare which aims at the partial unilateral disarmament of the United States.

But nuclear neurosis is at the bottom of the confusion. Unless we give up the dream that we can put the atom back into the womb of history, the dream of "a new social order founded on liberty and justice * * * in which states are the servants of their citizens and * * * men are the makers of their fate," will never come to life. The question before Mr. Kennedy is this: Should we confuse our dreams with life, or do we want to live so that we may continue to dream?

TITO

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I notice by the press that Madam Nhu was greeted at the Ivy League Institution of Princeton by the throwing of rocks and eggs and by boos. I wonder if these same people who treated her this way would treat Tito the same way, as he comes down Pennsylvania Avenue today, or will they be strewing flowers along the way to greet this Communist dictator.

We have adopted a policy today of placating our enemies and kicking our friends in the teeth. I think it would be far better if we treated our friends more kindly, and try to understand them, keep a wary eye on our enemies and all Communists.

WHITE HOUSE HOSPITALITY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I confess to some confusion regarding the standards which currently govern the White House hospitality.

Mme. Nhu is not invited.

Mr. Tito is invited.

Mme. Nhu is accused of calling American military men in Vietnam "little soldiers of fortune." She has denied the charge.

Mme. Nhu publicly condemns communism—the same communism we presumably are fighting in Vietnam.

Mme. Nhu is not on the White House invitation list.

Mr. Tito's forces shot down five American fliers aboard an unarmed transport plane and it took virtually a war ultimatum to get him to return the bodies of these American servicemen.

Mr. Tito declared last year that he shares the Soviet Union's goal of "building a new society of socialism and communism" and he has described "capitalist forces" as "our national enemies."

Mr. Tito is on the White House invitation list.

And on this "black Thursday" the hospitality to Mr. Tito becomes a shameful fact.

AMENDING TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE, FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7195) an act to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 5, after line 3, insert:

"SEC. 6. Section 307(c)(1) of title 23, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"'(c)(1) Not to exceed 1½ per centum of the sums apportioned for each fiscal year prior to the fiscal year 1964 to any State under section 104 of this title shall be available for expenditure upon request of the State highway department, with the approval of the Secretary, with or without State funds, for engineering and economic surveys and investigations; for the planning of future highway programs and the financing thereof; for studies of the economy, safety, and convenience of highway usage and the desirable regulation and equitable taxation thereof; and for research and development, necessary in connection with the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of highways and highway systems, and the regulation and taxation of their use.'"

Page 5, after line 3, insert:

"SEC. 7. (a) Subsection (c) of section 106 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Items included in any such estimate for construction engineering shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total estimated cost of a project financed with Federal-aid primary, secondary, or urban funds, after excluding from such total estimated cost, the estimated costs of rights-of-way, preliminary engineering, and construction engineering: *Provided*, That such limitation shall be 15 per centum in any State with respect to which the Secretary finds such higher limitation to be necessary. For any project financed with interstate funds, such limitation shall be 10 per centum.'

"(b) The second sentence of subsection (d) of section 121 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: 'Payments for construction engineering on any project financed with Federal-aid primary, secondary, or urban funds shall not exceed 10 per centum of the Federal share of the cost of construction of such project after excluding from the cost of construction the costs of rights-of-way, preliminary engineering, and construction engineering: *Provided*, That such limitation shall be 15 per centum in any State with respect to which the Secretary finds such higher limitation to be necessary. For any project financed with interstate funds, such limitation shall be 10 per centum.'"

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of inquiring of the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the Highway Subcommittee, which amendments were added on the Senate side. I would like the gentleman to explain to the House the contents of those amendments so that the House may be well informed.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, one amendment clarifies existing law to make it plain that the Federal aid and research planning funds may be used for development as well as for pure research. The intent is to stimulate the States to a greater initiative and to assume a more active role in that area of development. Of course, funds have been authorized and appropriated for this area and there is no additional cost involved here.

Mr. CRAMER. If I understand the gentleman's answer then, there is no additional appropriation involved or additional expenditure of funds involved in either of the two amendments added by the other body.

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. And further, as it relates to the first amendment, section 6, with regard to development use of these research and planning funds also for development purposes, they are still limited to the present 1.5 percent and it is discretionary with the State as to whether they see fit to use them for development purposes, and as a matter of fact the Bureau of the Budget has, has it not, in the past through executive decision and the rulemaking authority determined that it could be spent for development anyway and this legalizes what has been done by the Bureau?

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman again is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Second, with regard to section 2, as contained in section 7 of the bill, this requires the Secretary of Commerce and the Bureau of Roads of any State to qualify for use of 15 percent rather than 10 percent maximum?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. And it does not include or increase the total amount of allocation available to any of these States so designated?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct. It only relates to the ABC program and has no effect on the Interstate System.

Mr. CRAMER. And the Department appraises a given State for the reasons stated such as in Alaska where the construction season is unusually short or in Western States where projects may be far removed from established housing facilities and, therefore, the cost of engineering supervision is greater than in other areas, but the Secretary can, and only in instances of that nature, designate those States as being able to provide 15 percent rather than 10 percent for this engineering supervisory work?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct. And I think I might add this further note, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Most of these projects are small projects dollarwise.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman will further provide information—and I will yield to him for that purpose—if a State is also designated, the Bureau will still review each project for which such funds are requested. Is that not correct?

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. I say to the gentleman I am in support of the amendments. I think they are sound. The bill was noncontroversial when it initially passed the House. I do not believe it is controversial now in view of the statements made by the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I am a little confused as to the waiving of the 10-percent limitation and what States are involved. The gentleman alludes to the fact that Alaska and perhaps several of the Western States are involved. It seems to me this is something that has to be watched very closely.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes. And I say to the gentleman I agree with him wholeheartedly. That is why the bill was drafted in that manner, and the report is so drafted. That is why I thought it was important to have this discussion of it, so that the Bureau knows and the Department of Commerce knows and the States know that only in unusual circumstances is this to be used where it can be fully justified not only as it relates to the States but as it relates to each and every project. I will say to the gentleman those States who will probably benefit for the reasons I have mentioned are Alaska, Idaho, Montana, West Virginia, and Connecticut.

Mr. LAIRD. What is the reason for Connecticut?

Mr. CRAMER. And I want to say further to the gentleman other States can qualify if they can prove the same necessity.

Mr. LAIRD. What is the reason in Connecticut? Certainly there is not a great territory to cover in Connecticut. Why can you not get along on the 10-percent basis in Connecticut and West Virginia?

Mr. CRAMER. Because the State of Connecticut, as I understand it—and, of course, they are going to have to prove their case in each instance, I say to the gentleman—as I understand it they have a large number of small projects in congested areas and they may need additional engineering supervisory funds.

Mr. LAIRD. Are they going to have to run to Washington on every one of these projects and justify the 15 percent on a project-by-project basis before the Bureau of Public Roads?

Mr. CRAMER. It is my understanding they have to get clearance on a project-by-project basis for an additional 5-percent supervisory engineering money in the States that are approved.

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

Mr. CRAMER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. The project itself has to be approved by the bureau.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes.

Mr. FALLON. This is an additional approval that is necessary.

Mr. LAIRD. I understand that.

Mr. FALLON. It is not that they have to come to Washington for this particular purpose, but it is included in their application for the project when it originates.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman that this will be another item along with the approval of the project itself that is to be considered at the time it is made.

Mr. LAIRD. I still do not understand about Connecticut.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman that I am satisfied Connecticut, along with many other States, will have to justify the additional 5 percent in order to get it. I am not concerned, but I just suggested Connecticut as one State which indicated an interest along with others as well.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Then, any other State can come in on the same basis as Connecticut?

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is exactly correct, and that is the only fair way to legislate on the matter, I believe. At any rate, every State, if it can justify on the basis of proven need for additional supervisory engineering costs will have to justify it on a project-by-project basis. I will say further to the gentleman that it would be unfair not to include all States under those circumstances, but that State does not get any more highway construction authorization money. It comes out of what has already been allocated to those given States. If they want to spend it for that purpose and can justify it then I think they are entitled to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am concerned about these proposals to buy toll roads. Does this in any way enter into the toll road purchase proposal?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing up the subject, because he has opened up a subject in which I have a very great interest. This does not, I will say to the gentleman. And I wish I had a half hour on the floor of the House to discuss that subject, because I have been greatly concerned about the insertion of toll traps into the free highway system and have opposed them. Also, I have opposed parallel toll roads adversely affecting the free highway system, something which is certainly going on to a great extent in Florida today. That, as I say, I also oppose.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman says that neither of these amendments has anything to do with that particular subject?

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 21, 1963

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the majority leader if he will advise the House as to the program for the balance of this week and for next week.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the acting minority leader, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day. There is one suspension, H.R. 8667, authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.

For Tuesday, under the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] will call up H.R. 8321, to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, title XII of the Social Security Act, are to be restored to the Treasury.

H.R. 8427, improved retirement and disability system for certain employees of the Central Intelligence Agency. This has an open rule providing 2 hours of general debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 5945, establishing a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico. This has an open rule providing 2 hours of general debate.

This announcement is made, of course, subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think I should advise Members that a rollcall vote is possible on Monday, and also on other days later in the week.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 21

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

FRANCIS E. WALTER, IN MEMORIAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is of the highest importance that we be made aware of the high esteem in which our late colleague and beloved friend, Francis E. Walter, was held by all the members of the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration. The Director of the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration, B. W. Haverman, has expressed the sentiment of all of us. I am deeply moved by Mr. Haverman's expression and wish to share this tribute with all who knew and respected Francis E. Walter.

I take the deepest pleasure in inserting this memoriam which appeared in the fall issue of Circuit, a leading publication of the Netherlands, into the RECORD.

FRANCIS E. WALTER, IN MEMORIAM

Congressman Walter, 69 years old, died on Friday, May 31, in Georgetown University Hospital, Washington. In his passing, the U.S. House of Representatives has lost one of its most powerful Members, the Netherlands one of its best American friends, and the Western World one of its most dynamic leaders.

A week before his death, on the occasion of his birthday, he was hailed in the House by not less than 48 speakers, as one of its greatest Members of all time. In the following days, Congressman Walter was facing his last fight, a battle that no human being ever can win.

Congressman Walter was a brave fighter. He served in the Navy in World War I and fought as a lieutenant commander in the Navy Air Corps over England in World War II until he was called back by President Roosevelt. Sitting at the side of his bed in the hospital in February last, I expressed the hope that he would be able to return to the congressional battlefields in the near future. "No more battlefields for me" was his straightforward reply and he disclosed to me the real nature of his illness. He knew that only a miracle could keep him alive. He saw, very distinctly, the inevitability of the short but difficult path he had still to tread. However, he took keen enjoyment in being a

Protestant in the hospital of a Roman Catholic university, very well attended by a Negro physician. These circumstances, he thought, expressed in an excellent way his own philosophy on community life as it should be in the United States and all over the world.

Congressman Walter was buried with full military honors on a sunny slope in Arlington National Cemetery, the final resting place of America's great soldiers. A three-volley salute was fired at the grave by a Navy ceremonial guard. In attendance were relatives, friends, representatives of President Kennedy, Governors and State officials, Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, the Netherlands Ambassador Dr. J. H. van Royen and other members of the Diplomatic Corps, representatives of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and of the World Council of Churches, a banker, a judge, a union leader: in short representatives of practically all walks of life, joining together in extending their last homage to a great man.

After the burial, I mentioned to a general of the U.S. Air Force the important role Congressman Walter had played in the lives of more than one and a half million refugees and national migrants. Further, I told him the story of Mr. Walter's initiative in bringing the governments of 29 free nations together in an international organization to be "practical" by recognizing "the fact that one of the greatest assets in the world today is being dissipated through a failure realistically to place people where they are needed in the struggle for peace" (Brussels, 1951). I added that I did not know of any international politician who had succeeded in fructifying his ideas to the same degree and in such an efficient manner as Congressman Walter did. He not only influenced the thinking of a great number of governments but he brought them to joint action and good results. The general was amazed to hear all this. He said: "We are too used to judging our politicians only from the domestic point of view." All of us recognize Congressman Walter's stature as an American political figure, but only a few know of the role he played internationally.

Although Mr. Walter had extremely strong basic ideas to which he remained faithful in all circumstances, as a great politician he showed that magic, keen discernment of being able to distinguish between possibilities and impossibilities. By his pragmatic approach, his great command of facts, his prestige and his power of persuasion he often knew how to shift the borderline between them and to change a political impossibility into a concrete reality.

One of his basic ideas was that the resettlement of refugees had to be the prerogative of the Western world and should not be supervised directly or indirectly by Communist governments. With this in view, he became instrumental in the creation of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM), which succeeded the International Refugee Organization in 1952.

In 1956–57, this organization moved 105,000 Hungarian refugees to countries of resettlement, over 60,000 of them within 4 months of the uprising. Congressman Walter was present at the Austrian-Hungarian border where he saw refugees shot while attempting to flee and himself carried a young child from the Hungarian territory to freedom. Shortly afterwards he assumed leadership in the enactment of the U.S. Parolee Act of 1957 and subsequent acts which enabled ICEM to resettle a large number of refugees. This organization is still moving well over 30,000 refugees a year to countries where they can settle in freedom and peace.

The impact Congressman Walter had on the migration programs of many countries can easily be demonstrated by taking the Netherlands as an example. In 1957, he and a young Senator (now President of the United States) assisted me as the Netherlands Government Commissioner for Emigration in obtaining a loan from the Development Loan Fund to start the financing of a housing program for Dutch migrants in Australia. Last year he presented me—this time in my new capacity as Director of ICEM—to President Kennedy and we discussed the outcome of that housing scheme under which more than 3,500 Dutch migrant families in Australia acquired beautiful, privately owned homes.

In the same meeting Congressman Walter reported to the President on his visit to the Dutch settlements in Brazil, in the extension of which the U.S. Government had invested approximately $1½ million, of which $1,250,000 was made available through ICEM. These settlements inspired Congressman Walter and the U.S. delegation to the ICEM Council to encourage ICEM's participation in agricultural development projects in Latin America. The importance of the Holambra settlement and the Castrolanda settlements, I must confess, have been better understood by Americans like Congressman Walter than by many of my leading compatriots.

The greatest service to our country, however, of Congressman Walter was the opening he created for the resettlement of about 25,000 Dutch repatriates from Indonesia in the United States by amending the Pastore bill, enacted as the Pastore-Walter Act, 1958. I remember having dinner with him and the former Minister of Social Affairs and Health, Mr. Suurhoff, just after he had paid his first visit to Her Majesty, Queen Juliana. He told us that during this visit he had given his word to find a solution for this group of potential migrants to the United States. He explained that more than 5 million workers at that time were unemployed in his country and that immigration legislation giving new entry possibilities could be considered that year as a political impossibility. But he kept his promise.

I have taken the Netherlands as an example, but comparable stories could be written about other Western European countries and on solutions he brought to many groups suffering from oppression.

After World War II, Congressman Walter became the leading international statesman in the humanitarian and migration field, always progressive and always prodding governments into action, but with both feet on the solid ground of reality. The Netherlands honored him by his appointment as Commander of the Order of Orange Nassau and he received the Van Noort medal in gold, until now only bestowed upon two persons. By the death of Francis E. Walter, the Netherlands and the Dutch migrants—indeed, migrants and refugees all over the world—have lost one of their best friends. His memory will live on in his accomplishments.

B'NAI B'RITH—120TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, October 13, was the 120th anniversary of the 1st voluntary service organization founded in the United States.

It has a distinctive Hebrew name—B'nai B'rith. Its achievements are an inspiring example of the constructive force that Jewish citizens have been in the development of our Nation.

The name of B'nai B'rith and much of its good works are familiar to most of us; indeed, to millions of our countrymen. But our awareness of this public-spirited movement is further illuminated by some of the fascinating aspects of its long history—a history that has been rooted in American soil since the days John Tyler occupied the White House.

B'nai B'rith is the largest Jewish service organization in the world. But even more, it is distinguished as a pioneer group among the hundreds of important organizations that today give sustenance to the spirit of voluntary community activity in our free society.

The catalog of B'nai B'rith's good works, growing out of its four generations of service to the Jewish community, to our Nation and to people's everywhere, is far too comprehensive and too impressive for a brief review. But it is interesting to note that B'nai B'rith organized what might have been the first disaster relief campaign by a national organization. This was in 1868, more than a decade before the establishment of the American National Red Cross. In fact, it was in the Washington home of Adolphus Solomons, a B'nai B'rith leader, that Clara Barton and others met to organize the Red Cross.

B'nai B'rith conducted its first oversea relief campaign in 1865. Since then it has aided those stricken by flood, famine, earthquake, and the ravages of war in more than a score of lands. It opened, on a free nonsectarian basis, the first American hospitals specializing in chest and arthritic diseases. It sponsored orphanages and homes for the aged, free employment bureaus and technical training schools for immigrants. It established, in 1852, the first Jewish community center in our country and the first Jewish library.

B'nai B'rith is widely known for its effective campaigns against religious bias and discrimination. But perhaps not too many of us are aware that its first successful effort in this field was in 1851—in which it won the active support of Daniel Webster and Henry Clay.

A B'nai B'rith group in Chicago answered an appeal by President Lincoln for Army volunteers with a recruiting drive of its own, enrolling and paying the enlistment bonuses of a company of Jewish soldiers that served with heroism in the 82d Illinois Infantry Regiment. The regiment itself was commanded by B'nai B'rith leaders.

One might also recall B'nai B'rith members who fought with the Confederacy. Among them was young Moses Ezekial, later to become the great sculptor whose statue of "Religious Liberty," commissioned by the organization, stands in Philadelphia as a gift of B'nai B'rith on the 100th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

The patriotism of B'nai B'rith has been evident in every conflict since the Civil War. For its outstanding activities during World War II, B'nai B'rith was the first civilian group to be officially cited by both the U.S. Army and Navy.

B'nai B'rith has been publicly cited for its activities by every American President

since Teddy Roosevelt. It is particularly noteworthy that our Jewish colleagues in the Congress—from both sides of the aisle—are enrolled in its ranks.

This diversity is wholly typical of B'nai B'rith, which has served as a rallying force among all Americans of Jewish origin, transcending their varying ethnic backgrounds and their differences in religious, ideological, or political viewpoints.

B'nai B'rith today stands as a tribute to the spirit of the American Jewish community. In its 120 years, it has built up a structure of American participation and responsibility that identifies it with the great ideals of patriotism. Love of country begins with an appreciation of one's own place in it. The men and women of B'nai B'rith have made an enviable place for themselves in our Nation's history.

The Bible relates the age span of Moses the lawgiver as 120 years. Thus, the achievement of 120 years is a memorable milestone in Jewish tradition. But institutions—like people—grow old only when they desert their ideals. The vitality, dimensions, and sense of purpose of B'nai B'rith increase with each succeeding generation. The Nation salutes this remarkable organization on its historic anniversary and hails its continuing good works in philanthropy, democratic education, social service, youth work and other vital aspects of our national life.

THE TWO-PRICE COTTON DILEMMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, for a long time Congress has been seeking a way out of the two-price cotton dilemma. After months of diligent work, the House Committee on Agriculture reported favorably the bill H.R. 6196, commonly called the cotton bill. The committee's report states:

> The bill will end the two-price system for cotton. Domestic mills will be able to buy cotton at the world price.

Quoting further:

> The Department of Agriculture estimates that the program under H.R. 6196 would cost approximately $250 million more annually than the program under the current cotton law.

I would commend the committee for its interest in this grave and pressing problem. After adjournment of the 87th Congress, members of the committee held hearings to prepare for the 88th Congress. It has displayed admirable determination to "do something about two-price cotton." And it has reported what may be the best possible solution—if the present cotton support program is to remain unchanged.

But is the success of the present program such that it must remain inviolate? My purpose today is not to examine the cotton bill, but the cotton support program which gave it birth.

I am not a cotton farmer, nor a cotton manufacturer. I cannot supply all the answers to the cotton problem. But I can examine the facts.

And here are the facts: Two-price cotton has wreaked havoc with the textile industry. The largest employer in the South must pay 8½ cents per pound, or $42.50 per bale, more for cotton than foreign competition. The toll in lost markets, lost profits, and lost jobs is startling.

The textile industry bears this heavy burden because the Government supports the price of cotton at 32.47 cents per pound. The world market is 24 cents per pound—hence the 8½ cents differential.

The Government maintains prices at 32.47 cents per pound for one reason only—to help the cotton farmer.

Mr. Speaker, I think that no one will deny the truth of these statements. There is no question of the cause of two-price cotton, nor of its shattering impact. There is no question but that the cotton program was designed to help the cotton farmer. And there is no question that the desire to help the cotton farmer—particularly the small cotton farmer—is a laudable one.

There is no concept more appealing than the family farm. And all of us continue to harbor pleasant visions of the cotton farm.

Happy field hands harvesting snowy blossoms from the good red earth; the local cotton gin plucking rich seed from gossamer fiber; the crop baled and sold; and the profit of honest labor carefully put away. There are the bales of white gold, waiting at the ports of Savannah and Charleston for ships to bear them across the seas. At home, the mills change fiber to fabric, bringing employment and profit to all. Now, Mr. Speaker, in this vision every prospect pleases. But it fades away in the light of cold, hard fact.

There was a day in Georgia and the South when cotton was king. But that day, like many another southern dream, is gone with the wind.

Here are the facts:

In 1930, Georgia produced 11.4 percent of the Nation's cotton. Today, it produces 3.5 percent.

In 1930, California produced 1.9 percent of the Nation's cotton. Today, it produces 13.7 percent. These figures appear in the committee report.

Cotton is no longer king in Georgia, nor is the small cotton farmer prosperous.

The small farmer might fairly be described as one with an allotment of 10 acres or less. There were 652,387 of them in the United States in 1961—70.1 percent of all cotton farmers. These small farmers shared subsidies totaling $40,787,449. This comes, Mr. Speaker, to the sum of $63 per farmer for over 70 percent of all farmers. How much does that subsidy add to his income? About $5 per month. Among southeastern farmers, the average is even less—$55 per year. Compare this to the large farmer—one with 1,000 acres or more under cotton allotment. There were 322 such farmers in the Nation in 1961. These 322 received a total subsidy of $36,590,760—an average of $113,657 each. The States of Alabama, North Carolina, and South Carolina together had six such large farmers. Georgia, Florida, Virginia, and Tennessee had none. The largest growers in California and Arizona received $18,352,605 in subsidies, while the 358,965 small farmers of the Southeast shared less than $20 million—78 western farmers averaged $210,925 each. Over a third of a million small southeastern growers averaged $55. The attached table presents these figures in detail.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S COTTON SUBSIDY PROGRAM

TABLE 1.—*Money to small farmers compared with money to large (over 1,000 acres) farmers, 1961*

MONEY RECEIVED BY SMALL FARMERS

State	Farmers	Subsidy dollars paid	Average per farmer
Texas	102,221	$1,796,560	$18
Alabama	96,828	7,293,000	75
Mississippi	82,205	4,762,253	58
North Carolina	75,439	4,504,788	60
Georgia	64,474	3,335,910	52
South Carolina	61,252	3,545,478	58
Tennessee	46,426	6,283,370	135
Arkansas	34,967	2,971,770	85
Louisiana	31,714	1,907,953	60
Oklahoma	27,703	738,948	27
Missouri	6,751	895,645	133
California	5,046	911,668	181
Florida	8,328	580,490	70
Virginia	6,198	416,798	67
New Mexico	1,827	528,530	289
Arizona	1,008	314,288	312
United States	652,387	40,787,449	63
Percent of U.S. total	70.1	6.7	
Southeast	358,965	19,666,834	55
Other States	293,422	21,120,615	72

MONEY RECEIVED BY LARGE FARMERS

State	Farmers	Subsidy dollars paid	Average per farmer
Texas	102	$7,056,658	$69,183
Mississippi	62	5,464,055	48,681
California	58	15,136,205	260,960
Arkansas	56	4,442,440	79,329
Arizona	20	3,216,400	160,820
Louisiana	9	438,133	48,681
Missouri	7	431,163	61,594
Alabama	3	140,973	46,991
South Carolina	2	80,495	40,248
New Mexico	2	156,825	78,412
North Carolina	1	27,413	27,413
Tennessee	0		
Georgia	0		
Oklahoma	0		
Virginia	0		
Florida	0		
United States	322	36,590,760	113,657
Percent of U.S. total	0	6.0	
Southeast	6	248,881	41,480
Other States	316	36,341,879	115,005

NOTE.—(1) "Small farmers" include (*a*) farmers with cotton allotments who did not use them (hence getting no subsidy) and (*b*) farmers getting small subsidy (i.e. planting from 0.1 to 10 acres). "Large farmers" are those with cotton allotments of 1,000 and more acres. (2) "Subsidy" computed by multiplying rate of 8½ cents per pound by number of bales produced in the allotment categories shown, i.e. 0.1–10 acre category for "small" farmers and 1,000 and over acre category for "large" farmers.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Cotton Division, ASCS.

Mr. Speaker, the public pays this subsidy. Because it does, I believe it is entitled to know just who is receiving it. I am, therefore, including at this point a table, prepared from data furnished by

the Department of Agriculture, showing the names of those farmers with effective allotments of 1,000 acres or more, measured acreage, estimated yields, and—most important of all—the amount of public subsidy going to each farm. To my knowledge, no compilation equivalent to this has ever been published before. The year 1961 is chosen because, I am advised, the Department maintained yield figures only for that year.

TABLE 2.—*Upland cotton: 1961 effective allotments, measured acres, and estimated yields per acre for farms with effective allotments of 1,000 acres or more*

Owner	Operator	Effective allotment	Measured acreage	Estimated yield per acre	Production	Amount of subsidy
		Acres	*Acres*	*Pounds per acre*	*Bales*	
Alabama:						
Dallas County:						
J. A. Minter & Son	Same	1,420.2	1,413.5	405	1,145	$48,662.50
J. B. Hain Co	Same	1,554.0	1,547.4	405	1,233	53,252.50
Escambia County: State of Alabama	A. F. Lee, commissioner, Board of Corrections, Kilby Prison, Montgomery, Ala. (State prison farm, Atmore, Ala.).	1,312.7	1,312.7	350	919	39,057.50
Arizona:						
Maricopa County:						
B. F. Youngker, Sr.; Charles and B. F. Youngker, Jr.; K. K. Bowser; Mae L. Crumb.	Youngker Farms	2,313.1	2,277.3	1,265	5,762	244,885.00
(1)	J. L. Hodges Farming Co	1,118.9	1,111.8	1,200	2,668	113,390.00
Waddell Ranch Co	Same	1,286.4	1,286.4	1,375	3,538	150,365.00
Goodyear Farms	Same	2,192.5	2,192.5	1,265	5,547	235,747.50
Bogle Farms, Inc.; U.S. Indian Land	Bogle Farms	1,305.6	1,305.6	1,375	3,590	152,575.00
Arizona Title Insurance & Trust Co.; Del E. Webb Development Co.	J. G. Boswell Co	4,431.5	4,427.8	1,490	13,194	560,745.00
Pima County:						
Farmers Investment Co	Same	3,104.6	3,097.1	915	5,668	240,890.00
(1)	Kirby Hughes	1,006.7	1,004.8	865	1,738	73,865.00
John Kai	Same	1,533.8	1,533.8	865	2,653	112,752.50
Bing K. Wong	Same	1,559.7	1,559.7	865	2,698	114,665.00
Pinal County:						
Bogle Farms, Inc	Same	1,146.6	1,131.9	960	2,173	92,352.50
Calari Land Co. No. 1	Same	1,482.3	1,482.3	1,200	3,558	151,215.00
Isom & Isom	Same	1,072.8	1,066.4	915	1,952	82,960.00
Rancho Tierra Prieta, Inc	Same	1,266.0	1,262.5	1,035	2,613	111,052.50
McCarthy-Hildebrand Farms, Inc	Same	1,225.6	1,225.6	1,085	2,660	113,050.00
Arizona Farming Co	Same	1,554.4	1,554.4	1,080	3,358	142,715.00
Farmers Investment Co	Same	2,182.4	2,182.4	1,080	4,714	200,345.00
J. A. Roberts	Same	1,157.6	957.6	975	1,867	79,347.50
Coury Bros	Same	1,389.9	1,389.9	960	2,669	113,432.50
Pima Community Farms	Same	2,185.3	2,185.3	700	3,059	130,007.50
Arkansas:						
Ashley County:						
S. J. Wilson estate	Same	1,367.4	1,368.1	650	1,779	75,607.50
T. R. Pugh Sons Co	Same	1,059.4	1,058.5	650	1,376	58,480.00
Pugh & Co	Same	1,087.8	1,086.5	650	1,412	60,010.00
Crittenden County:						
J. F. Twist	Twist Plantation	1,729.4	1,675.1	500	1,675	71,187.50
Mrs. Mary K. Kuhn	Same	1,947.3	1,947.3	490	1,908	81,090.00
Don Weiner	Pacific Plantation	1,215.2	1,146.5	500	1,147	48,747.50
Henry and Love D. Banks estate	Bert Dickey, Jr	1,282.8	1,282.8	500	1,283	54,527.50
A. J. McKnight	Same	1,370.2	1,365.1	500	1,365	58,012.50
Mrs. Mary K. Kuhn; J. F. Rieves	Mrs. Mary K. Kuhn	1,694.3	1,694.3	490	1,660	70,550.00
(1)	Alpe Bros	1,177.5	1,177.5	510	1,201	51,042.50
Mallory Farms	Same	1,053.4	1,016.4	500	1,016	43,180.00
Cross County:						
W. M. Smith & Sons	James H. Johnston	1,382.8	1,372.1	500	1,372	58,310.00
E. A. Rolfe, Jr	Same	1,643.0	1,449.9	500	1,450	61,625.00
Roy Coldren	Dickey & Rich	1,067.4	960.6	500	961	40,842.50
Desha County:						
Stimson Veneer & Lumber Trust	Same	1,349.8	1,285.8	600	1,543	65,577.50
R. A. Pickens & Sons Co	Same	2,703.9	2,610.3	750	3,915	166,387.50
Baxter Land Co	Same	1,234.8	1,194.4	500	1,194	50,745.00
Drew County: Tillar & Co	Same	1,361.3	1,338.4	400	1,071	45,517.50
Jackson County: R. D. Wilmans & Sons	Same	1,619.5	1,552.1	515	1,599	67,957.50
Jefferson County:						
Cornerstone Farm & Gin & Standard Investment Co.	Same	1,119.6	1,119.3	625	1,399	59,457.50
Elms Plantation Co	Same	1,048.8	1,048.8	650	1,363	57,927.50
W. I. Payne estate	Same	1,491.1	1,457.4	525	1,530	65,025.00
International Paper Co	Same	1,045.7	1,020.4	650	1,327	56,397.50
Henderson Plantation Co	Same	1,214.8	1,214.8	600	1,458	61,965.00
Lincoln County:						
H. R. Woods	Same	1,083.9	1,059.2	500	1,060	45,050.00
Arkansas State Penitentiary	Same	1,657.9	1,668.1	500	1,668	70,890.00
Holthoff Bros.; B. A. Bell; Mrs. A. J. Johnson	Holthoff Bros	2,376.7	2,258.7	500	2,259	96,007.50
Lonoke County: Cobb Bros. & Co	Same	1,215.1	1,215.9	600	1,459	62,007.50
Mississippi County:						
Lowrance Bros	Same	1,115.3	1,081.4	600	1,298	55,165.00
Cromer Bros	Same	1,069.5	1,068.2	550	1,175	49,937.50
Ohlendorf Farms	Same	1,891.6	1,827.0	500	1,827	77,647.50
Lee Wilson estate	Keiser Supply Co	1,003.4	1,003.2	400	803	34,127.50
D. F. Portis	Same	1,087.0	1,080.8	550	1,189	56,532.50
R. C. Branch	Same	2,085.5	2,030.2	700	2,842	120,785.00
Keiser Supply Co	Same	1,254.1	1,150.1	450	1,035	43,987.50
Wesson Farms, Inc	Same	2,105.0	2,016.2	500	2,016	85,680.00
C. J. Lowrance & Sons	Same	1,410.7	1,355.8	625	1,695	72,037.50
Denton & Crain	Same	1,376.9	1,376.9	600	1,652	70,210.00
Lee Wilson & Co	Same	4,990.2	4,953.2	525	5,201	221,042.50
Armorel Planting Co	E. M. Regenold	3,514.7	3,514.7	575	4,042	171,785.00
J. C. Ellis	Same	1,015.0	1,015.0	580	1,177	50,022.50
B. C. Land Co	Same	2,708.1	2,620.9	512	2,673	113,602.50
Phillips County:						
Brooks Griffin	Jessie Peter estate	1,189.6	1,171.3	574	1,347	57,247.50
N. Vick Robbins	Crump & Rogers	1,121.6	1,121.3	574	1,289	54,782.50
Howe Lumber Co	Same	3,598.8	3,598.8	574	4,139	175,907.50
Poinsett County:						
Weona Farms	Same	3,742.8	3,677.6	512	3,751	159,417.50
R. H. Taylor	J. C. Stuckey	1,258.0	1,258.0	512	1,283	54,527.50
Reserve Estate Life Insurance Co	Same	2,140.0	2,117.1	500	2,117	89,972.50
A. G. Patteson	Same	1,460.0	1,446.3	500	1,446	61,455.00
S. C. Chapin	Same	1,710.0	1,652.2	596	1,966	83,555.00
St. Francis Valley Farms, division of E. Ritter & Co.	Same	6,178.6	6,159.9	573	7,084	301,070.00
Dan F. Portis	Same	2,043.8	2,035.7	459	1,873	79,602.50
Fairview Farms Co	Same	2,134.8	2,131.9	507	2,153	91,502.50

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Upland cotton: 1961 effective allotments, measured acres, and estimated yields per acre for farms with effective allotments of 1,000 acres or more*—Continued

Owner	Operator	Effective allotment	Measured acreage	Estimated yield per acre	Production	Amount of subsidy
		Acres	*Acres*	*Pounds per acre*	*Bales*	
Arkansas—Continued						
Prairie County: Hester B. Robinson estate	J. C. Stuckey	1,378.9	1,378.9	625	1,724	$73,270.00
St. Francis County: Miller Lumber Co	Same	1,169.4	1,169.4	606	1,415	60,137.50
Woodruff County: L. L. Cole & Son, Inc	Same	1,289.6	1,242.6	750	1,864	79,220.00
California:						
Fresno County:						
(1)	Airway Farms	2,716.9	2,711.9	1,250	6,780	288,150.00
(1)	V. C. Britton Co	1,537.9	1,536.4	1,180	3,626	154,105.00
Boston Ranch Co	Same	3,776.2	3,765.2	1,350	10,166	432,055.00
(1)	Hugh Bennett	1,581.6	1,581.5	1,100	3,479	147,857.50
(1)	Coit Ranch, Inc	2,062.7	2,062.4	1,200	4,950	210,375.00
(1)	Calflax Ranch	3,023.0	3,022.9	1,250	7,557	321,172.50
Frank C. Diener Ranch	Same	1,461.2	1,460.7	1,450	4,236	180,030.00
(1)	The Desert Ranch	1,338.0	1,335.8	1,200	3,206	136,255.00
(1)	Employees Enterprises	4,726.9	4,725.5	1,300	12,286	522,155.00
(1)	Five Points Ranch, Inc	2,297.1	2,294.6	1,150	5,278	224,315.00
(1)	Edmund C. Giusti	1,173.6	1,173.4	1,050	2,464	104,720.00
(1)	Price Giffen Ranch	1,788.9	1,786.3	1,400	5,002	212,585.00
(1)	Giffen, Inc	13,037.6	13,037.6	1,400	36,505	1,551,462.50
(1)	Jack Harris, Inc	2,232.3	2,414.4	1,250	6,036	256,530.00
(1)	Harnish Five Points	1,287.3	1,284.6	1,300	3,340	141,950.00
Hammond Ranch, Inc	Same	1,214.7	1,214.7	1,200	2,915	123,887.50
(1)	Murietta Farms Co	1,167.4	1,166.8	1,250	2,917	123,972.50
McCarthy & Hildebrand	Same	1,144.3	1,144.3	850	1,945	82,662.50
(1)	William H. Noble	2,358.4	2,357.8	750	3,537	150,322.50
Burrel Ranch Visalia	Producers Cotton Oil Co	1,488.5	1,488.5	750	2,233	94,902.50
(1)	Reece Bros	1,007.2	1,006.9	1,000	2,014	85,595.00
Redfern Ranches, Inc	Same	1,354.2	1,352.4	1,350	3,651	155,167.50
(1)	V. I. Sandell	1,294.2	1,274.7	1,050	2,677	113,772.50
(1)	Sullivan & Gragnani	1,169.6	1,169.5	1,150	2,690	114,325.00
(1)	Raymond Thomas, Inc	1,410.0	1,409.6	1,350	3,806	161,755.00
(1)	Vista Del Llano Farms	6,285.0	6,284.0	1,300	16,338	694,365.00
Imperial County: Adolph Weinberg	Imperial Land & Cattle	1,736.5	1,736.5	1,440	5,001	212,542.50
Kern County:						
Miller & Lux; B. V. Associates; J. G. Boswell	J. G. Boswell	4,156.8	4,156.8	1,300	10,808	459,340.00
(1)	D. M. Bryant, Jr	1,486.4	1,486.2	1,050	3,121	132,642.50
W. B. Camp & Sons, Inc.; Banking Trust Co	W. B. Camp & Sons, Inc	1,224.4	1,224.9	1,050	2,572	109,310.00
(1)	S. A. Camp Farms Co	4,701.5	4,686.2	1,300	12,184	517,820.00
Houchin Bros. Farming; C. E. Houchin	Houchin Bros. Farming	1,373.4	1,373.2	1,100	3,021	128,392.50
(1)	Coberly West Co	2,553.4	2,552.7	950	4,852	206,210.00
Kern County Land Co	Same	20,345.5	20,345.5	1,130	45,981	1,954,192.50
(1)	Giumarra Vineyard Corp	1,545.3	1,517.3	1,020	3,095	131,537.50
Kern County Land Co.; Uhalt & Uhalt; McKittrick Rauch.	McKittrick Ranch	1,066.5	1,066.5	1,200	2,560	108,800.00
Tejon Ranch Co	Same	1,594.6	1,594.5	977	3,109	132,132.50
(1)	Robert Pelletier	1,616.2	1,610.3	1,350	4,348	184,790.00
(1)	Pilgrim & Bowling	1,060.8	1,057.7	1,025	2,168	92,140.00
(1)	Wheeler Farms	1,135.9	1,135.9	1,010	2,295	97,537.50
Kings County:						
(1)	J. G. Boswell Co	16,985.7	16,984.2	840	28,533	1,212,652.50
Gilkey Farms Inc.; J. B. Boyett; Ralph Gilkey; Tulare Lake Land Co.	Gilkey Farms Inc	1,966.4	1,953.7	840	3,282	139,485.00
R. A. Rowan Co	Same	1,160.2	1,152.9	840	1,937	82,322.50
(1)	Salyer Land Co	5,043.9	5,026.3	840	8,444	358,870.00
(1)	South Lake Farms	5,275.1	5,256.6	840	8,831	375,317.50
(1)	West Haven Farming Co	1,294.9	1,294.9	840	2,175	92,437.50
Norman A. Wolfsen; Kings County Development Co.; R. B. Mills; Gertrude, Norman, and Hickey Wolfsen.	Norman A. Wolfsen	1,227.0	1,206.3	840	2,027	86,147.50
(1)	West Lake Farms Inc	5,212.1	5,210.1	840	8,753	372,002.50
Boyett Farming Co.; Maude Armstrong; J. B. Boyett; J. W. Guiberson Co.	Boyett Farming Co	1,372.0	1,363.8	840	2,291	97,367.50
Madera County:						
Newhall Land & Farming	Same	1,224.8	1,224.8	700	1,715	72,887.50
Jessup Farms	Same	1,142.5	1,142.5	900	2,057	87,422.50
Red Top Ranch	Same	1,173.4	1,173.4	750	1,760	74,800.00
Merced County:						
Sam Hamburg Farms, Inc	Same	2,068.1	2,102.8	1,143	4,815	204,637.50
Turner Island Farms	Same	1,136.6	1,136.6	940	2,137	90,822.50
Miller & Lux, Inc	Same	1,960.4	1,960.4	1,000	3,921	166,642.50
Riverside County: Riverview Farm & Cattle Co	Same	1,385.7	1,385.4	1,440	3,990	169,575.00
Tulare County:						
Raymond Bisconer	Coberly-West Co	1,266.8	1,266.8	950	2,407	102,297.50
(1)	C. J. Shannon & Sons	1,247.6	1,222.4	950	2,323	98,727.50
Florida: None						
Georgia: None						
Kentucky: None						
Louisiana:						
Bossier Parish:						
W. H. Mercer	Elm Grove Plantation	1,000.0	1,000.0	400	800	34,000.00
Chas E. Roemer II	Scopena Plantation	1,298.2	1,298.2	300	779	33,107.50
Caddo Parish: W. H. Robinson	Same	1,046.8	1,046.8	500	1,047	44,497.50
East Carroll Parish:						
Hollybrook Land Co., Inc	Same	1,655.1	1,655.1	600	1,986	84,405.00
J. P. Brown	Same	1,351.4	1,351.4	500	1,351	57,417.50
Franklin Parish: T. B. Gilbert Co., Inc	Same	1,000.0	906.9	375	680	28,900.00
Morehouse Parish: Barham, Inc	Same	1,000.0	1,000.0	750	1,500	63,750.00
Richland Parish:						
George B. Franklin, Jr	Same	1,406.8	1,377.2	400	1,102	46,835.00
Pearl R. Rhymes	Same	1,477.5	1,471.3	400	1,177	50,022.50
Mississippi:						
Bolivar County:						
R. N. and E. C. Tibbs; Mrs. Hogue; B. E. Masters; Joe Jeffries.	R. N. and E. C. Tibbs	1,124.3	1,047.6	600	1,257	53,422.50
E. L. McMurchy	McMurchy Farms	1,052.3	1,052.3	750	1,578	67,065.00
Brooks Cotton Co	Same	1,176.6	1,176.6	775	1,824	77,520.00
Zumbro Plantation	Same	1,105.0	1,105.0	800	1,768	75,140.00
J. A. Howarth, Jr	Same	1,208.3	1,201.2	700	1,682	71,485.00
Dan Seligman	Same	2,035.4	1,978.9	775	3,067	130,347.50
Fine Spinners & Doublers, Ltd	Delta & Pine Land Co	8,193.3	8,193.3	925	15,158	644,215.00
M. D. Dossett	Same	1,350.0	1,328.4	675	1,793	76,202.50

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Upland cotton: 1961 effective allotments, measured acres, and estimated yields per acre for farms with effective allotments of 1,000 acres or more*—Continued

Owner	Operator	Effective allotment	Measured acreage	Estimated yield per acre	Production	Amount of subsidy
		Acres	*Acres*	*Pounds per acre*	*Bales*	
Mississippi—Continued						
Coahoma County:						
Mrs. G. Fitzgerald; G. T. Mohead	Mohead Planting Co	1,166.5	1,166.5	700	1,633	$69,402.50
John B. and F. B. McKee	Same	1,910.7	1,910.7	700	2,675	113,687.50
J. and M. McKee; John B. and F. B. McKee	J. and M. McKee	1,317.7	1,317.7	700	1,845	78,412.50
W. K. Anderson	King & Anderson	2,087.1	2,087.1	675	2,818	119,765.00
Mr. and Mrs. Edgar Lee Anderson, Jr	Oakhurst Co	2,553.2	2,553.2	750	3,830	162,775.00
J. T. Fargason & Son, Inc	Same	1,050.0	1,042.1	675	1,407	59,797.50
J. H. Sherard estate	J. H. Sherard & Sons	1,348.5	1,348.5	600	1,618	68,765.00
Aaron Calvin estate; Kline Planting Co	Kline Planting Co	1,648.7	1,613.6	625	2,017	85,722.50
Leon C. Bramlett	Same	1,087.8	1,020.2	600	1,224	52,020.00
S. H. and Dorothy W. Kyle	Same	2,316.7	2,281.6	675	3,080	130,900.00
Roy Flowers	Same	2,224.8	2,224.8	700	3,115	132,387.50
DeSoto County:						
Banks & Co	Same	1,602.1	1,592.7	515	1,640	69,700.00
D. J. Thomas Co	Same	1,363.4	1,363.4	550	1,500	63,750.00
A. V. Shannon	Same	1,040.5	1,026.6	500	1,027	43,647.50
P. L. Sanders	Same	1,264.5	1,262.5	550	1,389	59,032.50
Hinds County: Gaddis Farms, Inc	Same	1,345.1	1,028.4	250	514	21,845.00
Humphreys County:						
S. H. Barret, Jr.; Susie B. Barret; W. H. Sumrall	S. H. Barret, Jr	1,077.1	1,077.1	700	1,508	64,090.00
C. B. Box Co	Same	1,323.8	1,323.8	520	1,377	58,522.50
B. W. Smith Planting Co	Same	1,411.7	1,411.7	650	1,835	77,987.50
Leflore County:						
Mrs. Josephine Barry	Four Fifths Plantation	1,058.1	1,058.1	800	1,693	71,952.50
Bledsoe estate	O. F. Bledsoe Plantation	1,287.0	1,262.3	900	2,272	96,560.00
Tom Gary, et al	Wildwood Plantation	1,940.0	1,935.6	750	2,903	123,377.50
Corporation	Race Track Plantation	1,070.4	1,070.4	1,000	2,141	90,992.50
W. M. Whittington	Whittington Plantation	1,077.5	1,077.5	750	1,616	68,680.00
W. M. Whittington, Jr.; Aven Whittington; Mary Davenport.	Buckhorn Plantation	1,193.7	1,193.7	780	1,862	79,135.00
C. S. Whittington; S. W. Erskine; H. Brown; John Hughes.	C. S. Whittington Plantation	1,138.0	1,138.0	700	1,593	67,702.50
Mrs. Mildred Metcalf; Mrs. Elizabeth Saunders	Runneymede Plantation	1,016.8	1,016.8	725	1,474	62,645.00
Joe Pugh and Stratton estate	Joe Pugh	1,026.1	1,025.0	750	1,538	65,365.00
The Brown Farm (Margaret B. Brown)	The Brown Farm	1,322.7	1,322.7	850	2,249	95,582.50
Noxubee County: Harrison Evans	Same	2,436.5	2,063.5	250	1,032	43,860.00
Quitman County: Yandell Bros	Same	1,496.9	1,496.2	860	2,573	109,352.50
Sharkey County:						
Pantherburn Co	Same	2,275.3	2,275.3	650	2,958	125,715.00
(1)	Milton Kline	1,236.1	1,236.1	625	1,545	65,662.50
Sunflower County:						
W. M. Duncan	Same	1,160.0	1,160.0	600	1,392	58,160.00
Billups Plantation	Same	1,349.3	1,349.3	850	2,294	97,495.00
W. P. Scruggs	W. P. Scruggs; McLean estate; Daily estate	1,336.5	1,336.5	600	1,604	68,170.00
Eastland Plantation	J. O. Eastland; Mrs. W. C. Eastland; estate of J. M. Parks.	1,725.3	1,725.3	560	1,932	82,110.00
J. R. Dockery	Same	2,096.0	2,094.8	580	2,430	103,275.00
Brooks Farming Co	Same	1,032.2	1,032.2	500	1,032	43,860.00
Mississippi State Pennitentiary	State of Mississippi	5,129.9	5,129.9	550	5,643	239,827.50
Bridwell Farms	Same	1,182.6	1,145.1	575	1,317	55,972.50
Tunica County:						
B. F. Harbert; Anne Harbert	B. F. Harbert Co	1,404.2	1,390.7	750	2,086	88,655.00
S. R. Leatherman, Sr.; William A. Leatherman; Mrs. Anne L. Grant; Mrs. Irwin L. Magevney.	Abbay & Leatherman	1,575.9	1,575.9	700	2,206	93,755.00
(1)	M. L. Earnheart	1,069.2	1,037.5	700	1,453	61,752.50
Clinton P. Owen	Same	1,106.0	1,086.1	650	1,412	60,010.00
(1)	H. R. Watson & Sons	1,261.1	1,261.1	600	1,513	64,302.50
(1)	Woolfolk Farms	1,427.5	1,427.5	550	1,570	66,725.00
(1)	S. C. Wilson & Son	1,439.0	1,411.7	550	1,553	66,002.50
Union County: Hugh Stephens	Same	1,300.0	1,300.0	350	910	38,675.00
Washington County:						
Cecil L. Earls	Bamboo Plantation	1,029.7	1,029.7	375	772	32,810.00
George Abraham	Same	1,562.5	977.7	375	733	31,152.50
Torry Wood & Son; Mrs. Charles Clower; Mrs. Meek.	Torry Wood & Son	1,492.6	1,492.6	625	1,866	79,305.00
Don O. Baker	Baker Planting Co	1,062.3	1,062.3	750	1,593	67,702.50
Leroy P. Percy	Trail Lake Plantation	1,501.9	1,501.9	625	1,877	79,772.50
Missouri:						
Dunklin County: W. V. Wright	Same	1,326.2	1,326.2	600	1,591	67,617.50
Mississippi County:						
Story Farms, Inc	Same	1,241.6	1,238.3	475	1,176	49,980.00
Mountain Level Farms, Inc	Same	1,114.4	1,058.5	375	794	33,745.00
New Madrid County:						
David M. Barton	Swiney & Sons	1,584.9	1,569.1	640	2,008	85,340.00
A. R. Wrather	Same	1,103.8	1,061.3	625	1,327	56,397.50
Stoddard County:						
Fisher Bros	Same	1,730.8	1,730.7	625	2,163	91,927.50
Trailback Plantation	Tom F. Baker	1,037.0	1,014.6	600	1,218	51,765.00
Nevada: None						
New Mexico:						
Eddy County: Valley Land Co. and Dan Harroun	Same	1,211.8	1,210.7	750	1,816	77,180.00
Lea County: W. V. Lawrence	Same	1,498.8	1,498.8	625	1,874	79,645.00
North Carolina:						
Scotland County: McNair Investment Co	Same	1,110.4	1,031.3	375	773	32,852.50
Oklahoma: None						
South Carolina:						
Marlboro County: Joe A. McDonald	Same	1,021.2	994.0	400	795	33,787.50
Sumter County: J. E. Mayes and Janie R. Mayes	J. E. Mayes	1,000.0	999.4	550	1,099	46,707.50
Tennessee: None						
Texas:						
Bailey County: The McLaughlins	Horace Hutton	1,561.8	1,561.8	250	781	33,192.50
Brazoria County: Texas Department of Corrections	Same	5,135.3	5,109.9	750	7,665	325,762.50
Brazos County:						
Harry H. Moore & Sons	Same	2,200.0	2,199.8	575	2,530	107,525.00
Tom Moore	Same	2,759.9	2,759.9	575	3,174	134,895.00
Joe Varisco	Same	1,325.3	1,229.5	575	1,414	60,095.00
Brazos A. Varisco	Same	2,246.4	2,232.1	575	2,567	109,097.50
Burleson County:						
J. Earl Porter estate	Same	1,490.3	1,490.3	450	1,341	56,992.50
H. H. and Edgar Baker	J. H. Baker estate	1,447.3	1,447.3	450	1,303	55,377.50
George G. Chance estate	Same	2,011.4	1,968.6	450	1,763	74,927.50
Holland Porter	Same	1,000.4	986.6	450	888	37,740.00

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Upland cotton: 1961 effective allotments, measured acres, and estimated yields per acre for farms with effective allotments of 1,000 acres or more*—Continued

Owner	Operator	Effective allotment	Measured acreage	Estimated yield per acre	Production	Amount of subsidy
Texas—Continued						
Cameron County:		*Acres*	*Acres*	*Pounds per acre*	*Bales*	
J. H. McDaniel; Milton B. Clapp	John A. Abbott	1,023.5	1,033.2	375	775	$32,937.50
E. D. Richmond, Jr., trustee	Same	1,322.9	1,344.0	250	672	28,560.00
Crosby County:						
Leslie Mitchell	Same	1,450.5	1,450.5	465	1,349	57,332.50
The McLaughlins	Same	2,017.2	2,017.2	400	1,614	68,595.00
Dawson County:						
W. M. Yates	Same	1,020.8	1,005.7	500	1,006	42,755.00
J. R. Weaver	Bill Weaver	2,400.7	2,400.7	800	3,841	163,242.50
Broyles Lamesa Farms	Same	1,518.1	1,518.1	350	1,063	45,177.50
Carson Echols	Same	1,438.4	1,438.4	300	863	36,677.50
Ellis County:						
Jack B. Eastham	Same	1,383.6	1,383.6	200	553	23,502.50
The Kirven Trust	Bob Crittenden	1,002.6	1,002.6	250	501	21,292.50
H. R. Burden	Same	3,436.7	2,832.7	250	1,416	60,180.00
El Paso County: Lee Moor Farms	Same	1,088.4	1,088.4	1,200	2,612	111,010.00
Fannin County: Loyd H. Smith & W. H. Francis, Jr. (a partnership).	R. A. Harling	1,250.1	1,250.1	500	1,250	53,125.00
Fort Bend County:						
Texas Department of Corrections	Same	1,318.6	1,318.6	573	1,516	64,430.00
Do	Same	1,241.0	1,233.4	573	1,418	60,265.00
Foster Farms, Inc	Same	1,046.6	1,037.6	478	996	42,330.00
Sugarland Ind., Inc	Same	2,127.5	2,127.5	478	2,042	86,785.00
Gaines County:						
W. S. Wimberly	Sneed Bros	1,090.3	1,090.3	700	1,526	64,855.00
K. K. Whitaker	Same	1,047.5	1,021.3	400	817	34,722.50
Hall County: Vera Dial Dickey	Same	1,223.3	1,203.9	350	843	35,827.50
Haskell County: Willie Z. Bettis estate	Same	1,467.3	1,460.8	440	1,286	54,655.00
Hidalgo County:						
Guerra Bros	Same	2,632.1	2,440.3	250	1,220	51,850.00
D. J. Schwarz	Same	1,166.2	1,145.4	600	1,374	58,395.00
Helen Engelman Stegle	Same	1,745.0	1,745.0	450	1,571	66,767.50
Valley Acres	Same	4,033.9	4,033.9	450	3,631	154,317.50
Rio Farms, Inc	Same	5,012.5	5,012.5	450	4,511	191,717.50
Shary Farms, Inc. and others	Shary Farms, Inc	1,758.1	1,718.6	450	1,547	65,747.50
Krenmueller Farms; B. & G. Forthuber	Krenmueller Farms	1,325.4	1,325.4	500	1,325	56,312.50
J. W. Wallace & Sons, and others	J. W. Wallace & Sons	1,322.9	1,265.8	500	1,266	53,805.00
(1)	Jerry Block	1,227.5	1,037.3	450	934	39,695.00
2 owners	Rio Grande Care	3,569.1	3,560.7	450	3,205	136,212.50
Hill County: Dr. S. W. Allen	Same	1,318.5	1,243.9	130	323	13,727.50
Hockley County:						
Aubrey L. Lockett	Same	1,101.0	1,101.0	500	1,101	46,792.50
Spade Farms, Inc	Kenneth Spradley and others	2,727.9	2,727.9	400	2,182	92,735.00
Houston County:						
Mustang Prairie Ranch	John Rials	1,600.0	1,377.3	400	1,102	46,835.00
Texas Department of Corrections	Same	2,783.8	2,701.9	600	3,242	137,785.00
Hudspeth County:						
Chandler Co	Same	1,282.7	1,282.7	810	2,078	88,315.00
C. & L. Ranch	Same	1,254.5	1,239.4	810	2,008	85,340.00
Jones County: Eula Phillips estate	Jimlee Baucum	1,068.9	1,008.3	267	534	22,695.00
Kaufman County: S. C. Pratt	Same	1,000.0	824.7	250	412	17,510.00
Knox County: League-Davis Properties	Same	2,231.3	1,926.0	300	1,156	49,130.00
Lubbock County:						
Lubbock Irrigation Co., Inc	Same	1,130.5	1,130.5	500	1,131	48,067.50
Carson Farms	Same	1,608.3	1,604.8	500	1,605	68,212.50
Lynn County:						
Crawford Edwards estate	A. N. Norman, Jr	1,472.3	1,472.3	432	1,266	53,805.00
W. C. Huffaker, Jr	Same	1,163.1	1,163.1	432	1,000	42,500.00
McLennan County: Texas Agricultural Experimental Station; Bluebonnet Farms.	Same	1,383.5	1,383.5	275	761	32,342.50
Martin County:						
E. B. and F. E. Holcomb	Don Holcomb and others	1,385.5	1,385.5	600	1,663	70,677.50
F. D. Breedlove	Earl Hightower and others	1,860.6	1,860.6	600	2,233	94,902.50
A. C. Woodward	E. R. Perry and others	2,642.2	2,642.2	600	3,171	134,767.50
Maverick County: Roseta Farms	D. C. Brown	1,300.0	1,299.5	600	1,559	66,257.50
Mitchell County: Charles C. Thompson	Same	1,029.4	1,004.0	187	371	15,767.50
Navarro County:						
Fortson Farms	James E. Fortson	4,546.7	3,582.3	200	1,433	60,902.50
Do	Joe B. Fortson	2,045.8	1,755.2	200	702	29,835.00
Nolan County: T. D. Young	Same	1,034.5	1,034.5	250	517	21,972.50
Nueces County:						
Ruth E. Cowles	Same	2,432.5	2,432.5	500	2,433	103,402.50
Berta C. Cunningham	Same	1,411.1	1,411.1	500	1,411	59,967.50
P. A. Chapman, Jr., estate	Same	2,067.1	2,037.8	500	2,038	86,615.00
John O. Chapman	Same	2,305.7	2,305.7	500	2,306	98,005.00
Pecos County:						
Fred Chandler and others	Chandler Co	1,662.4	1,662.4	750	2,494	105,995.00
Agriculture, Inc	Same	585.8	1,209.2	925		
Reeves County:						
U.S. National	Same	1,413.2	1,396.0	875	2,443	103,827.50
W. W. Hill and W. R. Sage	W. W. Hill	1,321.2	1,261.0	1,125	2,837	120,572.50
Progresso Farms	Same	1,152.0	1,236.9	800	1,979	84,107.50
Robertson County: John W. Nigliazzo	Same	1,103.5	1,059.1	759	1,610	68,425.00
San Patricio County:						
F. H. Vahlsing, Inc	Same	1,884.4	1,884.4	550	2,029	86,232.50
Joseph F. Green estate	Same	1,232.4	1,232.4	440	1,085	46,112.50
Jackson & Stripling	Same and others	1,065.4	1,065.4	580	1,236	52,530.00
Swisher County: Tyline N. Perry	Charles B. Martin	1,348.1	1,348.1	500	1,348	57,290.00
Terry County: Jessie K. Griffith	Same	1,059.3	1,059.1	375	794	33,745.00
Walker County: Texas Department of Corrections	Same	1,700.6	1,664.1	400	1,331	56,567.50
Willacy County:						
Rio Farms, Inc	Sam Taylor	1,615.9	1,561.7	500	1,562	66,385.00
Rudman Land Co	R. E. Selman	1,661.9	1,568.4	225	706	30,005.00
Stuart R, Stone and others	Same	1,287.8	1,287.8	500	1,288	54,740.00
Armendaiz Farms	Francisco B. Zamarron	4,311.6	4,311.6	375	3,234	137,445.00
Willie B. Kipp	Paso Real Farms, Inc	1,075.6	1,019.2	300	612	26,010.00
Alazan Farms	Same	1,731.9	1,697.5	425	1,443	61,327.50
Williamson County: H. A. Stiles estate	Same	1,281.1	1,281.1	200	512	21,760.00
Virginia: None						

[1] Ownership by more than 4 persons.

I would call the Members' attention to a few specifics in this list.

The greatest benefit from our cotton program flows to the J. G. Boswell interests in Arizona and California. Its share of the subsidy was $2,232,737. Kern County Land Co., Kern County, Calif., received $2,026,992.50. The Giffen interests in Fresno County, Calif., received $1,807,992.50. The Texas Department of Corrections, with farms in several counties, received $645,810. In Mississippi, Fine Spinners & Doublers, Ltd., received $644,215. A corporation styled the Race Track Corp., Leflore County, Miss., shared in $90,992.50 of subsidies. The Mississippi State Penitentiary received $239,827.50. The Arkansas State Penitentiary came in for $70,890. The Reserve Estate Life Insurance Co., Poinsett County, Ark., received $89,972.50. The International Paper Co., Jefferson County, Ark., received $56,397.50. Even Kilby Prison, in Alabama, received $39,057.50. I invite careful attention to this compilation.

I also offer for inclusion in the RECORD an additional table, disclosing the distribution, by size of allotments, of the subsidy for the year 1961.

TABLE 3.—*Subsidies under the Federal cotton program, 1961*

A. SUBSIDIES, BY STATES

Cotton producing States	Amount of subsidy	Farmers with allotments	Subsidy per farmer	Cotton producing States	Amount of subsidy	Farmers with allotments	Subsidy per farmer
Texas	$202,259,600	196,501	$1,029	South Carolina	$17,689,860	76,837	$230
California	72,452,156	14,943	4,845	Missouri	16,420,810	15,212	1,079
Mississippi	68,40[illegible],019	107,222	638	Oklahoma	15,728,366	45,220	348
Arkansas	61,775,799	59,186	1,044	New Mexico	12,744,790	5,345	2,384
Arizona	35,847,322	4,183	8,569	North Carolina	12,049,872	83,614	144
Alabama	25,881,769	118,473	218	Florida	580,491	8,700	67
Tennessee	23,575,252	61,227	385	Virginia	416,798	6,367	66
Georgia	21,838,268	82,583	265				
Louisiana	20,343,960	43,148	471	Total	608,008,132	928,761	

B. SUBSIDIES—BY SIZE OF FARMERS OBTAINING ALLOTMENTS

Size of allotment	Amount of subsidy [1]		Farmers with allotments		Subsidy per farmer	Size of allotment	Amount of subsidy [1]		Farmers with allotments		Subsidy per farmer
	Dollars	Percent	Farmers	Percent			Dollars	Percent	Farmers	Percent	
Above 5,000 acres	8,446,790	1.4	13	0.0	$649,753	15 to 30 acres	61,232,513	10.0	124,432	13.3	$492
1,000 to 5,000 acres	28,143,968	4.6	309	.0	91,080	10 to 15 acres	22,889,183	3.8	85,737	9.2	267
500 to 1,000 acres	45,141,375	7.4	1,148	.1	39,322	5 to 10 acres	29,102,640	4.8	226,046	24.3	93
200 to 500 acres	118,829,405	19.5	8,253	.9	9,809	0 to 5 acres	10,687,518	1.8	356,795	38.3	30
100 to 200 acres	135,809,898	22.3	21,486	2.3	6,321						
50 to 100 acres	90,987,443	15.0	48,920	5.3	1,860	Total	606,895,003	100.0	930,555	100.0	
30 to 50 acres	55,714,270	9.2	57,414	6.2	970						

[1] Does not include States of Nevada, Kentucky, Illinois, Florida, and Virginia.

NOTE.—"Subsidy" computed by multiplying rate of 8½ cents per pound by number of bales produced in the allotment categories shown.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Cotton Division, ASCS.

It shows that in 1961, there were 13 farmers in the United States with cotton allotments of over 5,000 acres. These 13 received total subsidies under the price support program of $8,446,790. That is an average of $649,753 each.

It will be seen that 79.4 percent of the entire subsidy goes to that 14.8 percent of all farmers who hold 30 acres or more. Farmers with allotments under 30 acres—85.2 percent of all cotton farmers—share only 20.6 percent of the subsidy.

It is said that the cotton program is of great benefit to the South. But does the program materially help the small southern farmer?

Here are the facts:

In 1961, 49.5 percent of all farmers holding cotton allotments in Georgia failed to plant. Of Georgia small farmers—under 10 acres—59.7 percent failed to plant. In California, 2 out of 703 large farmers—200 acres or more—failed to plant their allotments—less than one-third of 1 percent. Nationwide, more than half the small farmers—50.8 percent—failed to use allotments. Nationwide, only 1 percent of large farmers failed to plant. Further details appear in the attached table.

TABLE 4.—*Farmers not using cotton allotments, small farmers compared with large, 1961*

State	Total allotments obtained			Small farmers not using allotments			Large farmers not using allotments		
	State total	Not used	Percent not used	Small farmers obtaining	Not using	Percent not using	Large farmers obtaining	Not using	Percent not using
Texas	196,501	75,778	38.5	68,602	46,003	72.3	4,734	75	1.6
Alabama	118,473	40,224	34.0	93,337	36,733	39.4	198	0	0
Mississippi	107,222	43,938	41.0	78,988	40,741	51.6	1,409	4	.3
North Carolina	83,614	34,631	41.4	73,360	32,532	44.3	29	0	0
Georgia	82,583	40,905	49.5	58,434	34,865	59.7	119	3	2.5
South Carolina	76,837	31,224	40.6	56,881	26,861	47.2	112	0	0
Tennessee	61,227	15,747	25.7	45,523	14,844	32.6	97	0	0
Arkansas	59,186	21,255	35.9	31,621	17,909	56.6	1,153	8	.7
Oklahoma	45,220	20,466	45.3	21,894	14,657	66.9	93	2	2.2
Louisiana	43,148	19,068	44.2	30,033	17,397	57.9	331	3	.9
Missouri	15,212	2,157	14.2	6,380	1,786	27.9	161	0	0
California	14,943	2,971	20.2	4,398	2,323	52.8	703	2	.3
Florida	8,700	5,940	63.1	8,055	5,217	64.8	0		
Virginia	6,367	2,351	36.9	6,175	2,328	37.7	0		
New Mexico	5,345	455	8.5	1,707	335	19.6	106	0	0
Arizona	4,183	449	10.7	875	316	36.1	476	0	0
United States	928,761	357,069	38.4	582,841	296,151	50.8	9,721	97	1.0

NOTE.—"Small farmers," those obtaining allotments from 0.1 to 10 acres in size. "Large farmers," those obtaining allotments of 200 acres and more in size.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Cotton Division, ASCS.

Does the program materially help the small southern farmer? The above should provide an answer.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that cotton cannot be grown in the United States, for the world price of 24 cents a pound. It is said that when we pay the large farmer a subsidy of 8½ cents for each pound he grows, that, even then, he can barely make ends meet. Now, whether or not this is true, I do not know.

Recently, I asked that the Department of Agriculture advise me of the cost of producing cotton. I received a prompt and courteous reply, which I offer in its entirety. Cost is figured for the small farmer in the Piedmont region at 37.5 cents per pound—5 cents more than the support price. For the larger farmer, cost is figured at 35.1 cents per pound, or six-tenths a cent more than the support price. Now, this may be realistic. But quite possibly, it might be unrealistic.

Dr. Merle Prunty, Jr., chairman of the department of geography at the University of Georgia, has prepared a survey of cotton production costs, citing seven publications treating this very question. His summary, which is here included, indicates costs ranging from 12.77 cents per pound at a Georgia experimental station, to 24 cents per pound over the Southeast.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE,
FARM PRODUCTION ECONOMICS DIVISION,
Washington, D.C., September 16, 1963.

Hon. CHARLES L. WELTNER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WELTNER: In accordance with agreements reached in your conversation with Dr. Sherman E. Johnson, W. H. Brown, and E. L. Langsford, I am sending some data on the cost of producing cotton derived from our costs and returns series on cotton farms in the Southern Piedmont for 1961. Preliminary data for 1962 indicate that costs will be slightly higher, largely because of increased land values. Costs for producing cotton are calculated for two sizes of farms using three different methods. Table 1 shows detailed costs per acre and per pound of cotton lint for method 1. The results of all these methods are shown in table 2.

With method 1, operator and family labor is valued at $0.50 per hour, which is only slightly above the wage rate for hired labor in the area. Interest on investment is charged at 4.1 percent—the average rate charged by the Federal land bank from 1945 to 1958. Overhead and land charge are allocated to cotton according to the percentage of gross receipts from cotton. This method gives a cost of $0.344 and $0.323 per pound of lint for the small and large farms, respectively.

In method 2, the interest rate used to calculate the charge is increased from 4.1 percent to 6 percent (the current rate of interest on new loans by the Federal land bank). Costs obtained with this method are about 3 cents per pound higher than with method 1. On the other hand, if overhead and charges for the use of land are distributed according to acreage used (method 3), the cost is lowered by more than 5 cents per pound. This method of allocating overhead is frequently used but when applied to cotton farms cotton often shows a sizable margin of profit while other crops show a loss. Yet these other crops continue to be grown. Farmers apparently depend on cotton to carry most of the farm overhead.

The following data from the costs and returns series published in Agricultural Information Bulletin 230 (revised August 1963) provide some basis for interpreting the cost figures given in tables 1 and 2.

Year	Price received for lint	Return per hour [1] with capital charged at—		Hired labor wage rates per hour	Operator and family labor (hours)	Lint sold (pounds)
		4.1 percent	6 percent			
1958	$0.351	$0.76	$0.61	$0.45	2,600	9,112
1959	.329	.41	.29	.45	2,550	8,318
1960	.325	.34	.14	.47	2,350	7,218
1961	.340	.60	.40	.48	2,460	9,065
1962	.339	.61	.38	.50	2,380	9,972

[1] Family and operator labor.

With current prices received for other farm products, the price received for lint must be close to the cost obtained with the first method to return 4.1 percent on investment with current land values and hired wage rates to operator and family labor. In 1958, 1961, and 1962, prices received for cotton lint and other products sold were high enough to return more than these amounts. But if the interest rate is increased from 4.1 to 6 percent, 1958 is the only years in which returns to operator and family exceeded the wage rate for hired labor.

The data, of course, are for average farms. Some of our data indicate that producers on the better grades of land who use the most advanced technology have direct costs of 3 cents per pound or more below average. Also, producers with a greater than average proportion of the cropland in cotton tend to have less than average costs. For instance, a farmer with the size of farm and technology reported in the costs and returns series for 1962, but with 40 percent larger acreage of cotton could sell cotton for 2.2 cents per pound below the price received in 1962 and get the same income as the farmer with the acreage of cotton reported in 1962. This is because farm overhead is spread over a larger acreage.

I hope that this information will prove useful to you.

Sincerely yours,

GLEN T. BARTON,
Acting Director.

TABLE 1.—*Cost of producing cotton on cotton farms in the Southern Piedmont, 1961*

Item	Unit	Small	Large
Total land in farm	Acre	114	293
Cropland harvested	do	31	102
Cotton harvested	do	12	40
Yield of lint per acre [1]	Pound	357	368
Production of lint per farm	do	4,284	14,720
Total capital	Dollar	13,768	36,182
Total labor	do	2,330	7,110
Operator and family labor	Hour	1,850	2,970
Wage rate to hired workers	Dollar	0.478	0.478
Net farm income [1]	do	1,523	3,226
Cost per acre with normal yield:			
Normal yield per acre	Pound	357	368
Direct cost:			
Materials and services	Dollar	34.12	34.96
Hired labor	do	18.13	35.83
Irrigation	do		
Tractor and machinery	do	8.70	8.15
Depreciation [2]	do	3.46	2.78
Total direct cost	do	64.41	81.72
Indirect cost: [3]			
Overhead	do	14.08	14.05
Operator and family labor and management [4]	do	31.31	12.23
Capital charge [5]	do	26.17	24.63
Total indirect cost	do	71.72	50.91
Total all costs	do	136.13	132.63
Less value of seed	do	13.36	13.78
Net cost per acre	do	122.77	118.05
Net cost per pound	do	0.344	0.323

[1] Estimated normal yields for 1961.
[2] Depreciation allocated according to hours of tractor use.
[3] Overhead allocated by percent of gross receipts from cotton lint and seed.
[4] Valued at $0.50 per hour.
[5] Capital charged at 4.1 percent of total current value of farm investment Jan. 1 plus current expenses at current interest rate on short-term loans.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated costs per pound of producing cotton lint with different methods of charging overhead and operator labor, Southern Piedmont, 1961*

Method	Assumption	Southern Piedmont	
		Small	Large
1	Overhead allocated on basis of gross receipts, interest charged at 4.1 percent and operator and family labor charged at wage rates for comparable labor (same as in table 1)	$0.344	$0.323
2	Same as method 1 except capital charged at current rate of interest	.375	.351
3	Same as method 1 with overhead allocated on basis of crop acres	.293	.271

SURVEY OF COSTS OF COTTON PRODUCTION FROM PUBLISHED SOURCES

(By Merle Prunty, Jr., chairman, Department of Geography, University of Georgia)

1. "Can Cotton Pay?" North Carolina State College of Agriculture, Extension Folder No. 138, December 1956.

This publication lists the following (on overleaf) as estimated cotton production costs and returns with specified yields:

	1 bale per acre	1.5 bales per acre
Income:		
Lint at 32 cents per pound	$160.00	$240.00
Seed at $44 per ton	17.89	26.83
Expenses	109.57	149.13
(Seed; fertilizer; poisons; hauling; ginning; man labor in harvest, hoeing, and other; tractor and equipment costs; hand harvesting at $3.30 per 100 pounds of seed cotton included.)		
Net revenue	68.32	117.70
Net production cost per pound of lint cotton	.1833	.1630

NOTE.—This study does not take into consideration many recent cost-cutting developments such as preemergence and postemergence herbicidal sprays. It does not include the cost benefits of mechanical picking, and it apparently bases its costs on the use of two-row planting and cultivation equipment.

2. D. L. Branyon: "Can You Make Cotton Pay?" University of Georgia College of Agriculture, Agricultural Extension Service, circular 437, 1958.

This publication lists the following (overleaf) as the summary of results obtained by 72 Georgia farmers in 1957. These farmers averaged a production of 820 pounds lint per acre on 1,351 acres.

Yield: 820 pounds per acre, average.

Plant nutrient per acre, average: 81(N), 94(P), 113(K).

Number of times poisoned: 11.

Total cash cost, production per acre: $151.17.

Value of crop, seed and lint: $272.80 (cotton at 30 cents per pound).

Return on land, management, and equipment: $121.63.

Cost per pound of lint produced: 18 cents.

NOTE.—This study also is based upon hand harvesting at $40 per bale, and on other hand labor at 75 cents per hour. Though not stipulated, it apparently is based on use of two-row cultivating equipment, and preemergence—postemergence herbicidal sprays were not employed. If the latest, contemporary, techniques and equipment had been used, the reviewer's opinion is that production cost would have been considerably less than the 18 cents per pound indicated.

3. O. L. Brooks and C. E. Perry, "Cotton Production at the Southeast Georgia Branch Experiment Station," University of Georgia College of Agriculture, Agricultural Experiment Stations (Circular N.S. 22, 1961, 22 pp.).

This study involved the use of most contemporary techniques and machinery, and unusually detailed production cost analyses. Within the heading "Expenses," on all production cost analyses, the study includes the following: Acid-delinted breeder's seed; fertilizers; an allowance for liming each 5 years; herbicidal spray—pre- and past-emergence; hoe-hand labor; insecticides; defoliants; hail insurance; machinery charges by machine involved; hauling, ginning, and warehouse expenses; interest on operating capital at 6 percent; all labor.

Two production cost analyses are presented: One for 1960 which details costs on 94.8 acres grown at the Georgia Branch Experiment Station at Midville, Ga. (table 1), and one for 1958–60, 3 years averaged, on 76 acres at the same locality (table 2). The tables are summarized in abbreviated form below:

	1960: 94.8 acres	Average 1958–60: 76 acres
Receipts:		
Lint yield per acre ... pounds	560.38	684
Seed yield per acre ... do	967.88	1,183
Lint value per acre	[1] $173.13	[2] $218.13
Seed value per acre	$17.71	$21.65
Expenses (includes all items noted above) ... per acre	$109.17	$108.99
Net returns to land and management ... do	$83.69	$130.79
Net cost per pound cotton lint cents	15.96	12.77

[1] At $0.309 per pound.
[2] At $0.3189 per pound.

Table 3 of this study exhibits a comparison of costs, based on the 3-year experience, 1958–60, and on the same 76 acres, if two-row cultivating equipment has been used in lieu of the four-row equipment that actually was used. The comparison indicates that costs would have been $5.99 (9 cents per pound) higher per acre with two-row equipment.

Since 1959, six-row equipment—based on a new generation of tractors marketed recently by equipment manufacturers—has been used extensively in California, Texas, and the Mississippi Valley. Based on the comparisons made by Brooks and Perry in their table 3, this reviewer estimates that production costs reported in this study could have been reduced at least an additional 5 cents per pound had contemporary six-row equipment been used.

Table 6 exhibits a comparison of machine-harvesting versus hand-harvesting costs for the 76 acres in the 3-year study. Machine harvesting reduced production costs 6 cents per pound below what they would have been if hand harvesting had been used. The picker unit used was a one-row harvester. The study states that picker-harvesting costs are relatively high because of the one-row trait, and because the picker is integral with a tractor; thus harvesting costs necessarily reflect the tractor costs as well as those chargeable to the picker.

Table 4 details a comparison of savings via employment of bulk fertilizer spreading, and table 5 a comparison of savings based on use of spraying equipment in lieu of dusting equipment for insect control. The practices reduced costs per acre a total of $1.50 per acre (21 cents per pound lint) below what they would have been otherwise.

4. F. E. Justus, Jr., "Cotton Production Costs and Returns," University of Missouri, Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 758 (November 1960, 19 pp.).

This study reports findings from detailed records kept by 42 farmers during production of the 1959 cotton crop in southeastern Missouri's section of the Mississippi alluvial valley. The 42 farms average 57 acres in cotton planted; however, 19 of them contained less than 24 acres (an average of 12.1 acres per farm) and only 9 contained more than 100 acres planted to cotton.

Details of production costs are summarized in table 3. The cost analysis system is fully comparable to that used in other studies cited in this review, and is even more detailed than that in the Brooks and Perry study from the Georgia Experiment Station. For example, a charge against land at 5 percent of appraised market value, plus total land taxes, is included in cost calculations.

The 42 farmers used a variety of production techniques; notably there was great variation in harvesting techniques. The abbreviation of table 6, below, details the variations involved:

Harvesting method	Number of farms	Harvest cost	
		Per acre	Per 100 pounds of lint
Machine only	11	$42.20	$6.63
Machine plus handsnapping	3	30.35	5.74
Machine plus handpicking	13	49.77	7.22
Machine plus both handsnapping and handpicking	6	58.39	7.69
Handpicking only	9	68.21	9.34

There were other variations in cultivation, fertilization, weed and insect control. Similarly, there were variations in land quality, labor inputs, age and efficiency of machinery. One farmer used mules for certain tasks.

Since size of cotton operation also was a major variable, it is significant to note that both the highest cost and the lowest cost producers grew less than 20 acres of cotton. Differentials in productivity per acre, then, were more important than size of operational unit per se. "Farmers, by increasing their lint yield from 520 to 831 pounds/acre, almost doubled their net income per acre."

The study cites an average production cost of 22 cents per pound lint, for the 42 farms. However, this is incorrect, since recapitulation of the receipts/costs enumerations (table 2) reveals that no credit was allowed for income received from the sale of seed. When corrected, the average production cost was: 19 cents per pound lint.

Table 1 indicates (when corrected for seed sales) that 26 of the 42 farms grew cotton for less than 19 cents, that 9 grew it for less than 16 cents, that 6 grew it for less than 14 cents, and that 2 farmers grew the crop for less than 13 cents per pound lint. The lowest cost individual producer grew his lint for approximately 12.44 cents per pound.

5. W. F. Hughes and A. C. Magee: "An Economic Analysis of Irrigated Cotton Production, Middle Brazos River Valley, 1955–58," A. & M. College of Texas, Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, Miscellaneous Publication 580 (May 1962, 12 pp.).

This study summarizes 4 years of record-keeping on 12 farms in Brazos, Burleson, and Robertson Counties, Tex., between 1955 and 1958. The farms ranged in size from 180 to 1,800 acres, but most were 600–800-acre units. Some produced by irrigation; others did not. Production techniques varied widely, as did also the prices received for a wide range in grades/classes of lint sold. The production cost per pound of lint, however, was rather uniform (table 7, p. 10):

Per lint pound in cents

Irrigated producers' cost of production, 4-year average: 18.31

Dryland producers' cost of production, 4-year average: 18.85

The cost analysis involved is compatible, and comparable in detail, with studies previously cited in this review.

6. W. H. Brown and D. D. Caton: "Cotton Farms, San Joaquin Valley: Organization, Costs and Returns, 1947–59," U.S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Economics Division, Economic Research Service, Agriculture Economic Report No. 3 (Washington, December 1961), 27 pages.

This study treats three types of cotton-growing farms in the San Joaquin Valley: (1) medium-sized cotton—general farms averaging 300 acres of cropland on which barley and alfalfa are the main companion crops to cotton; (2) cotton-specialty farms, of same average size as above, but producing such additional specialties as melons, potatoes, onions, sweetpotatoes; (3) and large

cotton-general farms ranging from 640 to 1,600 acres cropland and averaging about 1,000 acres. The number of farms studied is not stipulated either in total or by category.

This report does not contain a tabulation which, in and of itself, reports or produces a cost-per-pound figure for lint cotton production. However, table 10 exhibits a comparison of returns from small and large acreages of cotton produced on medium-sized cotton-general farms. The average acreage planted to cotton is reported as 115 acres, which produced 1,040 pounds of lint per acre average. Production expenses and net income from cotton are reported, respectively, at $39,585 and $27,375 (33 cents per pound sale price) per farm.

It is, therefore, possible to compute the cost of production from this table, as follows:

Gross from cotton per acre	$343.20
Net income per acre	$195.74
Expenses (gross-net)	$147.46
Cost per pound lint (1,040 pounds per acre) (cents)	14.17

There is nothing to indicate whether or not the sale price of seed was considered in computing production costs. Cross-tallying of gross incomes with lint yields, volumes produced, and lint prices, suggests that the value of the seed yield was not included. Therefore this reviewer is left with the feeling that the production cost was quite probably 12 cents per pound lint, or even slightly less.

7. Eugene Butler, "What Does It Cost To Grow Cotton?" Progressive Farmer, volume 78, No. 4 (April 1963, p. 46).

This article is an informal, running account of production costs from many individuals in many areas, viz:

(a) High Plains of Texas: "Per-pound cost of production is often 20 cents or less." Elsewhere "16.5 to 20 cents."

(b) Mississippi Valley: "One of the top plantations is King and Anderson, near Clarksdale, Miss." "They are growing cotton for about 21 cents a pound."

(c) From Alabama Experiment Station studies on large and small farms in south Alabama, Mr. Butler cites the following:

Machine-harvested cotton, average yield 800 pounds per acre.

Large farms (200-acre allotments), 15.3 cents per pound.

Small farms (20-acre allotments), 17.5 cents per pound.

(Seed value deducted before lint cost computed.)

(d) North Carolina Extension Service, quoted as reporting production costs of "top 10 percent of the State's producers" as 19 cents per pound.

(e) San Patricio County, Tex. (an individual farm record not identified by name): 16 cents per pound.

(f) Mississippi Delta Farms: "16–22 cents" (p. 51).

(g) Southeast—Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina: "16–24 cents" (p. 51).

Other, individual growers also cited with production costs generally within the foregoing range of costs.

SUMMARY

This review of publications treating costs of cotton production includes studies from representative cotton production regions from coast to coast. Excluding the Progressive Farmer report of Mr. Butler, which underscores the findings of the other reports, the publications treat production costs in detail and in comparable manner.

Summarized, the findings reported on production costs, per pound lint, are as follows:

1. North Carolina, 1956: 18.33 cents at 500 pounds per acre level; 16.3 cents at 750 pounds per acre level.

2. Georgia (72 farmers in 1957): 18 cents at 820 pounds per acre level.

3. Georgia, experimental farm, 1960: 15.96 cents at 560.3 pounds per acre level; experimental farm, 1958–60 average: 12.77 cents at 684 pounds per acre level.

4. Mississippi Valley, Southeast Missouri (42 farms) 1959: 19 cents at 680 pounds per acre level.

5. Brazos Valley, Tex., 1955–58 average: Irrigated producers: 18.31 cents a pound at 823 pounds per acre level; dryland producers: 18.85 cents a pound at 400 pounds per acre level.

6. San Joaquin Valley, Calif.: Unspecified number of cotton-general farms: 14.7 cents (or less) at 1,040 pounds per acre level.

7. Eugene Butler, progressive farmer: Reports from many districts citing production costs from 15.3 cents per pound to 24 cents per pound.

The reviewer concludes that substantial amounts of cotton have been grown for 18 cents per pound, or less, that production at this cost level is widely distributed throughout the cotton-growing States, and that the evidence suggests much cotton has been produced at 16 cents per pound, or less.

Since most of the studies reviewed herein are at least 4 crop-years old, it is necessary to conclude that production at a cost of 18 cents, or less, has been going on for some time.

It is also appropriate to suggest that, currently, production costs probably are lower than reported by the studies reviewed herein, because of continued improvement of production techniques, equipment and insecticides during the past 5 years.

Of course, not being an agricultural expert, I am not qualified to judge the accuracy of these sources.

Nor am I competent to say which nearer states the facts—the Department's letter or Dr. Prunty's summary.

However, I am qualified to recognize the vast gulf of difference between the two.

If cost figures of the Department of Agriculture are applicable, then the $2,232,737 that the public paid to the Boswell interests in California and Arizona hardly is enough. Producing 62,535 bales in 1961, there would be nonetheless a loss of $67,505. If this be the case, the subsidy should be increased.

If Dr. Prunty's lowest estimate is applicable, Boswell not only would have received a public gift of $2,232,737, but would have made a profit, at world prices, of $3,511,340.25.

Again, I do not attempt to arbitrate the issue of cost. I offer no judgments, only the fact of a wide divergence of opinions.

Mr. Speaker, if Americans are to continue to pay subsidies in excess of $608 million annually to growers; if the small cotton farmer is to continue to receive from this subsidy but $5 per month; if the largest producer is to continue to receive a subsidy of $2,232,737—the American people should have all the facts. They are entitled to know where their money goes. They are entitled to know what part of that subsidy is cost, and what part is profit. And they are entitled to ask whether this program is to remain unchanged in spite of two-price cotton and all its evils.

Mr. Speaker, in recent decades, farm families have moved to the cities in great multitudes. There is already a pressing national problem in unemployment. With no farm program, our Nation would doubtless be gripped by an unemployment crisis of major proportions. This is not to mention the distressing human aspects of sudden upheaval of thousands of farm families. I have a deep concern for the welfare of the small farmer. I realize that by providing this minimal support, we are in part helping him to remain on the farm.

For decades, the family farmer has faced grave economic problems. Most assuredly, I would not add to his already heavy burden. Nor would I deprive him of the meager assistance now given him. But, Mr. Speaker, are we, in fact, helping the small farmer? Is $5 per month out of a subsidy of $608 million enough? Does the small farmer profit from these subsidies? Is our complex and expensive program helping him, who needs it most? Or has it served only to enrich large producers who need it least?

The small cotton farmer continues in the need of assistance. We should assure for him the opportunity to earn a fair share of the Nation's wealth.

Is there no way to do this, and at the same time eliminate both two-price cotton and huge subsidies to Western growers?

Our program should serve three important groups—the consumer and the taxpayer, who pay $608 million a year in subsidies, and the small farmer, who receives from these millions the sum of $5 per month.

Surely there is a better way.

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

Mr. WELTNER. Yes, I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia for taking this time to bring to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the problem confronting the entire cotton industry in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Georgia, I represent a congressional district which by and large does not produce a pound of cotton, or if it does produce any, it is negligible. However, this is a matter of grave concern to the entire country. I have talked with the cotton producers and with the textile manufacturers, and others, and I am hopeful that before this session is concluded this Congress will pass a bill which will be helpful in this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman and thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WELTNER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana for his comments.

CREDIT UNION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

CREDIT UNION NEXT TO CHURCH IN IMPORTANCE IN MANY COUNTRIES OF WORLD

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is Credit Union Day. The credit union is next in importance to the church in many communities in the world. The Associated Press within the last few minutes has carried on the wire the following statement about a meeting at the White House this morning. It is inserted herewith:

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy lauded credit unions today as "a form of self-help in the best American tradition."

Then, on National Credit Union Day, he signed a bill that grants greater flexibility of operations to federally chartered credit unions.

At a ceremony in his office, Kennedy said credit unions perform a valuable function in "permitting people to pool their resources and obtain greater economic security."

With a touch of home State pride, the President said Massachusetts was the first State to pass a law authorizing credit unions. That was 54 years ago. Now there are unions in every State.

"Fourteen million American citizens have used their facilities to accumulate $7 billion in savings," Kennedy said.

"With their growth has [sic] come increased opportunities for service—in teaching thrift—in making credit available to people without major assets at reasonable rates of interest."

Standing behind the President were Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, and Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, who sponsored the bill the Chief Executive signed.

They told reporters Credit Union Day is being observed around the world in 70 countries which have credit unions.

We were in the office of the President this morning to witness the signing of H.R. 4842, which I introduced in the House of Representatives, to allow Federal Credit Unions greater flexibility in their operations.

Along with me were Senator SPARKMAN, who guided the bill through the Senate; J. Deane Ganno, Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions; and three top men from the Credit Union National Association: J. Orrin Shipe, managing director; Julius Stone, chairman of the legal and legislative committee, and David R. Weinberg, director of the legal and legislative department.

Mr. Kennedy made a very excellent statement about Credit Union Day, and I would like to read it into the RECORD at this time.

THE WHITE HOUSE STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Today, credit unions throughout the Nation are celebrating Credit Union Day. It is therefore particularly appropriate that we recognize the occasion by signing this bill, which allows Federal Credit Unions greater flexibility in their operation.

Credt unions have had a long history of service. They perform a valuable function—permitting people to pool their resources and attain greater economic security. It is a form of self-help in the best American tradition.

Fifty-four years ago, Massachusetts passed the first State law authorizing credit unions. Now, there are active units in every one of the 50 States, and there is a Federal Credit Union Act. Fourteen million American citizens have used their facilities to accumulate $7 billion in savings.

With their growth has come increased opportunities for service—in teaching thrift—in making credit available to people without major assets at reasonable rates of interest.

This legislation, which I am delighted to approve, was sponsored by Congressman PATMAN and Senator SPARKMAN. Their longstanding interest in credit unions is known to all of us. We are grateful to them for their leadership.

Of course, Senator SPARKMAN and I were both pleased to offer this assistance to credit unions.

It gave me great pleasure to participate in this ceremony at the White House which had a dual purpose. First, we are marking the enactment of H.R. 4842, a bill which I sponsored in the House and Senator SPARKMAN in the Senate, and it will equip Federal credit unions to serve their members more expeditiously.

Second, we are marking International Credit Union Day. All day today credit union members are gathering around the globe to pay tribute to the idea of the founders which have made their movement possible.

Whether they are the poor in Korea and Bolivia or Fiji or even in the cities and towns of this country, they are all thankful that the idea of economic self-help through credit unions has been brought to them.

The credit union movement has proved itself a stanch foe of loan sharks and usury and has helped countless people to become economically self-sufficient.

The democratic idea of credit unions has proved just as stanch a foe of communism wherever the two meet. I am sure that when credit unions and Communists come face to face, it will be the democracy of the credit unions which will triumph.

I wish to congratulate the leaders of the credit union movement represented by the Credit Union National Association for their devotion to their fight against high interest costs. My best wishes to all of you.

It seems hard to believe, but the first speech I made about credit unions was on the floor of the House over 29 years ago. That was on June 16, 1934, the day the Federal Credit Union Act passed the House of Representatives. It passed the Senate on the same day and became the law when President Roosevelt signed it.

My good friend, Senator Morris Sheppard, from my hometown of Texarkana, led the bill through the Senate. The first credit union was named in his honor and is still going strong in Texarkana. I had the pleasure to appear before the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House in support of this bill. I believe I was the only Member of the House or Senate who appeared before the House Committee on Banking and Currency in behalf of the bill before it was reported out by the committee in 1934. I was not a member of the Banking and Currency Committee until 1937. That was in 1934. I sponsored the Sheppard bill in the House and did all the footwork in connection with its passage in the House, although a number of the House Members were sympathetic and in many ways helped, which is disclosed by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during that session of Congress.

I was reminded of these thoughts when my attention was called to the fact that October 17 is International Credit Union Day. Since the passage of the Federal act, credit unions have gone a long way.

Not long ago, when representatives of the Credit Union National Association and the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency, I was impressed to learn of the growth of these self-help enterprises.

For example, membership in U.S. credit unions, both State and Federal, is nearly 14 million. Assets are over $7 billion. In 1934, credit union statistics were reported in hundreds and thousands. Now they are reported in millions and billions.

As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, I was particularly impressed with the balance achieved between the size and number of State and Federal credit unions. The balance in membership, savings, assets, and other categories is almost exactly 50-50. This means that both State and federally chartered credit unions are doing a fine job, and one is not dominating the other.

There have been some reports that credit unions now are abandoning their traditional concept, especially in the vital area of the common bond. Every credit union, according to the Federal and most State acts, must have a valid common bond.

These include groups having ties of occupation or association, or to groups within a well-defined neighborhood, community, or rural district. The community credit unions have been particularly criticized, yet this is puzzling since the very first credit union in the United States was a communitywide credit union.

Far from "losing" their traditional identity, credit unions are maintaining it to a remarkable degree. The growth that is so striking, especially to their competitors, has been brought about because they have filled a need. They were the first to supply the common man with a safe place to save and a reliable place to borrow at low cost.

The spirit that motivated the passage of the Federal Credit Union Act has now extended to other countries. Credit unions are now operative in nearly all the Central and South American countries.

In this work, the organized credit union movement in the United States is cooperating with the Agency for International Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Peace Corps. South of the border, just as in the United States, the prevalence of high interest rates accounts for the rapid growth of credit unions.

Bolivia is an example of a country benefiting from credit union development. In 1960, there were just 3 credit unions in the country. Now there are 80, with the equivalent of $144,000 in U.S. dollars saved. With proper support, it is estimated that there can be 300 credit unions operating there in 1967.

This projection is not surprising when it is understood that the usual interest obtainable on a consumer loan there is

10 percent per month, or 120 percent a year.

I am happy to say to the credit union movement: Well done, and best wishes for the future.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Thank you very much. I am very happy that the distinguished dean of the Texas delegation and the most able chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, our own colleague from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], has yielded in order to enable me to add my comments to his. In other words, those of us who have benefited immeasurably by the credit union movement do find that it is a happy occasion to congratulate the movement on its anniversary and particularly our distinguished chairman and colleague because of the tremendous work that he has done in behalf of providing consumer credit in the most obtainable form for countless thousands of people who would not otherwise have it. For example, in my district Federal credit unions have grown tremendously. There are 85 credit unions in Bexar County, Tex., which is the 20th Congressional District, with 69,202 members. Their assets amount to $28,518,600. The loans outstanding represent $24,482,700 and the savings reflect $25,399,300.

Incidentally, a very important point to make is that the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions is a Government agency requiring no tax money. It is supported by supervisory and examination fees paid by the credit unions.

I am very happy that I have this chance to make public a statement of accomplishments because on a firsthand basis I have knowledge of the tremendous good it has done individuals and families in my home district. And I wish to make patent the tremendous contribution that the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the dean of our Texas delegation, has made personally in this regard.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Bexar County, the city of San Antonio, the distinguished Congressman from that district, for his remarks. He is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and has helped to sponsor and has sponsored every credit union bill that has been before that committee. He is one of the best supporters that the credit unions have on our committee in the House of Representatives or in the Congress. I am glad to hear that fine report from his own district about the advancement and progress of the credit unions in that area.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to my colleague from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join in expressing my congratulations to our distinguished colleague, the dean of the Texas delegation [Mr. PATMAN]; and in expressing my personal appreciation and that of many thousands of people in my area for the untiring and farsighted work and vision on his part which has brought this movement along to its present state.

Countless numbers of people in my area, as well as throughout the country, have benefited by the work of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on this distinguished and important committee of the House.

I should like to say also that I have had some opportunity to observe, as the gentleman from Texas has pointed out, the fact that the growth of credit unions throughout the rest of this hemisphere, in Central and South America, has been one of the really stabilizing factors in the economies of those countries. In Peru, for example, Father Daniel McLellan, a Maryknoll priest, whom I have the pleasure of knowing, began a credit union with some 23 Indians in a little mountain village at Puno, who, between them, were able to put together the munificent sum of only $30. But this was the only source of available credit for these people to buy such things as seed, fertilizer, and the necessary implements to ply the farming of their acres, to get from the patrimony of their land what they could to see a better tomorrow for their children.

The movement has gone on in that country until today I am informed there are more than 200 credit unions, all of them highly successful, and with a negligible bad-debt loss. This has proven that those people are worthy of credit, that given the opportunity to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps they do so.

This, in my opinion, has become a form of grassroots help that has been very practical, and has aided and assisted those friendly countries to the south of us. For this, too, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who deserves great congratulations.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from the Fort Worth area in Texas who has been a good friend of the credit union movement. He has been very helpful in the passing of many bills in support of the credit unions. I appreciate his contribution to this debate.

OIL DEPLETION PREFERENTIAL LEGISLATION—PART II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks have gone by since I addressed the House on preferential legislation for the oil interests.

More information has come to light on this vast industry which has thrived on the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance so generously provided by the American public over the years. Let us make no mistake, these oil boys know their way around. To get information on this subject can be likened to pulling teeth, but I intend to continue my relentless drive to get to the bottom and to bring to the attention of the American taxpayer every facet of this gigantic operation of the "untouchable" few.

Clearly, the current inflated depletion allowance is an unnecessary indulgence on the part of the Federal Government in favor of one of this Nation's most prosperous industries. The loss of revenue to the Government from the 27½-percent allowance for oil and gas, as well as from similar allowances to mining and other industries at somewhat lower rates, has been enormous.

In 1957 the total tax deductions for U.S. corporations under depletion provisions was $3 billion, of which the oil and gas industry alone accounted for $2 billion. At the same time, the oil industry was spending approximately $5 billion annually for exploration and development, with $1 billion lost down dry holes each year. In other words, the Government is providing $1 billion or more annually in tax relief to the oil industry under the heading of depletion allowances—for no reason better than undisguised favoritism. Calculation of the $5 billion ventured and $1 billion lost yearly on the single exploration aspect of the oil-production process would allow complete coverage of the loss at a depletion rate of only 20 percent.

The reasonable reduction of the depletion rate for oil and gas is a necessity; its complete elimination is also a possibility to be considered. There is no magic associated with the current rate; 27½ percent is nothing more than the result of a 37-year-old legislative compromise. Fixing a new rate is bound to be equally arbitrary, but at least it could be more in line with later and more rational depletion allowances on other natural resources.

At 27½ percent: Oil, gas.

At 23 percent: Bauxite, lead, mercury, nickel, platinum, zinc, tin, uranium, sulfur.

At 15 percent: Clay, gold, iron, slate, marble, copper, silver, gypsum.

At 10 percent: Coal and others.

Conclusion: Oil and gas prosper, yet enjoy a 27½-percent rate; while coal, a floundering and hard-pressed industry, is given only a 10-percent tax break.

Taking an arbitrary but reasonable reduction to 15 percent, and complete elimination, the following revenues would accrue to the Government:

Revenue effect of reducing or eliminating percentage depletion for oil and gas

[In millions of dollars]

27½ to 15 percent:	
Gross revenue increase (immediate)	390
Longrun dividend effect	−65
Net revenue increase annually	325
27½ to 0 percent:	
Gross revenue increase	925
Longrun dividend effect	−125
Net revenue increase annually	800

Whatever the system, each percentage point reduction in the oil depletion allowance is worth about $32 million annually in additional tax revenue. In an industry where exploration requires less time, less equipment, and less financial risk than ever before, this windfall to oil corporations should be modified or eliminated.

To give you a brief summary on the positions taken by past Congresses and administrations, I include the following:

Congress has investigated the oil depletion allowance nine times since 1926.

In 1933–34: Investigation of administration's abolition proposals—no changes.

In 1937: Investigation of administration's abolition proposals—no changes.

In 1941–42: Investigation of administration's abolition proposals—no changes.

In 1950: Investigation of administration's reduction proposals—no changes.

In 1951, 1954, 1958, 1959: Senate upheld existing rate. There are, however, signs of increasing Senate support for the downward modification of the depletion allowance, as evidenced in the following Senate rollcall votes:

In 1951: 71 against, 9 for.

In 1958: 63 against, 26 for.

In 1959: 58 against, 31 for; and 54 against, 21 for—and in these two rollcalls, more of the nonvoting Senators announced for the bills than announced against.

Roosevelt administration: Favored abolition.

Truman administration: Favored reduction to 15 percent.

Eisenhower administration: Took no public position.

Kennedy administration: Current tax proposals take a back-door approach to reducing the depletion allowance, reflecting first, preference for a gradual reduction scheme; second, feeling that companies can bear additional tax burdens more easily than can individuals.

I have also come across the following table which presents some very interesting facts:

Ratio of net income after taxes to net assets in the oil industry and others, 1947–58

Industry	Number of companies	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952	1951	1950	1949	1948	1947
Oil and gas producing	[1] 76	11.8	16.5	16.0	16.2	15.3	16.4	16.3	19.5	18.3	21.7	35.9	19.9
Oil refining	45	10.0	13.4	14.6	14.1	13.7	14.3	14.4	16.5	14.9	13.2	22.1	15.8
Chemicals	72	11.1	14.0	15.6	17.7	14.5	13.3	13.7	16.3	21.3	16.5	17.7	17.2
Drugs	27	21.9	24.0	22.4	18.3	15.8	13.7	14.0	19.2	21.9	16.2	19.0	20.6
Soap and cosmetics	19	15.7	17.8	16.2	16.0	14.6	12.4	12.6	15.4	20.9	(2)	(2)	(2)
Cement	30	16.0	15.9	19.5	20.3	18.8	14.7	14.1	14.1	18.2	18.1	16.6	12.2
Glass	27	11.9	15.3	16.6	20.5	16.3	14.9	14.7	15.3	23.6	18.5	16.0	17.4
Office equipment	26	14.1	17.5	17.3	16.9	15.1	12.8	14.3	16.9	19.0	18.5	25.6	27.1
Automobiles	15	8.8	16.4	15.7	29.1	21.1	18.0	18.5	17.5	32.3	30.8	26.0	20.8
Aircraft	39	14.[illegible]	20.1	21.6	24.7	27.4	21.0	8.9	9.8	7.3	7.2	10.2	10.5
Total manufacturing	1,852	9.8	12.8	13.9	15.0	12.4	12.5	12.3	14.4	17.1	13.8	18.9	17.0

[1] Also, chart includes more oil companies than companies in any other category; reaching further down the corporate scale probably has the effect of lowering the overall profits for an industry as the more marginally successful corporations are figured in.

[2] Categories combined in these years.

Source: First National City Bank of New York.

NOTES

	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952	1951	1950	1949	1948	1947
Rank of oil's profits among the 10 listed industries	7/10	5/10	7/10	8/10	6/10	3/10	2/10	1/10	7/10	2/9	1/9	3/9

CONCLUSIONS

The oil industry was one of the top 3 most profitable industries in 6 of the above 12 years.

The oil industry was more profitable than every one of the 1,852 industries grouped under total manufacturing in every one of the above 12 years, oil exceeding total manufacturing by the following percentages each year:

Percentage	2.0	3.7	2.1	1.2	2.9	3.9	4.0	5.1	1.2	7.9	17.0	2.9

This completes part II of my dissertation on this tax bonanza at the expense of the American public.

I shall continue my spadework for more facts, and I hope soon to give you additional highlights on this preferential legislation.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill H.R. 8720.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there has been the understanding that requests to transact business of a general nature in the House would not be brought up after the House goes into special orders.

I am not going to object to this request, but I here and now serve notice that I will object to any future requests to transact business of a general nature affecting all of the House after we go to special orders. As far as I am concerned, this will be the last such unanimous consent that will be granted.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. May I explain to the gentleman from Iowa that there was every intention of presenting this request prior to the time the House went into special orders, but through inadvertence that did not occur. It has been cleared with the leadership and members of both parties who are concerned with it. I thank the gentleman for withholding his objection.

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

There was no objection.

THE CAUSE OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND HUMAN DIGNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in behalf of every American and the cause of civil rights and human dignity.

We stand here a full 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation proclaimed the freedom of the slaves. Yet many of the traditions and trappings of that evil institution—slavery—still exist. We stand here 10 years after the U.S. Supreme Court decided that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal and deprives members of the minority group the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment. And the 14th amendment was enacted to implement the Emancipation Proclamation. Yet the old attitudes and patterns of behavior persist and children are denied the opportunities of education and of bettering themselves by those of us who are older and presumably wiser, on the simple basis that the skin color of some children is a shade or two darker than others. We are a nation founded by a group who fled the Old World because of religious persecution. We are a nation built on the rock of belief that "all men are created equal." Yet we are not free from intolerance and unreasonable discrimination.

We tell ourselves and the peoples of the world the message of peace and good will. Yet we resort to violence in our own land. For many American Negroes street, homes, and even churches have been made unsafe places.

Yet when it became known that some of us would on this day speak out against these practices and express our indignation at the American brand of terrorism, some persons met us with doubts and skepticism. They have asked us to let well enough alone. They have said that by speaking out today from the floor of this House matters would be aggravated. They have warned that the situation would be stirred up. I guess they mean now that the dust from the latest bombings and the freshest graves has settled.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot stir up a whirlwind that has wrecked a number of cities and killed and wounded people. That whirlwind is already stirred up. We speak today in the belief that a wound covered and neglected is more

likely to fester and became infected than to heal by itself. We speak to lift the bandages of apathy and the callouses of indifference, not to aggravate the wounds. Our goals are to seek ways to repair the damage that has been done, and most importantly to prevent further damage. To be unconcerned with the problems of our time today is sinful in every sense of the word. To be silent is criminal.

We realize that we will win no converts on this day among our fellow citizens who do not accept our values. To them the old way of life is apparently more important than the dignity and well-being of the minority groups. We do not demand that segregationists become integrationists. We are not unrealistic. But these matters must be discussed in public despite the discomfort that results. The alternative of silence is the pathway to a wasteland. A wasteland of moral and spiritual values that will herald devastation of a material kind that even the simplest of us will know and understand.

The lessons of history are often forgotten. The next generation is not necessarily wiser than the last. But how can we forget the lessons of World War II? How can we forget the men and boys who died fighting the racial madness of Adolph Hitler? The people were silent in Nazi Germany. Nazi thugs burned synagogues and those who did not participate were silent. They passed the infamous Nuremberg laws to make racial and religious discrimination and bigotry the law of the land, and those who did not actually welcome their newfound advantages over the minority groups were silent. They beat up Jews on the streets, old and young, women and children. And those that did not actually strike blows were silent. Inevitably the racial and religious hatred led to violence. When the millions of men, women, and children were imprisoned in the concentration camps and murdered in the gas chambers those who were not present were silent.

Those who acquiesced by their silence were as guilty as those who held the torches, who threw the bombs, who pulled the triggers and who closed the doors to the gas chambers. Yet the soldiers protest that they were only following orders. The Eichmanns protest that they were only following orders. The citizens protest that they did not realize what was happening and there was nothing they could do about it. Some, even today, say that it was somehow the victims' fault for getting themselves exterminated.

They say they were not responsible. But they were. The ones who remained silent were as guilty as those who shouted "Heil Hitler." The businessmen who manufactured the gas and the furnaces in which the bodies were cremated were as guilty as those who gave the orders for the executions. This was the wasteland in Nazi Germany.

There is a dangerous degree of indifference to the sufferings of fellow human beings amongst Americans today. There are reports that some of us are blaming the Negroes for getting themselves beaten and killed.

Mr. Speaker, it is a ridiculous accusation. It is an excuse and an attempt to dodge reality. People do not want themselves hosed down and prodded with electric prod sticks. People do not want themselves attacked by dogs. People do not want themselves beaten and bombed, maimed and murdered.

The words "national disgrace" are appropriate to describe the violent course that the civil rights movement has taken. But to blame the Negroes and the other minority groups for the violence inflicted on them is a twisted form of reasoning. We are here today to blame no particular community, State, or region. We blame no group. We are all responsible. Even those of us who live in districts where there are relatively few Negroes are guilty if we remain silent. But while we come not to blame anyone, none are blameless.

That is the message we are trying to convey to the people of this great Nation today. We plead not only for reason and sanity, not only for nonviolence. We ask every American to reflect on the problems in his country, to raise his voice wherever it is necessary, to cry out against hatred and violence.

To implement this objective and to clarify the matter of law enforcement, I make the following requests:

First. The Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Justice have expressed some doubt as to the intent of Congress in passing the Civil Rights Act of 1960, and particularly the provisions dealing with the criminal violations of using or possessing explosives. Doubt has been expressed as to who has jurisdiction to investigate and prosecute these crimes. If there is official doubt in Federal agencies then Congress has a right to know about it and Congress ought to know about it through official channels. I, therefore, request the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Attorney General of the United States to convey to this Congress their position on this portion of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 and on the question of who has jurisdiction to investigate and prosecute under section 1074 of the act.

Second. I ask every American who has not spoken out on this subject to communicate with the elected and appointed officials in their communities and States, with the communications media and with the Members of this Congress. Let yourselves be heard for the cause of human dignity and nonviolence.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for taking this special order, and I wish to associate myself with his remarks. I think it is extremely appropriate at this time that Members of the Congress should be expressing their concern over this very serious problem, which casts shame upon all of us.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. I, too, should like to express my congratulations and appreciation to the gentleman from Texas for his deep interest in this matter.

It is typical of the deep humanity and the inherently sympathetic nature of my colleague from San Antonio, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], that he would feel so keenly the violence which recently has punctuated race relations in our country, culminating in the wanton slaying of four innocent children on a Sunday morning while they were in church.

Yet it should not be strange that a Member of the U.S. Congress would feel a tragic sense of loss nor an impelling personal responsibility to speak out over such a senseless deed. That such a thing could happen at all is a symptom of a sickness in our society. It would be a sad commentary indeed if our culture had become so brutalized as to lose the capacity for moral outrage or sensitivity to so needless a loss.

The loss of any child of this land, and the unspeakable anguish visited upon the parents, is in one sense a loss to us all. The sunrises these children will never see could have been as beautiful to them as to my own children, the simple joys of noontime play as sweet, the daily dramas of triumph and disappointment as poignant, their evening prayers as precious.

How purposeless a loss. Four little lives sacrificed upon the pagan altar of hatred. How innocent were they of the violent, raging tide of uncontrolled anger which crushed the breath from their bodies. How blameless were they for the forces of ugly unreasoning conflict which motivated their assassins. Their only crime was being born at a time when some Americans have been taught to hate one another. They were too young to hate or even to know what it was all about.

What insanity possessed their slayers? To what depths of depravity must a man sink to throw a bomb in a church where people have gone to worship the God of love who, as St. Paul tells us, "created of one blood all the nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth"?

It is the insanity of race hatred. And insanity it is. Why in the name of reason would I hate my friend, "BOB" NIX, or my friend, "BILL" DAWSON? What difference, beneath the skin, is there between us? Do they not dream the same dreams as I? Do they not serve the same country? Do they love this land any less? What have they done to me except befriend me? I tell you I would be insane if I felt for them anything but kindliness and friendship.

And this is what is wrong. The sane men have been silent, and the insane men have spoken. Harsh voices honed on hatred, they have spewed out the poison of prejudice. Men of reason and responsible restraint have muted their message and defaulted their obligation;

while men of violent irresponsibility have screamed from the rooftops. They have fanned the flames of passion and made a shambles of the dignity of law.

This is by no means the first act of violence to cast its dark stain upon the honor of our land. It is only perhaps the most depraved. But we who deplore it cannot, like Pontius Pilate, simply wash our hands of the blood of these little children at this Sunday school nor of the other innocent victims of violence. Though perhaps it was not our demagoguery that caused it, we of good will somehow did not offer the leadership that could have prevented it.

Whom do we serve when we allow this land so blessed with benefits of every kind to become divided by bitterness? We need our national unity today perhaps more than ever in the face of an international ideological challenge to all that we hold dear. Surely it is not a time to let the mantle of leadership fall to those agitated ones in our midst, on either side, who divide Americans against Americans.

Sentimentally and emotionally, I have an attachment for the South. It is the land of my forebears. It has some fine and noble traditions. But hatred is not one of them. Bitterness is not one of them. Twisted, warped prejudice is not one. Violence is not one.

Graciousness is one of them. Responsibility is one of them. The courage to do what is right is one. Compassion and the spirit of noblesse oblige were among the patrician virtues of the South. And a reverence for law.

I may not wholly agree with some of my colleagues as to the precise means of solution for this problem which more and more preoccupies us. But as reasonable men we can find solutions. May we try as hard to understand one another as we strive to be understood. And may we not abandon the leadership to those whose hearts are hard and evil. For if we do, the fault will be our own.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I wish to express my appreciation to my distinguished colleague from Fort Worth, Tex. [Mr. WRIGHT] for his very apt and able expressions and for his leadership in his own community and the progress his community has recently made through voluntary desegregation of practically every public accommodation in the city.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL].

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who speak today in favor of an effective civil rights bill do so in full realization of the strong crosscurrents of feeling that exist in this House on the issue. The crosscurrents—this emotional confusion if you will—that exist here merely reflect similar feelings across the Nation.

Our plea is a simple one: that Congress lead the Nation away from its confusion, not attempt to mirror it.

Indeed, the mythical man from outer space would have great trouble understanding our current confusion over civil rights. Why should a people bound together by the principle that all men are created equal have difficulty writing a piece of legislation that says just that? It is certainly not my purpose to attempt to analyze the social, political, and economic snarl that we as a nation have created for ourselves; I merely hope to add a thought or two about the practical political problem that we face here in the House.

Inevitably, in any discussion of civil rights legislation, our brethren from the Southern States emerge as the devils. This is unfortunate from a number of respects. Certainly all of us recognize that many of the most competent and skilled Members of this House are from Southern States; the longer we are here the more we come to note that many of our colleagues from this area have no personal connection with racial bigotry or hate. However, we can all recognize the political bind in which some find themselves. A web of circumstance at least a century deep makes it politically impossible for most of them to support effective civil rights legislation.

So be it. This means that the burden of passing such a bill falls on the rest of us, on both sides of the aisle, who are more favorably placed. Similarly, it follows that the responsibility for any failure must fall largely on the shoulders of those of us of both parties from the north, the east, the west, and indeed the far, far west of Hawaii.

And we shall fail if we cannot pass a strong and effective civil rights bill that will, in a manner of speaking, "unfuse" the Negro revolution. What is strong and effective is always a matter of argument, but suffice it to say that any legislation we pass must give the Americans of Negro ancestry easy, speedy, and effective access to process of law and the various avenues of government to right their legitimate wrongs. There is no other way that responsible Negro leadership can lead its people away from the streets and into the normal processes of our society. If we fail—if we cannot move the demonstrations off the streets, we may find our Nation drifting into the whirlpool of hardened racial attitudes, where human communication fails, and we are sucked toward the bottomless vortex into which South Africa has fallen.

If we are going to understand the type of law we must pass, I submit we must understand the nature of the revolution it is designed to meet. It has been said that abject poverty and degradation does not breed revolution; it is rising expectations. This is certainly true of the racial movement in America today. The pace and solutions of yesterday are not enough; indeed the pace and solutions of today can be utterly inadequate tomorrow.

Our task, in theory, is simple: We have to pass a civil rights bill which will "unfuse" our racial revolution not only today, but tomorrow and in the years to come. If we temporize, cut back, compromise for the sake of compromise, and look to the ills of yesterday and not the needs of tomorrow, we will have failed.

Let us get to specifics. The reasonably strong and effective civil rights bill approved by the judiciary subcommittee is now reported to be in the process of compromise, or in a less complimentary phrase, cut back to a form satisfactory to the Republican leadership. Reportedly the cutback is necessary to insure passage, and the slings and arrows for this move are being accepted, generously, by the Attorney General. "We want a bill, not an issue," is the cry today. We can all agree. But the question remains: What kind of a bill? Do they mean just any bill so that we can go home for Christmas and tell everyone that we are in favor of civil rights—not too much, mind you, but just enough?

We are still faced with the dilemma that the bill we pass must be effective enough to work tomorrow, not yesterday. We cannot compromise until it is meaningless in the context of what history will surely bring us.

The more practical among us will nod sagely and say that compromise is part of our legislative process, and this is true. They will also say that half a loaf is better than none, and this is often true. However, I sometimes have the feeling that some of the amateur strategists on Constitution Avenue have memorized these dicta without reading the footnotes.

Surely some compromise is essential to the passage of a civil rights bill, but the timing is just as important as the compromise itself. If we cut the bill in committee, cut it again on the floor, and cut it again to resolve the Senate filibuster, just what will we have left? Will it mean anything? Will it unfuse the racial disturbances or merely act as a salve for our own conscience? Should not those who now appear so anxious to lay themselves as live offerings at the foot of the great goddess of political compromise, wonder a little at what happens next?

May I respectfully suggest that a compromise on a compromise on a compromise will not make these willing young men statesmen—it will merely make them the laughingstock of the old pros in these halls, and failures in the eyes of their friends.

I hope that nothing said here today will tend to make this bill a partisan issue—it should not be. Rather let this be a call for those of us who know the importance of strong civil rights legislation, and who are in positions where we can support it vigorously and openly, to lock arms, regardless of party affiliation, and hold for a bill that will meet the needs of tomorrow. Surely we can do this without rancor, without name calling, and with understanding of the predicament of many of our brethren. We need not fail; indeed, we cannot afford to fail.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield briefly?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I want to ask a question of the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL]. I was under the impression that I had read in the morning press that the so-called retreat by the Committee on the Judiciary from a stronger civil rights bill was made at the

request of Attorney General Mr. Robert Kennedy rather than the members on the committee. Is that correct or incorrect?

Mr. GILL. I believe I mentioned that the Attorney General had decided to take the credit for such a retreat, if indeed there was one, and it was so stated in the paper and was so stated in my remarks.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman think about it? Was it a retreat or was it not a retreat?

Mr. GILL. I would say, although I am not on the committee and cannot speak with any authority other than hearsay, that it was the result of an impasse. Most members of the subcommittee and various other members of the full committee are reported to be strongly in favor of the stronger bill and various other people, including members of both parties, are reported as being against it. The attempt then is to find a compromise. The only objection I am raising to this—and I am sure the gentleman will agree—is that if we compromise too much, in too many places and too soon with the opponents of civil rights legislation, we may not have a meaningful bill. This, of course, would be disastrous for all of us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman hear the Attorney General on television the other evening, following his meeting with the Committee on the Judiciary, when there was an agreement by the Attorney General that there should be a retreat? Did the gentleman hear the Attorney General attempt to explain away the necessity for the retreat, or his statement in that connection?

Mr. GILL. No; I merely read the remarks of the Attorney General as reported in the press.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman the Attorney General said that the retreat, in his opinion, was necessary because they needed 60 to 80 Republican votes. Now let me ask the gentleman, What is the Democrat majority in the House of Representatives? Does the gentleman have any idea? I am sure he does.

Mr. GILL. I think what is being said here today is very definite affirmation of what I just said this should not be a partisan issue. It requires votes on both sides of the aisle. And it further illustrates that the people who are suggesting compromise at this point may be opening themselves to ridicule by some of the old pros.

Mr. GROSS. But the Attorney General does not need a single Republican vote on the basis of the Democrat majority in the House of Representatives to pass any civil rights bill.

Mr. GILL. I would suggest very strongly to the gentleman that even if we did not need Republican votes—which, of course, is not the case—it would still be very wise and good for the country if we had a strong majority of the Republicans voting with us on the civil rights bill. This is not a partisan matter. This is a matter for the good of the country and all the people who live in it.

Mr. GROSS. Then I wish the Attorney General would keep it out of partisanship, because he certainly put it on a partisan basis on television the other evening.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary which has been studying the subject of a civil rights bill for some time. I do not know whether the press, on this whole subject, has been fair to the people or not; I really do not know. I do know that the press has reported continuously that the reason it is now being suggested that the civil rights bill be cut back in the full Judiciary Committee is in order to get Republican votes. I think that if the administration has made that statement it is an unfair statement. But I am not sure that the administration has ever said that. I think the press is reading into it a good deal, because the fact of the matter is that it just is not so. You do not have to cut back the bill in order to get Republican votes, because Republicans on the Judiciary Committee will vote for the bill as reported out of the subcommittee.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the reference to the need for bipartisanship in this proposal, because in the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and the Civil Rights Act of 1960 in the House of Representatives it was only through strong bipartisan support that civil rights legislation did pass this body. It is interesting to note that in 1957 almost 90 percent of the Republicans here supported the civil rights bill and slightly more than 50 percent of the Democrats did so; and in 1960, 91 percent of the Republicans voted "yea" while the Democrats produced affirmative votes from a little over 60 percent of their membership. Thus, having those percentages in mind with reference to support for the civil rights bill of 1957 and 1960 I am pleased that the gentleman is calling, along with his colleagues, for bipartisan support for this legislation.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman very much. I think that in all fairness we should interject at this point the matter of the indisputable fact that such distinguished Members of this House as the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] has been not only a hard fighter but a pioneer in this respect and while sitting on this committee has contributed very valuable service not only to the committee, the Congress, but to the country as well. I agree that this legislation should not be bogged down in any sterile partisan dispute because it is not a fair reflection of the facts and history.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I shall be glad to yield at this time to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to join my distinguished colleagues today in this continuing colloquy on civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] for his initiative in holding this special order today. It seems to me that this is an appropriate time to again reassert our determination as one of the two bodies of Congress, that before this session ends we will have passed a strong and effective civil rights bill.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the statements that have just been made, let me say that I am one of those Members of the House of Representatives who has taken the position from the outset that this question of civil rights must be dealt with on a bipartisan basis. I do not think any Member on this side of the House, on the Democratic side, has to apologize when he makes the statement, which is true today, that we have to have the support of our Republican colleagues in order to pass an effective civil rights bill. I think it could be said just as well by the Republican side of the House that they, in turn, would like the support of their Democratic colleagues who are ready to support a strong civil rights bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased that the gentleman from New York should announce today—and this is the first time I had heard of it—that all of the Republican Members on the House Judiciary Committee are prepared to vote for the civil rights bill as originally reported by the subcommittee.

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

Mr. FRASER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I am glad that the gentleman has raised that point again, because it does have to be clarified. If any bill is going to be substantially cut back in the full committee, it will be on the motion of the majority side, because they want it that way. The majority of the Republicans, which is all you need to get the bill reported out in its present form—will be happy to support the bill with the present provisions contained in it, subject to possible language modifications and a tightening of the bill. But insofar as the major provisions are concerned such as voting rights and FEPC, the majority of the Republican Members will support them and vote them out, provided the Democratic majority side of the aisle does not take the initiative to cut them back, because they control the show in that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman raised the point, because I think the press has tended to play it the other way in indicating that the Republicans were the ones who were initiating proposed changes in these particular items.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman for those remarks. I assume that the gentleman would agree with me that what we are really concerned about is to get enough votes in this House, whether they come from the Republican or the Democratic side, in order that we can pass the most effective bill we can get through. Perhaps there will be differences of opinion as to how strong a bill can be passed. I think we could get into a discussion as to whether the bill is too broad in title III or whether it should be cut back, or whether the FEPC provision should be left in or made a separate bill. However, these are questions which do not impugn the good faith of anyone who is interested in civil rights. I personally hope the FEPC provision stays in.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I am delighted that I happened to be on the floor this afternoon to hear the discussion, but it just so happens that you do have present on the floor today on the Republican side the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] and myself. Here are two of us who are going to vote for FEPC and will attempt to hold it in the bill, and we hope there is no effort made to cut it out.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman. I am only saying that all of us agree we would rather have a bill than an issue. I, for one, would prefer to go into the 1964 election and say that the Republicans and Democrats joined hands to meet a great national crisis and that they set aside partisanship when partisanship had no place in resolving this question.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I am rather surprised to hear—and that is what I understood him to say—the gentleman asking or stating the need of Republican support for this legislation, especially when I go back to President Kennedy's speeches in 1962 when he asked for an overwhelmingly Democratic-controlled Congress. Is the gentleman inferring that you have two different Democratic Parties on that side of the aisle and with 258 votes you cannot pass this legislation? Is this what the gentleman is saying here today?

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman for the question. It is a rhetorical question. On the Democratic side as well as the Republican side there are differences of opinion about the kind of bills we consider and what we are seeking to do. We want a good civil rights bill.

Mr. BECKER. We have supported civil rights. There is no need of telling the country you have to have Republican support. We have always given civil rights our support. What is the matter with the votes on that side of the aisle? You have 258 votes.

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman may not have heard his colleague from New York when he said that he thought the press had misinterpreted what the Attorney General said.

Mr. BECKER. All I know about it is he was talking about softening up something to about the way they wanted it in the beginning.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman. Perhaps we disagree as to what is involved here. If the gentleman will join with us in getting a good civil rights bill through we will have made progress.

Mr. BECKER. It is a question of determination of what is a good civil rights bill, whether or not you are going to put tyrannical power into the hands of the Attorney General and the President or not. We want to see what is going to be in the bill. I have voted for four civil rights bills here and in the State of New York in the last 20 years, but I want to see what is in there and how it is going to be amended before I make a clear-cut statement as to what I want to do.

Mr. FRASER. You may have differences with your own colleagues on your side of the aisle. What we want to do is to work out something in a constructive, positive way, without bringing partisanship into it.

Mr. BECKER. I wish that could be done. But I think the Attorney General's own statement has brought partisanship into it. It has not been us. He has been the one who injected partisanship into this matter. As a matter of fact, in my years the only time partisanship comes up is when your side of the aisle accuses us of being partisan. When you do not agree with us you are doing it on a high level.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman again. I will say that in my judgment Attorney General Robert Kennedy has done as effective a job on this civil rights issue as any Attorney General we have had in many years, and he deserves praise from this body. He has accepted the responsibility in this field as the principal legal officer of the United States, and he has been making progress.

Mr. Speaker, there is a natural tendency on the part of most of us to allow our energies to be diverted and our voices to wane, once the glamor and excitement of the early moments of a crusade have passed. The stirring of the popular conscience is not an easy task, but once accomplished it does not represent the attainment of a final goal. The mobilization of the moral force of this Nation is but the means through which equality is being sought. And we are here today to remind ourselves, and the people, that the major task remains as yet undone, and that there is a determination that it shall be done. For those of us in Congress our task is to produce meaningful legislation; other citizens must join in to make equality an everyday thing in their own communities.

There are those who are attempting to cater to our natural desire to be relieved of problems which burden our consciences. Our public guilt has been thrust upon us; we wear it uncomfortably, and would like to shed it. This year, we have witnessed a great change in the manner of combating discrimination: Overt activity all over the country has made us all a part of this struggle.

After months of being forced to live with guilt and tension, we are now prey to the voices which cry that we must have a release from the fatiguing demands for equality. Yes, it is a tiring process in which we must daily acknowledge our errors and be challenged by the sounds, emitting from every news medium, of people hungry for freedom.

But it is not the intent of the civil rights movements to compel confessions, nor is much to be accomplished thereby. We cannot answer our consciences or our people until these admissions are translated into meaningful action. If these demands were just and proper when they were originally made some months ago—they are no less so today. If anything, time and continuing delay have given to them even greater merit and urgency. It would be hypocritical to reject in the practical sense that which we had approved so heartily in the abstract.

"How much do the civil rights people want?" "Hasn't enough been done for 1 year?" These are questions asked by people who have been touched by the struggle, but they have not been involved. Had they engaged in this drive, these questions would be self-revealing in their irony.

The answer to these questions comes from four men charged with a capital offense for encouraging peaceful demonstrations and the exercise of the voting franchise; from the construction worker who, because his color excluded him from his union 10 years ago, does not now have enough seniority in that union to get regular work; from the doctor who knows that he must carefully select his travel itinerary for the family vacation, if he is to avoid the embarrassment and indignity of receiving second-class service and accommodations, if indeed any are available at all.

"Hasn't enough been done for 1 year?" From all of these people, and millions more unnamed, the answer comes in a resounding din. If I may presume to be its sotto-voiced echo, the answer is, "No."

Mr. Speaker, that crescendo of protest will be with us so long as we remain unresponsive to its plea. My distinguished colleague from the State of Georgia told this body not too many days ago that Dixie could no longer "look away." This admonition is no less true for all sectors of this country.

Mr. Speaker, some people have expressed concern for the supposed negative effect that the continued peaceful protests and demands for equality, are making upon the welfare of our country. The time for real concern should come when citizens of a democratic nation are no longer speaking out—and speaking vociferously—for the rights of man.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Edwards].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] in speaking out on the frightening events that are taking place every day in this Nation. I do not know how much good it will do to raise our

voices in this forum, but continued silence leads to a subtle acceptance and apathy. If one reads, day after day, of citizens being arrested for trying to vote, or trying to go to school, the awful human tendency is to skim over it. It is nothing new. Another 10 people carted off to jail. One loses the ability to respond, to become indignant. A high level of indignation is hard for most of us to maintain, especially if these things are not happening in our own districts or to people we know.

The psychologists tell us that the ability to experience something vicariously, or to put it more simply, to get a "gut" reaction from what one reads is a mark of a civilized person, and I think that reaction was universal in this body of civilized men and women, when we read about the bombing of the children in Birmingham, and when we saw the pictures of the police dogs straining at the leash. But the fact is that things almost as bad are going on every day, and the fact is that we get used to it. Being arrested for trying to exercise your constitutional rights is no longer front page news. You will notice that most of the newspapers are carrying the stories from Birmingham, Danville, and Cambridge as routine items these days.

I am not suggesting that we beat our breasts, or piously deplore, to show that we deeply care about our fellow citizens who face tear gas, firehoses and cattle prods. What I do suggest is that we keep faith with them; that we give them what we can give—the protection of this Government. John Donne's simple words have been quoted many times but they bear repeating regularly:

> Never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

I am delighted to hear the expressions of support from the Republican members here today. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] has long been a strong champion for civil rights legislation. I am a Member of the House Judiciary Committee. We are considering the civil rights bill at the present time. We need bipartisan support to report this bill. It is for the good of our country, and should not be a partisan, political issue.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding, and I congratulate him on his splendid speech on this vital national problem.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California very, very much and now wish to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS].

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, first I wish to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas. I believe all of us who participate in this activity today owe him a deep debt of gratitude and certainly the fact that he is stirring up so many confessions of bipartisan support, I think, indicates he is already accomplishing something by having asked for this special order.

The murder of four little girls in a Birmingham Sunday school has shocked the Nation and commanded attention throughout the civilized world.

They were Negro children, a fact which makes the crime no more dastardly, or less. But reactions to the tragedy vary, increasing in stronger condemnation as one moves geographically away from the immediate locale. Decent citizens everywhere feel a sense of guilt that in our country such a thing is even possible, or not uncommon.

But in assuming our rightful share of the blame, it is important that we not diffuse our thinking or diminish the guilt of those directly and those whose ideology make them most responsible. For, then, solutions too might become so vague and general as to be meaningless.

One thing is certain, this crime fits into the broad context of the multifaceted problem of race relations in America. The victims in this instance were Negroes. But the hatred behind such crimes can just as easily find other victims which could be any one of a thousand diverse groups that compose our heterogeneous population.

In an atmosphere charged with group hatred and open defiance of Supreme Court decisions, acts of violence often become tolerated and heroism can be bought cheaply—slap a Negro woman, keep a Negro child out of school, shoot down a Negro leader, throw a bomb at a Negro building—and be a hero.

Twenty-one bombings have occurred in Birmingham in the past 8 years; seven against Negroes since last May. And without a single solution.

For most Americans, preoccupied with other problems, the issues become confused with myths of race superiority and the old bugaboo of social equality. One Negro woman in a Southern State, too tired to walk and desirous of sitting in a vacant seat on a public bus, so the logic goes, "causes intermingling, threatens the social structure, undermines the economy, and will destroy the white people."

How amazing is our democracy. Who are its citizens? What are their rights, their privileges, and their responsibilities? Are all Americans entitled to our constitutional rights? Or merely some? Who decides?

Since 1896, the South following the doctrine of "separate but equal" as stated in Plessy against Ferguson was content to rely on the Supreme Court.

Actually, most Southern States never provided equal facilities but they were always separate; and just to make doubly sure, laws were passed to compel separation. It did not matter in that case that violence was done to the "sacred" theories of private property and "freedom of association," or that legislative bodies were used to affect race relations.

But when the courts spoke out in unmistakable language that State-supported segregation is unconstitutional, the same jurisdictions, with some exceptions, found the courts were interfering in their internal affairs and they have openly defied judicial decisions.

Thus, deprived of any other way of correcting an obvious social injustice—voting, negotiating, court action, and so forth—Negroes are demonstrating, and we may expect they will continue, as all other Americans would do, until full constitutional rights are won.

A clash then of these two forces presents a national crisis. To ignore the situation or postpone action is the same as using plastic band-aids to stop exploding dynamite.

Nor will solutions be found in emotional outbursts, fancy dogmas, name calling, encouragement of group hatred and irresponsible acts by leaders seeking personal gain or political advantage.

It has been well said: "Brotherhood is not so wild a dream as they who profit from postponing it pretend," that people have and can live together in peace and security. And there are thousands of examples in our American life and in all sections of the country where persons of all faiths, creeds, and colors are joined in a constructive fellowship for the common good of all. To pretend that these associations are not a potent force in our affluent society in opposing ignorance and bigotry is to ignore the nobility of our national ideals and the noteworthy progress our people have made in many fields already.

I believe responsible leaders can and must find a way out of our present and unnecessary racial conflicts, and that we will if we keep open the direct lines of communication between groups.

And we can do this if we but realize that most men want only three things and it seems to me these are: First, a world of peace; second, a decent standard of living; and third, a chance at human dignity.

I believe that if given the equal opportunities to achieve these things, most men will be decent, fair, just, and reasonable.

Actually, nothing new is required except of our own behavior. Tomorrow morning if upon awakening all Americans would begin according to each other the same rights which they enjoy, and for which they would fight if they didn't, human relation problems would be well on the way to solution.

Unfortunately, some will not do this. Thus, arises the necessity for governments to act. Those who oppose strong Federal action are generally the ones who make such action necessary.

Passage this year of a strong civil rights law and workable civil rights programs is a necessary beginning upon which we can build.

If man's dignity is to be recognized, if his rights and his security are to be achieved—now and the remainder of this decade is the time for this development.

Science and technology make this manifestly possible; world events and our morality make it necessary.

Albert Einstein once said:

> The splitting of the atom has changed everything except our modes of thinking.

Perhaps it is not too much to believe that we can do this also, as do it we must, while time remains.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] for his very eloquent message as well as every other Member who has taken time out from an ex-

tremely busy schedule. As you know, many Members, in fact, in anticipation of the closing out of this week's legislative business, have left. I especially wish to thank the Members who took time out to stay here and express themselves on this very important issue.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I would like to congratulate him on initiating this special order. I am convinced that the issue of civil rights in this country is the most important one that has faced the U.S. Congress certainly in the years I have been here, and I am convinced perhaps for many more years. It seems to me essential to the future of the United States that we in the Congress pass an effective civil rights act and act promptly. Unless we do so I fear that those who are disadvantaged today will lose faith and confidence in the ability of their Government to act for their rights. The consequences of such an attitude would, it seems to me, be utterly disastrous for the United States internally and for the United States in its role as a leader of freedom in the world.

Again let me say I am grateful to the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regret that illness prevents me from attending today's session. However, I want to add my voice to those who share my deep concern over the denial of civil rights and justice to American citizens.

I am filled with a feeling of sorrow and anger over the ruthless bombings and murders in Birmingham. I also feel great humility in the knowledge that fellow citizens in Birmingham and throughout the Nation are fighting for freedom with awe-inspiring courage, determination, and dedication. Their fight is everyone's fight. As Lincoln said 101 years ago, "In giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free."

Freedom for most Americans was established through the Revolution of 1776—a revolution which Jefferson called "the world's best hope." The great tragedy of our Nation is that the Revolution did not establish freedom for all and that the hope is still unfulfilled. We are now witnessing a second revolution—a revolution which is also devoted to freedom, but freedom for all. The revolution is being waged by heroic men, women, and children in the face of fantastic hatred and brutality. Birmingham, Danville, and Americus will go down in history as did Concord, Lexington, and Bunker Hill.

Up until very recently the Government has stood by for the most part as a sympathetic observer who intervenes when the situation becomes highly explosive. The time for sympathy is over. The time for action is now. It is time to establish new laws which fully guarantee the constitutional rights of all citizens. Laws which guarantee everyone's right to vote, right to assemble, and petition, right to go to a good school, have a productive job, live in a decent house, and to be a full member of American society. Until Congress realizes that the American dream of liberty and justice will not become a reality for any unless it is in fact a reality for all, there will be more Birminghams.

The struggle for liberty must continue throughout America until the cancer of discrimination and segregation has been removed from our Nation.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, just 1 month ago, on September 15 as you recall, a small band of demented men demolished the sanctity of Birmingham's Sabbath by hurling a bomb into a Negro church during its Sunday school services and killing four Negro girls. In the rash of race riots which ensued, two Negro boys were shot to death. By the end of that gruesome day, at least 20 others, both Negro and white, had been injured.

This sudden eruption of charring, scarring murderous hate the world watched, aghast. Men of conscience everywhere bitterly decried the bombers' dastardly act. They firmly placed the blame not solely on the murderers themselves, but on the officials and the society which created that nerve-taut atmosphere in which the seed of hate could quickly germinate, and bear its deadly fruit.

Proponents of moderation strongly hoped that the horror and shame which this incident occasioned would bring all racial violence to an abrupt halt. But this has by no means been the case. Callous brutality and carnage continue, in both North and South. Plaquemine's policemen have plagued Negro high school students, thwarting with tear-gas bombs their every attempt to secure a reasonable measure of integrated schooling, and even invading the sacred confines of the Freedom Rock Baptist Church to rout the youngsters out of their seemingly inviolable haven. Negro and white students in south Philadelphia have clashed repeatedly. Many were attacked and beaten, and one 16-year-old girl was slashed with a razor blade.

Even the Birmingham bombings have scarcely abated. Two more dynamite bombs, one with shrapnel "made to kill," were set off in a Negro neighborhood. This brings to 52 the number of bombings on Negro property in that city since the end of World War II.

Many citizens whose only crime is their belief that the U.S. Constitution should apply equally to every American are enduring extreme physical and mental cruelty in jails throughout the South. A young man from my State of New Jersey, Don Harris, is in jail in Americus, Ga., on a charge of attempting to incite insurrection for which he faces a possible death penalty. Mr. Harris, who graduated from Rutgers University with an outstanding record in 1963 was in Americus to help American citizens obtain their constitutional right to vote. For this heinous crime Mr. Harris was beaten, charged with disorderly conduct, resisting arrest, inciting a riot, and attempting to incite insurrection, and jailed. It is unbelievable that such outrages can occur in the United States.

Something must be done—and quickly—to stop this protracted racial conflict. The Civil Rights Act of 1960, enabling the FBI to investigate racial bombings and brutality, was designed to do just that. But recent events have proved that the 1960 measure alone does not suffice. We must hack at the root causes of the disturbances: ignorance, fear, bigotry, and hate. These insidious evils must give way to the mutual understanding, trust, and brotherly love which have long been the basis of America's Judeo-Christian heritage, and of the inner strength which helped raise us to our present stature as a major world power.

What is the "something" that must be done? We cannot legislate love, or any other state of mind, but we can help to create an atmosphere more conducive to the development of such a progressive state. This is exactly what the pending civil rights bill attempts to do. The Negro's major grievance, as you all well know, is the continuance of discriminatory practices against him in voting, housing, education, public accommodations, employment, and in the administration of justice by State and local officials. H.R. 7152, as recently redrawn by a subcommittee of our Judiciary Committee, contains specific provisions to correct these unjust practices in every area mentioned except housing, and this could be handled in part by the proposed Community Relations Service for mediating local racial disputes.

Let us, as Congressmen, accept our challenge—to set aside all prejudice, or prejudging before full, conclusive evidence is available—and give this long-slighted segment of our populace the equality which our Constitution is supposed to provide. Let us weigh each provision carefully, but with all due dispatch, so that H.R. 7152 will be promptly passed. In my opinion, the sooner it is enacted the quicker we can cure the ugly, festering sore of race violence which so mars the face of America today.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months it has been my

practice, at every possible opportunity, to "put in a plug," so to speak, for inclusion of fair employment practices provisions in the omnibus civil rights bill now being considered by the House Judiciary Committee. I have done this because I am firmly and wholeheartedly convinced that equal employment opportunity is the very crux of the discrimination issue.

Thus, it was with a good deal of pleasure that I learned the Attorney General has this week, before the Judiciary Committee, given enthusiastic and unequivocal support for legislation similar to H.R. 405, as reported by the Committee on Education and Labor earlier this year.

The Attorney General reminded the members of the committee of the President's endorsement for Federal fair employment practices legislation applicable both to employers and to unions, and pointed out that the provision in the subcommittee's bill as reported "deals with one of the most basic and important areas of discrimination." He referred to the bipartisan recognition of need for legislation to deal with the problem of equality of job opportunity, as evidenced by the number of bills introduced by members of both parties.

Significantly, the Attorney General stressed that "nothing can be more important or fundamental to equality than to assure that all citizens have a fair opportunity to earn a living." In this statement there is support for the contention that there is limited value in granting a member of a minority group the right to service at a restaurant if he lacks the financial means to pay for his dinner, and illustrates why job equality should not only be an integral part of any civil rights measure but should receive primary consideration for inclusion in an overall bill.

The Attorney General's statement should dispel any doubts as to the administration's position in this area. There can be no misunderstanding, for it has been stated clearly:

> I hope that the omnibus civil rights bill will, when enacted, include a strong fair employment practices section of the type recommended by the Labor Committee, supported by the President, and included in the subcommittee print.

With pride I echo the expression of support for the retention of this subcommittee amendment.

I want to commend my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, for bringing to our attention the danger of apathy in the tragic situation which has confronted us from the pages of recent newspapers. But we must take positive action in deeds as well as words, for what is to be gained in just talking about spilled milk, tragic as that spill may be? The immediate effect of enactment of this measure will be the restoration of self-respect and confidence within those of the Negro race who have in some areas of our land been the unwilling victims of deprivation of every civil right, the unwilling victims of unearned hatred, violence and tragedy, which cannot and must not be permitted to continue.

This 88th Congress has frequently been sharply criticized of late for its lack of substantive action in this session to date. I submit that we have not been lax in our duty, but rather have shown a rare display of caution in giving to each measure upon which we have acted the most careful scrutiny and consideration. This applies to the civil rights bill particularly, and it is to the Judiciary Committee's credit that it has refused to report hastily on a measure of such import to the citizens of our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to give the omnibus civil rights bill the same careful individual deliberation. Examine the bill and examine your hearts. I am confident you will find not only justification for your favorable vote on this vital measure, but that you will cast it with dignity and self-respect.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in expressing my concern over the need for Congress to pass strong civil rights legislation and to do it soon.

I do not support this measure because of a great need for the benefits contained therein to my own State of California. There is very little in this bill that would affect California. In fact, we have gone a great deal farther than the proposal which is now in the Judiciary Committee in many respects, and I think a study of California's experience can be of great value to the Congress.

I am not saying that we do not have any problems remaining in the Golden State. I do believe that we have been moving faster towards solving these problems during the past 5 years than most States. I know that the world has not collapsed around our ears because of these rapid advances.

California has had a broad public accommodations law for many years. We have a very effective fair employment practices commission. Our voting laws are above criticism insofar as discrimination is concerned.

This year, the California State Legislature passed a fair housing act which will insure that everyone, regardless of race, religion, color, origin, or national ancestry may choose to live anywhere he wishes.

Actually, this has been the public policy of our State since passage of the Hawkins Housing Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act in 1959—and especially since the courts last year interpreted the Unruh Act to apply to most people functioning in a business capacity in housing.

The new act strengthens this policy by giving the family discriminated against an administrative remedy by going to the State fair employment practices commission rather than having to retain an attorney and going to court. In addition, the commission may actively promote general observance of the spirit and letter of the law.

Another advance this year has been the issuance by Gov. Edmund G. Brown of a code of fair practices. This code spells out a comprehensive policy of nondiscrimination ranging from personnel practices in the State government to licensees, those doing business with the State, law-enforcement agencies, schools, and recipients of loans, benefits, and grants.

Some of our problem areas that still exist are in de facto school segregation, law enforcement, and a need for greatly increasing job opportunities for members of minority groups. I do not think that the proposed bill will help a great deal in these respects, but I am hopeful that continued and concerted action through other means—including an expanded manpower development and training program and extension of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act, and along with the Governor's Code of Fair Practices—can go a long way toward solving these problems.

In view of this picture of enlightened programs and legislation, it is hard for many Californians to understand the concern and the label of "extreme" that is given to this national legislation that does not affect them directly. Proposals are presented to me by those who are very concerned that appear to be "extreme" when placed alongside the new law that we are likely to see passed here soon.

These extreme proposals include those which the Western States Democratic Conference passed unanimously recently. They would like to see all persons entitled to equal use and enjoyment of public services and accommodations. I have a very hard time going back to them and explaining that, although this may work fine in California, we need votes from the "loyal opposition" so we must restrict this on a national level to restaurants, hotels, theaters, and retail stores.

They also feel that all persons should be entitled to equal opportunities for job training and employment, and that these rights should be effectively enforced through special administrative channels.

Considering the fact that during 1961–62 the California Fair Employment Practices Commission completed investigation of more than 1,300 cases of alleged discrimination, found evidence of discriminatory practices in 414 cases and obtained corrective action through conciliation, it is understandable that they would feel that this is a very reasonable request at the Federal level.

I find it hard to explain that this portion of the civil rights bill might have to be given a quiet funeral because some of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle might use this as an excuse to vote against a bill that they ostensibly would support if it did not contain this basic and proven protective device.

This same Western States Democratic Conference feels that the rights of all citizens to vote without artificial restriction or intimidation be specifically enforced by the Federal Government.

They also feel that the right of young people to a good education in the company of their peers, without the stigma

of racial segregation, should be guaranteed by Federal action.

They do not feel that these are "extreme" provisions and, in fact, feel that the necessity of taking action on voting and school cases one by one, as will be necessary under the proposed law, could stand to be improved.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that it is hard for Californians to understand the consternation over this very strong or extreme bill. I am possessed of a somewhat practical nature and will most certainly support the best bill we can get, but I will feel obliged to report back to California that that is exactly what we did. I will have to tell the minority group members that we have brought the rest of the Nation part of the way toward where California now stands because we had to "buy" a few votes from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter relating to civil rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged recently to receive many expressions from friends and constituents in Hawaii asking support for a strong civil rights bill.

While we in the Fortunate Isles have far fewer racial problems than many parts of the Nation, I find it very encouraging that so many of our people have taken the problems of others to heart. Under unanimous consent, I include the following communications at this point in the RECORD:

ST. MARK'S PARISH,
Honolulu, Hawaii, September 28, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS GILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We the undersigned, concerned members of St. Mark's Parish, urge you as our representative in Washington to work for the passage of legislation to insure the equal rights of all citizens of our country no matter of what race they may be. We believe segregation and discrimination due to race, creed, or color is contrary to the will of God.

Faithfully,

John N. Week, T. Dudley Musson, Eleanor D. Musson, Elaine Lau, Grace R. Wong, Violet K. Mossman, Kay Neddermeyer, Mollie King Cummings, Eva M. Pomroy, George K. C. Lum, Herbert S. C. Wong, Willima S. Mossman, Grace H. Ching, Dorothy Tanibe, David Y. Ching, Mary Lynne Godfrey, Louise Nagata, Walter N. S. Ho, Thomas Q. P. Ching, Chiyo Tokushige, Masami Tokushige, Thelma K. Shintani, George T. Young, Barbara H. Clopton, Yukimi M. Kawano, Elsie N. Okada, Elma Joan Booth-Saunders, Robert H. Kawano, William R. Moore, Patsy Chingon, Marjorie Becker, Etta E. Frost, Laura G. Schafer.

CHURCH OF THE HOLY NATIVITY,
Honolulu, Hawaii, October 4, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL,
U.S. House of Repersentatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GILL: Hawaii has been called, "The Melting Pot of the Pacific." If this statement falls short of being the whole truth, it is conceivable it is because the Aloha State is the melting pot of the world. This is shown in our culture through our many nationalities and races living together in harmony.

Considerable faith in our population has been shown by the establishment of the East-West Center. We have been led to believe that a good portion of the world believes that we practice the fundamental idea to which so many give lip service * * * brotherhood of man. Although we admit our shortcomings in this respect, we do take pride in our accomplishments.

Having considered these ideals, we the members of the Youth Congregation of the Church of the Holy Nativity, respectfully request that you as a Member of the Congress should proclaim these ideals as the standard for our Nation. Further, we trust that you will declare Hawaii overtly favorable to full integration of all races and that our representatives will play a leading role in the present struggle for social justice throughout the land.

We the undersigned, teenagers of Hawaii, deeply concerned for the future welfare of all Americans, beseech you to exert all your influence in bringing about strong civil rights legislation at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully,

Cookie Inouye, Helen Orain, Lesley Rice, Sydney Pietsch, Jack Warner, Sue Warner, Charles G. Braden, Jr., Lawrence P. Crum, Susan Barkley, Claudia Hinz, Bill Johnson, K. Newsom, Betsy Saul, Sheri Tibbetts, Laurel Dodson, Nancy Kriskern, Henry Kriskern, Lori Lambert, Susie Thomas, Richard Evans, Jane Thomas, Reed Minuth, David Pickering, Ryan King, Cleo Higgins, Beverly Brown, Rocky Higgins, Abigail Button, Ronald Taber, Ken Kuniyuki, Bonnie Pritchett, Robbie Littlejohn, Michael Littlejohn, Lee Aguiar, Laraine Yamamoto, Geraldyne Chun, Judith Pang, Connie Geisler, Charlotte Tanna, Beverly Sung, Karen Yanagida, Keith Matsuo, William Grant, Jan Gerard, Mary E. McNeill, Willard Chow, Joe Barkley, Joseph Wilhelm, Jr., Brian Grieves, Sharon Elliott, John Fulton, Robert Luck, Tom Evanson, Dinah Silva, Jack Tobin, Laraine Lent.

RESOLUTION OF THE MAUI WOMAN'S CLUB

Resolved, That the members of the Maui Woman's Club, having a deep concern for the deprivation of civil rights experienced by the Negroes in the South, as well as Negro and other racial groups in other portions of our Nation, and being equally concerned with the moral issues involved in the problem of assuring equal rights, before the law, in access to suffrage and equality of opportunity, do hereby declare and affirm their support for strong civil rights legislation now pending before the Congress of the United States, to the further support of the law of the land and unity of our Nation, as well as the dignity of each individual, that every citizen shall have full citizenship, with protection against the destructive effects of discrimination against race, color, or creed.

We resolve to take an active part in this national moral struggle, with the realization that inaction implies implicit consent; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the Governor of the State of Hawaii, Hawaii Members of the U.S. Congress, Maui members of the State legislature, and editors of the Maui and Honolulu press.

Respectfully submitted.

DOROTHY NEILSON,
Chairman,

LOIS HALING,
Vice Chairman,
Legislative Committee.

THE HILO METHODIST CHURCH,
Hilo, Hawaii, September 17, 1963.

Rev. JOHN H. CROSS,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR REVEREND CROSS: The congregation of the Hilo Methodist Church was deeply shocked by the death of four of your Sunday school children in the heartless bombing of your church. We extend to you, the parents, relatives, and friends of the children, and to your congregation our deepest sympathies, and assure you that our prayers and thoughts of Christian brotherhood and concern are with you.

If we may be of any help to you, please call on us.

Sincerely,

STEVE THORSON,
Chairman, Commission on Christian Social Concerns.

ST. BARNABAS' CHURCH,
Ewa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii,
October 14, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The members of St. Barnabas' Episcopal Church, Ewa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii, have authorized me to express their deep concern for the civil rights bill that will soon be before Congress. We urge your support of the bill in its entirety, and pray that you will be an example to those Congressmen and Senators who have not yet found within themselves the strength to speak out strongly in favor of this urgent legislation.

We realize this bill is but a step in the right direction, but it must be taken or the people of the United States will lose faith in their Government and its Constitution, where a guarantee of the rights and privileges of citizenship are promised to all in the 14th amendment.

The words that guide the Episcopal Church in Hawaii, and its work, also carry the power of law. They are: "Have we not all one Father—Hath not one God created us." These words from the Bible leave no doubt as to their meaning, and different words with similar meaning guide people of all faiths.

Love between peoples of varying ethnic backgrounds cannot be legislated, but hate that erupts into violence and suppression, and the loss of equal opportunity can be controlled by our Government. The civil rights bill will be important in this concern, and therefore we offer our prayers and wholehearted support as you work for its passage, knowing that justice for all men must prevail.

Sincerely yours,

REV. DAVID K. KENNEDY,
Vicar.

MEMBERS OF ST. BARNABAS' CHURCH

David K. Kennedy, J. E. Woolley, Mrs. J. E. Woolley, Mrs. P. Kendall, Susan E. Waters, John P. Mayer, Steve St. John, Lois M. Steadman, W. D. Deringer, Jr., Charles M. Loomis, Estelle H. Loomis, Paul J. Hartley, Jr., Kenneth C. Campbell, David W. Malvin, Gilbert E. Smith, Viola C. Miller, Elizabeth Streeter, Mr. and Mrs. Glen L. Burdick, Mrs. Paul Hartley, Jr., Betty Gregory, Gladys Salts, Margie Emmons and John Emmons, Mr. and Mrs. Roy McIntyre, Jr., Clifford Burroughs, Anna Marie Kennedy, Sylvia Johnson, Richard C. Johnson, Mr. and Mrs. Shirrill B. Tanner, Ronald L. Viets, Carnation Brash, Ruth Marks Campbell, Winifred B. Hawthorne, Frances T. Deringer, Joan Alice Malvin, Walton J. Chabrow, Carrie W. Chabrow, S. Hickenbottom, Pearl West, Gail West, Gernie C. West, Florence J. Hickenbottom, Caroline Brannon, Robert Mr. Brannon, Jr., Charles W. Roane, Mildred J. Roane, Ray Thiele.

THE MINISTRY OF RECONCILIATION

(Ephesians 2: 11–22)

(Part of a Sermon by the Reverend Seido Ogawa, September 22, 1963)

Let us look then at the major area of disruption in our national life, the whole vast problem of civil rights. How well do we as churchmen and churches comprehend the scope and depths of the current revolution? What is the task of reconciliation and how effectively are we discharging our ministry? Events within the past week have raised some fearful questions. The eruption of violence in Birmingham, with the church directly and physically involved, with innocent children the victims, lends a note of ultimate desperation to the current crisis in race. "What follows now?" was the title of an editorial in the Honolulu Advertiser early this week. It is a question many of us have asked. From a human point of view we can only hope that even in the face of such atrocities the real struggle will not be abandoned, that the leadership of men like Martin Luther King will continue to prevail.

We badly need perspective, because perspective is what we tend to lose when emotions rise to a high pitch. We need a perspective which will permit us to recognize even the horror and tragedy of recent events without losing sight of what it is all about and what we must desperately cling to. I think we need to be reminded, all who have a concern and stake in the struggle, of some things that Martin Luther King wrote from the Birmingham city jail on April 16. It was in response to criticisms made by eight clergymen calling the earlier Birmingham demonstrations both unwise and untimely. He wrote:

"I guess it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say 'wait'. But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers and drown your sisters and brothers; when you have seen hate-filled policemen curse, kick, brutalize and even kill your black brothers and sisters, when you see the vast majority of your 20 million Negro brothers smothering in an air-tight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society; when you suddenly find your tongue twisted * * * as you seek to explain to your 6-year-old daughter why she can't go to the public amusement park that has just been advertised on television, and see tears welling up when she is told that Funtown is closed to colored children, and seeing the depressing clouds of inferiority begin to form in her little mental sky, when you have to concoct an answer for a 5-year-old son asking, 'Daddy, why do white people treat colored people so mean?'; when you are humiliated day in and day out by nagging signs reading 'white' men and 'colored'; when your first name becomes 'nigger' and your middle name becomes 'boy' and your last name becomes 'John,' and when your wife and mother are never given the respected title 'Mrs.'; when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the fact that you are a Negro, when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of nobodiness—then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait."

But we need also to recall other things he said, such as "presenting our very bodies as a means of laying our case before the conscience of the local and national community." He wrote:

"We are not mindful of the difficulties involved. So we decided to go through a process of self-purification. We started having workshops on nonviolence and repeatedly asked ourselves: 'Are you able to accept blows without retaliating? Are you able to endure the ordeals of jail?' "

The question is: What now? Has the nature of the struggle changed? Does it call for a new and different strategy? Where does one draw the line between degrees of sacrifice and endurance? No human answer is sufficient. If there ever was a crisis in our national life which needed to be grappled with in the context of our Christian faith, this is it. And if the church is to be faithful to its mission and be a reconciling force in the midst of this upheaval, what must the church be willing to do, what should its posture be, with what understanding should it address itself to so grave a problem.

Applying the observations I shared with you earlier I would suggest the following necessities. At the same time I would ask you to understand that my logic and insights may be entirely faulty because by the very nature of profound issues human wisdom is not enough. In the present crisis, if the church is to be a genuinely reconciling force, it cannot stand apart. It cannot offer reconciliation on the usual basis of a disinterested third party. The reconciliation which is needed can only come out of shared hurt, shared sorrow, shared fears and hopes. This means that the heartache and the despair, the bitterness and the anger, the kinds of hurt that Martin Luther King talks about must be understood, not from our point of view but from theirs, and since this kind of identification is practically impossible it means we must make more than the usual effort to be involved in the struggle, in the hope that something of the underlying emotions may rub off on us. This means understanding not only the resentments but the sheer determination that motivates our brothers.

To be involved means to act. And my second observation is that doing, acting, not speaking and saying, is the heart of the reconciling ministry of Christ's church. It isn't what we say, but what we do, that makes us instruments of reconciliation.

My third observation is that both involvement and action imply considerable risk, that whatever the church does with respect to a problem as complex as the race issue exposes the church to attack and danger. Yet the willingness to risk one's very life in the pursuit of what is right in an essential part of the reconciling ministry of the church. Put the other way, if the church will not or cannot risk its life in this struggle, it is likely to lose both its reconciling power and its influence upon American life; consequently it will lose its life in trying to save it.

Let me try to gather up all this by relating it to some things which churches and churchmen have been doing. On July 4 police arrested 283 demonstrators at the Gwynn Oaks Amusement Park in Balitmore. Among them were 36 clergymen, the best known of whom was Eugene Carson Blake. There were seven Roman Catholic priests and a Rabbi also. Thirteen more clergymen were arrested July 7 in a second attempt to integrate the park. I don't need to tell you that this isn't the traditional approach of the church to social problems.

It certainly isn't the kind of action that is universally applauded either within or without the church. It isn't a popular course to take and it could have been rationalized away. But it is the kind of involvement and action which held the promise of eventual reconciliation. Listen to what the New York Times had to say, that "future historians will regard the Gwynn Oaks demonstration as a 'milestone' in the development of church participation in the struggle for racial equality. The participation of churchmen, it said, was 'the most spectacular gesture to date in a sudden and impressive determination by U.S. church leaders to do something rather than just say something about the evil of segregation.' "

More recently the church took part in a prominent way in the August 28 march on Washington. What many may not appreciate is that this decision was a reversal of earlier thinking in church circles, and was made in full awareness of potential angers. In a sense the church had as much to lose as to gain, and the risk was great. The decision certainly was not widely acclaimed by churchmen in general. It was one of those rare situations in which the church acted strictly on faith. The result is a new image of the church, of courage to match the faith, of willingness to risk all in dependence upon God's guidance. Even David Lawrence expressed the opinion that the presence of the church in the march on Washington exercised a restraining hand upon the demonstration. Russell Baker of New York Times, described it in these terms:

"No one could remember an invading army quite as gentle as the 200,000 civil rights 'marchers' who occupied Washington today. For the most part, they came silently during the night and early morning, occupied the great shaded boulevard along the mall, and spread through the parklands between the Washington Monument and the Potomac. But instead of the emotional horde of angry militants that many had feared, what Washington saw was a vast army of quiet, middle-class Americans who had come in the spirit of the church outing."

What we may never know is whether the presence of the church was a restraining and reconciling factor, or what relationship there is between episodes like the Gwynn Oaks participation of churchmen and their influence upon the march on Washington. What is impressive is that the church in America, particularly in relation to the race issue, has become involved in the life of people at a level that is new, has forsaken its traditional caution and dared to risk its life, and in so doing has lifted the hopes of many men in a way that may yet be its most decisive ministry of reconciliation.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Texas, HENRY GONZALEZ, today in his remarks about racial discrimination in the United States.

The distinguished Member from Texas, in asking me to join him here today, has spoken feelingly that on this vital issue "the greatest crime is silence." I agree.

In this connection I quote the remarks of Rabbi Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress, at the jobs-and-freedom rally at the Lincoln Memorial last August 28. Rabbi Prinz in the 1930's lived in Germany under Hitler. He told the rally:

When I was the rabbi of the Jewish community in Berlin, I learned many things. The most important thing I learned under those tragic circumstances is that bigotry and hatred are not the most urgent problem. The most urgent, the most disgraceful, the most shameful and the most tragic problem is silence. A great people, which had created a great civilization, had become a nation of silent onlookers. America must not remain silent. It must speak up and act and not for the sake of the Negro but for the sake of the image, the idea and the aspiration of America itself.

I think a significant aspect of this House proceeding today is that it was organized by Representative GONZALEZ himself who with his constituents in San Antonio have encountered a great deal of discrimination. Discrimination against one group is merely a manifestation of discrimination everywhere—know-nothingism, whether it be directed against Roman Catholic, Protestant, Negro, Italian, or American of Mexican descent.

I strongly support effective civil rights legislation. I have introduced legislation in this area. This Congress must take a position on this issue. Its reputation is at stake in this campaign against discrimination, one aspect of which is to assure triumph of ethics over law.

I think it particularly interesting, too, in the welter of misinformation about ethnic backgrounds to quote a reply from a union local in Anchorage, Alaska, in reply to a request from the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities for the number of Negroes, orientals, Spanish Americans, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians in the local.

The local replied that:

We were unable to completely fill out the form on an honest basis as we are not anthropologists and we do not know when a member becomes or ceases to be a Negro, an Indian, an oriental, a member of a minority group or any of the other designations in the form. For example, the treasurer of this local union, to the best of his knowledge, is part Negro, part Indian, part Jewish, part Irish and has perhaps a little Swedish blood.

We have one member from Cuba who speaks Spanish, looks like a Norwegian and drinks like an Irishman.

Fortunately we are a long way from Governors Wallace and Barnett and a man's race is none of our business. To quote Mark Twain, "We do not allow 1 part of a man to outvote the other 15 parts."

In connection with my brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I ask to have incorporated at this point a most worthy legal paper written by an outstanding lawyer, a woman, Pauli Murray, of the Yale University Law School.

Much remains to be done everywhere, including Oregon, although I am pleased that the situation is not nearly as aggravated there as in some other States. I add, too, that many of the proposals contained in the Federal civil rights legislation now before the Judiciary Committee have been law in Oregon for many years with none of the consequences of doom and destruction predicted by the opponents if the Federal legislation is enacted.

THE LAW AS IT AFFECTS DESEGREGATION

(By Pauli Murray)

INTRODUCTION

During the past several weeks, American Negroes have confronted the Nation with what has been described as a "massive insistence" upon drastic changes in the social structure to achieve rapid and total integration. They have abandoned their traditional role of patience; they have rejected tokenism and gradualism; they are saying, "100 years of fractional citizenship is enough. We want full citizenship now."

This mood pervades the entire Negro community as seen in the tremendous outpouring of hundreds to tens of thousands of Negroes into the streets of the Nation. Police violence, kicking, beating, the use of fierce dogs and firehoses, even murder—none of these has stopped them. For the 7-day period ending June 2, an estimated more than 30 demonstrations took place in widely separated areas of the country. A week later, the New York Times reported that demonstrations had occurred in nearly 50 localities since May 1. This week has been marked by defiance of the Governor of Alabama in a confrontation with the Federal Government, a televised appeal to the Nation by President Kennedy, and the fatal shooting in the back of an NAACP official in Mississippi. Clearly, this is our most serious domestic crisis since the Civil War.

Describing it as the "Second American Revolution," the Washington Star editorialized on June 2 that the real problem in this situation is: How best to cope wisely with a rapidly developing revolution. The current outbreak of mass demonstrations by Negroes * * * is a manifestation of as genuine and justified revolution as any of the revolutions in history, history being largely an account of a sequence of revolutions."

Actually, we are experiencing the climax of a phase of the continuing social revolution in the United States which began with our Declaration of Independence and our war to throw off colonial rule. Periodically our country has been thrown into convulsions as various groups of the population have taken the initiative in reaffirming their fundamental rights and freedoms. These upsurges have been part of the growth and maturing of our democracy.

The most serious of these conflicts was the Civil War, which ended in major constitutional change. The fundamental law was amended to abolish slavery, to define U.S. citizenship, to guarantee to all persons due process and equal protection of the law against the power of the States, and to secure the right to vote without distinction as to race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Women carried on a struggle for education in the 19th century which was less dramatic but no less determined than that of Negroes for education in the 20th century. The 20th century brought marches, demonstrations, and arrests of women as they entered the crucial final stage of a century-long struggle for their right to vote. Here, too, constitutional change was necessary to secure this right.

Within the memory of some of us here are the bloody battles waged by American workers in the 1930's to establish their right to organize and bargain collectively for a fairer share of the Nation's economic growth. Labor, too, voiced its demands through sit-in strikes, stay-out strikes, marches, demonstrations and picketing, as well as boycotts. So hostile were some local authorities and employers to labor's freedom of expression that in 1933, the only place where Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins could speak to the workers of Homestead, Pa., was on the steps of the Federal post office. In the summer of 1937, Chicago police opened fire on a demonstration of unarmed workers killing 10 people, many of whom were shot in the back. National legislation in the form of the National Labor Relations Act was necessary to secure labor's basic economic rights.

Now in the 1960's, Negroes are engaged in a desperate effort to end segregation and discrimination everywhere in the United States. All the evidence indicates that they will not be stopped short of their goal. President Kennedy correctly placed this struggle in its proper historical perspective, when he observed in his recent Vanderbilt University address, that it was in the best American tradition.

The issues involved in this confrontation are moral as well as legal; the alternatives have become total equality or total repression, and there is no turning back. Each of us is caught up in an atmosphere of impending conflict, of a mounting urgency to come to fundamental grips with our most longstanding and explosive domestic issue and one which rates high priority among the most crucial issues of our foreign policy.

At this turning point of our history, I find it difficult to maintain a balance between academic objectivity and deep personal emotional involvement. As one of an earlier generation of freedom riders with a prison sentence as a reminder of the days when the struggle was a lonely one, and as a student leader of successful nonviolent sit-in demonstrations in Washington restaurants exactly 20 years ago, I cannot pretend a scholarly detachment from these events.

In our time we are being compelled to return to our revolutionary roots. Potential violence has been inherent in this issue from the beginning of our history. I am glad that this long unsettled business of democracy is now coming to a head. I rejoice that Negroes in ever greater numbers are today standing where the American patriots stood in 1776; that they are now willing more than ever to risk their lives for personal liberty and human dignity. They are reenacting the American Revolution in 20th century form. I believe that if the American people as a whole could identify Negroes with our revolutionary traditions of liberty, we will have taken the first significant step toward eliminating the schism which has so divided and almost destroyed us as a nation in the past.

This revolutionary upheaval has not come about through formal decision of any single group, but through a consensus made up of individual commitment by thousands of people taking a stand, igniting and inspiring others to do the same. Many of the demonstrations have been planned; others are spontaneous. Out of this personal commitment to the struggle for liberty is emerging a new self-image, a new self-respect. And if I read the signs correctly, the Nation is gaining a new image of the Negro, for it is our tradition that when people have self-respect, nothing can keep them from asserting the inalienable rights of free men, women, and children.

I emphasize children here, for in reality, Negro children in the South, for the past 9 years, have led the crusade for human dignity. I need not remind you of the children who have braved hostile communities to exercise their right to attend nonsegregated schools. You are aware of the Birmingham children who recently, as if by prearranged signal, marched out of a school assembly and into the streets to demonstrate for their rights leaving an astonished faculty and an empty school building. You have doubtless read of the schoolchildren of Mississippi carrying signs directed to their adults which read: "We have gone to jail for you. Will you register and vote for us?"

In Washington, one of my friends is having difficulty with her teenaged son who remonstrates with her because she has not let him join some of the demonstrations in nearby Maryland. He feels ashamed because his cousin—a mere girl—has already demonstrated, been arrested and taken to prison. This fire and idealism among Negro schoolchildren today is so intense that their parents are left no alternative but to join the demonstrations themselves to maintain their honor and their children's respect.

By now, it must be clear to all of us that, for the second time in our Nation's history, we stand on the threshold of a major decision on human rights of the most fundamental character. In 1963 it has been forcefully brought home to us that our Nation cannot endure with fractional degrees of equality or citizenship. The right to human dignity is indivisible.

Against this background, let us address ourselves to the following questions: (1) What is the central issue in the present conflict? (2) What has been the role of the law, and particularly of the courts, in resolving this issue? (3) What are the new factors which demand new solutions? (4) What is the role of the law in solving the present crisis? In approaching these questions, we must continually bear in mind that the law operates in a moral climate and reflects that climate.

I. THE CENTRAL ISSUE IN THE RACIAL CRISIS

As a point of departure, let me tell a story which seems relevant. I have a friend who would be described as a white Anglo-Saxon

Protestant and who lives in suburbia. One day her little girl came home from school weeping uncontrollably and her mother was unable to get her to tell what happened. So the mother went to school to investigate. She learned that her daughter's playmates had refused to let her join a rope-skipping game. She was a fat little girl and not a good rope-skipper, but what really broke her heart was that the other children would not even let her hold the rope and turn it for others to skip. When she could talk about it she told her mother, "Mommy, what hurt me so was that they wouldn't even let me be a 'steady-ender.' "

The exclusion from participation as an equal with one's fellows, in work and in play in any society, makes one an outcast. It robs the individual of a feeling of personal worth and of belonging. The permanent effects of such exclusion may be apathy, self-deprecation, violence and aggression, stunted growth, lack of ambition, or sometimes refuge in the exclusion itself as an excuse for poor performance.

In the language of my friend's little daughter, for three centuries the Negro has not even been allowed to be a "steady-ender" in American life. It is against the crushing weight of these three centuries, and against a background of a world revolution in human rights that Negroes now rebel in mass upheavals. Dr. Martin Luther King has explained this mood of impatience as a father who finds it difficult to wait for promises:

"When you suddenly find * * * your speech stammering as you seek to explain to your 6-year-old daughter why she can't go to the public park that has just been advertised on television, and see tears welling up in her little eyes when she is told that Funtown is closed to colored children, and see the depressing clouds of inferiority begin to form in her little mental sky, and see her begin to distort her little personality by unconsciously developing a bitterness toward white people; when you have to concoct an answer for a 5-year-old son asking in agonizing pathos: 'Daddy, why do white people treat colored people so mean?' "

The central issue in this rebellion is human dignity—the inherent rights of free men and women. This issue is not merely the American dream; it is the foundation of our society. We cannot reaffirm too often the principle upon which our Nation stands or falls: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed—that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

These rights are entrenched in the U.S. Constitution. Therefore, they are not only inherent in our beings; they are also guaranteed by our fundamental law and placed beyond the reach of transient legislative majorities. No government can rightfully take them away or permit others to impair them.

Mr. Justice Goldberg made this clear in his opinion in *Watson* v. *City of Memphis* on May 27 of this year, in a Supreme Court decision denying further delay in desegregation of Memphis public parks and other municipal recreational facilities. Speaking for a unanimous Court, he declared:

"Any deprivation of constitutional rights calls for prompt rectification. The rights asserted here are, like all such rights, present rights; they are not merely hopes to some future enjoyment of some formalistic constitutional promise. The basic guarantees of our Constitution are warrants for the here and now and, unless there is an overwhelming compelling reason, they are to be promptly fulfilled."

The major stumbling block in the way of a national solution to our racial problem in the United States is that we have allowed ourselves to be entrapped into the fallacious idea that we have conferred rights on the Negroes and gradually extended them, when the true idea is that we are dealing with inherent rights which have to be reaffirmed. Because we have conceived of the issue as the gradual extension of rights, we have used a piecemeal, fragmentary approach which accords neither with the rightful expectations of Negro citizens, nor with the realities of the world situation.

It is as if, literally, 20 million individuals must each assert and carry the burden of proof, and reassert and reprove endlessly in a multitude of situations, rights which are, in fact, self-evident. What these demonstrations around the country are trying to tell us today is that the issue is not the extension but the reaffirmation and present enjoyment of inherent rights; that the rights which sustain human dignity cannot be fragmented and exercised in part—they must be exercised in whole. And the demonstrations are also reminding us that there needs to be not only prompt rectification but restoration on a scale which will enable Negroes more quickly to throw off generations of cultural deprivations and participate fully and freely as American citizens in our society. In my view, only if we approach this crisis as the reaffirmation of present and inalienable rights can we orient ourselves quickly toward creative and permanent solutions.

II. THE ROLE OF THE LAW AND THE COURTS

In the American legal system, as you know, the Supreme Court has the function and the authority of ultimately interpreting and applying the constitutional principles underlying guaranteed rights to myriad fact situations, and of adjudicating between various rights if they are in conflict. Having declared what the supreme law is, the Court's interpretation is binding upon all the people. Hence, we say that our society is based upon the rule of law and not upon the rule of men.

From its inception, however, our fundamental law contained an irreconcilable contradiction, in that the same basic document which affirmed basic human rights also recognized the institution of slavery—the complete denial of these rights to some men. How was this intolerable contradiction in the law to be resolved?

In 1857, Chief Justice Taney of the Supreme Court attempted to resolve it in the Dred Scott case by determining that some human beings have inherent rights and others do not. He concluded that Negroes were not intended to be included in the Declaration of Independence or in the term "people" in the opening phrase of our Constitution—"We the People of the United States"; nor were any persons of African descent, whether slave or free, intended to be citizens of the United States; "that they had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an inferior race, and altogether unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations, and so far inferior that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect." Thus, according to Taney, the framers of the Declaration of Independence "knew that it would not in any part of the civilized world, be supposed to embrace the [N]egro race, which, by common consent, had been excluded from civilized governments and the family of nations, and doomed to slavery."

This attempt by the Supreme Court to resolve the issue by exclusion did much to make the conflict irrepressible. When the supreme law of the land is consistent with human dignity, controversies as to which rights are paramount can be determined peacefully within the orderly legal processes of our constitutional system. History has shown again and again, that when the fundamental law is interpreted in such a way as to be inconsistent with human dignity, conflict is inevitable.

After a bitter Civil War of 4 years, the Nation reaffirmed and made more explicit inherent human rights in the form of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Congress was expressly given the power to enforce these amendments by appropriate legislation. The purpose of this constitutional change was to sweep away all political and legal barriers to the exercise of equal rights with all other citizens.

Since the institution of slavery had been supported by detailed legislation in the various slaveowning States, and since these formerly rebellious States attempted to reenslave Negroes through the enactment of the Black Codes after the war, the thrust of the 14th amendment was against State action. That amendment provides in part:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

It was clear to the framers of the Reconstruction amendments that Federal protection was necessary for the full and free exercise of citizenship rights. In the 10 years following the Civil War, it also became clear that these rights had to be protected from violation by private persons as well as by State action. These rights also had to be protected uniformly throughout the United States, if citizenship was to be meaningful. Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1875 which declared in part:

"That all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters and other places of public amusement; subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law, and applicable to citizens of every race and color, regardless of any previous condition of servitude."

The act made it a misdemeanor for any person to violate the law by denying to any citizen the full and equal enjoyment of public accommodations, and granted a civil remedy of damages up to $500 to persons aggrieved by such denial.

What was not sufficiently clear to Congress or to the Nation at the time of Reconstruction was that the institution of slavery over a period of two centuries had had a dehumanizing effect upon blacks and whites alike in the entire region where it had become entrenched and had affected the moral climate of the Nation as a whole. A national effort of rehabilitation and restoration of the dignity of impoverished whites and newly freed Negroes in the former slaveowning States ravaged by war was essential if the Nation was to recover from this dehumanization. This was not done. The Freedmen's Bureau, created at the end of the war to give relief to the needy Negroes and whites in the conquered South, was imperfectly conceived, poorly administered, and short lived, lasting only 7 years. What was sorely needed was a 19th-century version of UNRRA or Marshall plan for the South. The absence of such planning set in motion forces of reaction, and we are today reaping the whirlwind of those forces.

At the judicial level, there followed perhaps the most inglorious period in our history with reference to human rights. Judges of the Supreme Court were conditioned by the same attitudes which produced the Dred Scott case; the majority of the Court found it expedient narrowly to interpret the Reconstruction amendments, permitting the Nation to drift backward instead of marching forward. Bit by bit the Court whittled down the broad protection of these amendments. First, it limited the concept of "privileges and immunities" in the 14th amendment and the rights which flow out of Federal citizenship. In light of the current issue of desegregation, two of the Court's important decisions are relevant to our discussion.

In the famous Civil Rights cases of 1883, the Court, by an 8-to-1 decision, declared that the Civil Rights Act of 1875, prohibiting discrimination by private persons in places of public accommodation throughout the country, was unconstitutional and void, on the ground that Congress had no power to enact legislation operative upon individuals in this field under either the 13th or 14th amendments. While it conceded that the language of the 13th amendment was broad enough to reach individuals, it rejected the argument that the 13th amendment was intended to abolish not only the technical legal relationship of master and slave but also all of the incidents of slavery and the badges of inferiority the institution had imposed upon Negroes, whether slave or free. The Court also held that the 14th amendment applied only to State action and not to individual invasion of private rights. Presumably, suggested the Court, these rights could be protected by resort to the laws of the various States.

Mr. Justice John M. Harlan, a former slaveowner from Kentucky who had bitterly opposed the abolition of slavery before the war but who was dedicated to the supremacy of the Constitution, wrote an eloquent and masterful dissent on both of these points and left a beacon light to guide future lawyers upholding human rights. In light of the President's speech on Tuesday night calling for another Federal statute on public accommodations, Mr. Justice Harlan's dissent warrants rereading today. Unquestionably, the decision in the Civil Rights cases opened the door to widespread discrimination by private persons against Negroes, leaving the protection of the most basic aspect of human dignity—the right not to be humiliated by unequal and exclusionary treatment—to the whim of the various States. In my opinion, the Civil Rights cases were wrongly decided and are an important factor in the current unrest. As late as 1959, the Supreme Court refused to reexamine a case brought under the 1875 act. Around the same time several lower Federal courts also denied the applicability of this act to restaurants on interstate highways. Having no remedy in the courts, as President Kennedy aptly pointed out in his nationwide address, Negroes took the issue into the streets. It is significant that the first mass sit-in cases arose in early 1960 following the latest refusal of the Supreme Court to declare an available remedy.

In 1896, the Supreme Court decided the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* and upheld the constitutionality of a Louisiana statute which provided separate railway cars for Negroes and whites in circumstances (a) where regulating intrastate commerce and (b) where such accommodations were "separate but equal." Here the Court denied the view that a segregation statute implied inferiority of Negroes. Although it conceded that the object of the 14th amendment was to establish absolute legal equality, it held the amendment was not intended to abolish distinctions based upon color. Again Mr. Justice Harlan dissented vigorously. His reasoning against the background of contemporary events has been proven to be eminently sound. His words were prophetic. He wrote:

"In my opinion, the judgment this day rendered will, in time, prove to be quite as pernicious as the decision made by this tribunal in the Dred Scott case * * *. What can more certainly arouse race hate, what more certainly create and perpetuate a feeling of distruct between these races, than State enactments which in fact proceed on the ground that colored citizens are so inferior and degraded that they cannot be allowed to sit in public coaches occupied by white citizens? * * * The sure guarantee of the peace and security of each race is the clear, distinct, unconditional recognition by our governments, National and State, of every right that inheres in civil freedom, and of the equality before the law of all citizens of the United States without regard to race. State enactments, regulating the enjoyment of civil rights, upon the basis of race, and cunningly devised to defeat legitimate results of the war, under the pretense of recognizing equality of rights, can have no other result than to render permanent peace impossible and to keep alive a conflict of races, the continuance of which must do harm to all concerned."

The Plessy decision opened the door to massive segregation laws in the Southern States and various degrees of permissive segregation in other areas. Legislative intervention in many Northern States following this decision took the form of State civil rights statutes forbidding discrimination in public accommodations. These laws, however, varied as to places covered and as to degree of enforcement. Some States had no laws.

Distinction and exclusion on grounds of race and color became fixed in our law. As late as 1927, the Supreme Court upheld a Mississippi court ruling that it could constitutionally segregate children "of the brown, yellow, and black races" from white children in the public schools, and denied a child of Chinese ancestry the right to enroll in white schools in that State.

Rigid enforcement of segregation laws in the South, desultory enforcement of civil rights laws in the North and West, constituted the posture of the country with reference to racial segregation as it moved toward World War II. With the exception of a 1917 decision outlawing a Louisville ordinance which, in effect, created residential segregation, the Court showed no inclination to question legally enforced segregation.

Beginning in 1938 with an attack on the exclusion of Negroes from the State universities of the South, the Court, in a case-by-case approach, began the task of realining the law with our fundamental constitutional principles. In 1946, it struck down segregation on interstate carriers, incidentally, declaring void as to interstate passengers, the Virginia statute under which I was arrested and imprisoned 6 years earlier. Bit by bit it overturned the barriers erected on the legal foundation of the Plessy case, but it was not wholly clear until the school desegregation cases of 1954 that the Court was deciding foursquare on the issue of inherent and constitutionally entrenched human rights and their incompatibility with legal segregation. Here the Court met the real issue in the following words:

"Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does * * *. To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone * * *."

With this decision, the Supreme Court sounded the death knell of all segregation where the exercise of State power is involved. Since 1954, that Court has handed down numerous decisions reiterating and applying the basic principle of that case, ordering desegration of State or municipal public facilities, and more recently, reversing convictions of sit-in demonstrators and their leaders under trespass, and other statutes in cases where a local segregation ordinance was present, or local officials voiced a policy of segregation. The Court put over for further argument a case in which there is no segregation law or ordinance or no declared official policy of segregation, and yet sit-in demonstrators are arrested for trespass at the request of the owner of a place open to the public. Thus, by radical surgery in a series of operations, the "separate but equal" doctrine on grounds of race has been removed from our constitutional law. What remains to be decided or legislated is an affirmative remedy for privately enforced segregation or exclusion from public facilities.

III. THE NEW FACTORS WHICH DEMAND NEW SOLUTIONS

With the Supreme Court giving this reaffirmation of basic rights and slowly correcting the earlier deviations from our fundamental law, why have we suddenly found ourselves in a national crisis? This present explosion, of course, is not sudden. Warnings by Negro leadership have been sounded for years, but most of the Nation has been too preoccupied to listen. One important factor is the difference in outlook and tempo between Negroes and the rest of the Nation with respect to the central issue. As Dr. Ralph Bunche pointed out last week, no government ever does enough when people are denied their basic rights. The Nation has been looking at how far Negroes have come in the past two decades, while Negroes on the other hand, are looking at how far they have to go. They see the slow pace of desegregation—four-tenths of 1 percent of Negro children attending desegregated schools in the 11 States of the old Confederacy 9 years after the Supreme Court decision. They look at their limited employment opportunities, their disproportionately high rate of unemployment, the de facto school segregation in the North which is just as damaging to the personalities of their children as the legally enforced segregation condemned by the Supreme Court in 1954. They find their way out of the ghetto to decent integrated housing blocked by various devices, one of which was used in the infamous Deerfield, Ill., case where local authorities in collusion with certain local residents condemned an integrated housing project in process of being built and took over the land for public parks. They experience the daily affronts and humiliations with reference to exclusion from public facilities. The very fact that important improvements have been made in recent years has whetted the appetite for total inclusion. It is axiomatic that the closer one gets to one's goal of human dignity, the more intolerable become the remaining indignities.

A second factor is the rise of a generation of Negroes born during or since World War II into a climate of opinion in which the universal declaration of human rights represents the common aspirations of peoples everywhere and into a world of revolutionary upsurge of colonial people against foreign rule with its implications of racial superiority. This generation has grown up in an atmosphere of incredible speed of events. Gradualism and patience form no part of its heritage, as those of you with children readily appreciate.

A third factor is that by accepting gradualism as the timetable for the solution of

this problem, we have permitted the gains of a bloodless social revolution to be threatened by a violent counterrevolution. My good friend, Dr. Caroline F. Ware, social historian and a doctor of philosophy from Radcliffe, constantly reminds me that social revolutions are not violent; that violence comes into play after social change has occurred or is plainly in sight, and counterrevolutionary efforts are then made to turn the clock back.

We might have escaped much of the violence and unrest of the past decade: if the Supreme Court had moved forthrightly in 1954 to implement its decision, as the NAACP urged, and not waited a whole year which gave the counterrevolutionary forces an opportunity to regroup; if there had been intelligent and creative leadership in the White House and in Congress of sufficient strength to change the moral climate and to implement the decision by legislation which brought into play the educational, persuasive, and conciliatory techniques developed by administrative agencies in the field of intergroup relations, and the implementation of so crucial a social change had not been left to courts which are not equipped to deal with such issues and the atmosphere of which in argumentative and contentious instead of conciliatory; if there had been intelligent joint planning on a national and local scale by Negroes and whites together to aid those Negro children who were most culturally deprived to ease the transition by projects of rapid improvement, remedial instruction and by other methods; and if Federal action had been undertaken at all levels to bar delays and subterfuges in the desegregation of the schools.

I need not recite to this audience the details of headlines which have documented events of the past 8 years and worn down the patience of Negro citizens everywhere: the bombings of homes, schools, churches; massive resistance and interposition in defiance of the authority of the Constitution and Federal court orders; closing of the schools; enactment of pupil placement laws used primarily to produce tokenism; use of other devices to delay and circumvent the 1954 decision; the compelling of Negro children and their parents in hundreds of individual cases to go through interminable administrative and legal procedures with delays and frustrations at every stage to enforce their rights to attend desegregated schools; refusal of white community leaders to sit down and discuss with Negro leaders the problems and tensions building up and to work out peaceful solutions in an atmosphere of mutual self-respect; and finally, incitement to violence by the highest officers of at least three States, and the actual or threatened violence which has forced the Federal Government to make a show of Federal force in order that the Constitution be obeyed.

Meantime, while we allowed the counterrevolution to mount an assault on rights legally reaffirmed, the swift march of world events radically altered the social climate. The peoples of Africa and Asia have achieved self-rule since World War II with a speed that was almost inconceivable a decade ago. As this happened, in the words of Harold R. Isaacs, writing in his recent book, "The New World of Negro Americans":

"The downfall of the white-supremacy system in the rest of the world made its survival in the United States suddenly and painfully conspicuous. It became our most exposed feature and in the swift unfolding of the world's affairs, our most vulnerable weakness. It was like being caught naked in a glaring spotlight alone on a great stage in a huge theater filled with people we had not known were there."

Negro citizens have watched the dramatic advances of the Asian and African peoples and their growing influence in world affairs. They note the consternation of our Government when an African diplomat is refused service in the United States, and see no reason why American citizens should still be treated with "prejudice as usual" inequality.

Over and against this swift rise to independence and recognition of Africans in the world arena, is the fact that American citizens, after patiently using the slow procedures of litigation to enforce their rights, and after numerous pronouncements of the Supreme Court reaffirming these rights, find that the burden of proof still remains upon Negroes and the burden of bit-by-bit implementation has remained on the courts. Congress has passed only one significant piece of national legislation in this area since Reconstruction, the woefully inadequate Civil Rights Act of 1957. The executive branch has taken prompt action in the face of violence, and the Kennedy administration has done considerable behind-the-scenes work in efforts to persuade local authorities to comply with the fundamental law. But in the main, both the Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations tended to react to pressures rather than to assume the vigorous moral leadership necessary to mobilize national opinion and meet the realities of the situation. It is to be hoped that President Kennedy will deepen the tone of moral commitment which pervaded his talk to the Nation on Tuesday evening.

However, given the increasing determination of Negroes to exercise their rights, the moral and legal justification of their cause, the failure of the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government to keep apace of the Supreme Court's pronouncements, the intransigency of local authorities, and the apathy of a wide section of the public, Negroes have taken their case directly to the Nation. They now demand national legislation of a comprehensive character which will reach discriminatory action by individuals as well as States. It was impossible for our country to escape the winds of change which have been sweeping Africa and other parts of the world.

In the circumstances I have just described, until now these demands have been met by temporizing methods or have been ignored. The rising tide of discontent among Negroes to which the President referred is nothing new. Militancy and impatience have been present in Negro protest in every generation since the first African slave landed on these shores—in the slave revolts, the underground railroad movement, periodic marches and rallies, racial episodes and riots, experimental probes with nonviolent direct action during and after World War II, individual challenges to the status quo, and outbursts which have taken the form of intragroup violence.

What is new about the present revolt is the realization by many Negroes that there is an effective answer to violence and an effective alternative to sullen endurance. There is a new consciousness of strength pervading the whole of the Negro community, a total involvement including children and a mass reaction to the problem.

Dr. Martin Luther King and other leaders of his type have been able to harness seething revolt to organized, disciplined, nonviolent direct action. The legal implications of this action are that it is within the protection of freedom of expression guaranteed by the first amendment. The moral implications are, in my opinion, far more significant.

There is a growing national consensus that racial discrimination is essentially a moral problem. If so, it must be attacked at the moral as well as legal level. Nonviolent direct action is based upon the conviction that in social conflict, the power of the spirit is stronger and more enduring than the power of force in a physical contest. By discipline of the spirit, the nonviolent demonstrator determines that violence, if at all, will be on only one side of the controversy. Thus, the demonstrator exercises a certain amount of control over the conflict situation because he eliminates or reduces the immediate provocation to retaliate and transfers the struggle to the conscience of the opponent. He believes that the opponent's hatred, if given only itself to feed upon, must eventually run its course and that, in these circumstances, reconciliation is more possible after the conflict has been resolved. The Negroes have seen this method work with Ghandi in India and have adapted it to peculiarly American situations. Where this method has consciously been used in the demonstrations, despite indignities on the part of the police, violence has been minimized.

As Dr. King wrote in his book, Stride Toward Freedom:

"We will match your capacity to inflict suffering with our capacity to endure the suffering. We will meet your physical force with soul force. We will not hate you, but we cannot in all good conscience obey your unjust laws. Do to us what you will and we will still love you. Bomb our homes and threaten our children; send your hooded perpetrators of violence into our communities and drag us out on some wayside road, beating us and leaving us half dead, and we will still love you. But we will soon wear you down by our capacity to suffer. And in winning our freedom we will so appeal to your heart and conscience that we will win you in the process."

The wider significance of these nonviolent demonstrations by Negroes and their white supporters is that they have brought together two revolutionary ideas: The equality of the rights of man and the assertion of those rights through a spiritually and morally powerful nonviolent technique. They are outpacing the application of the law and making a creative contribution to rapid social change with a minimum of violence. Historians may well record this as one of the important social developments of the 20th century. Nonviolence has filled the vacuum between the declaration and the implementation of the fundamental law.

Nevertheless, we have seen the fruits of violence even after the President made a passionate moral appeal to every American to examine his conscience in this matter. The examination by one depraved person led to shooting an NAACP leader in the back. Negro citizens cannot be expected to maintain a superhuman discipline in the face of continued provocation. It has been pointed out that from 85 to 95 percent of the Negroes in this country do not believe in nonviolence and are going along with it only because it appears to be working. If it fails, we are in for serious national bloodshed.

IV. THE ROLE OF THE LAW IN THE PRESENT CRISIS

At the beginning of our discussion, I said that we are a society built upon the rule of law and not rule by the passions of men. What, then, is the role of the law in resolving the current conflict?

It cannot be too strongly emphasized here that the history of race relations in the United States has proven conclusively that the right to be free from discrimination because of race or color—and I might add sex—is so crucial to human dignity and the exercise of the rights of citizenship, that we have been tragically wrong to leave the protection of this right in so large degree to local regulation. Local laws and policies can supplement but not substitute for a clearly formulated and enforcible national policy binding upon all persons.

The public humiliations which do such violence to human dignity are dramatized by laws, customs, and attitudes of exclusion in places of public accommodation and

amusement. Congress rightly saw in 1875 that this issue was so important it must be resolved in a manner which operated uniformly throughout the United States. It recognized that there could be no piecemeal or fractional coverage in a matter which involves such explosive human emotions. And so it granted total coverage.

Negroes have lived too long with uncertainty to make the recognition of their rights dependent upon any other individual's degree of color blindness, or whether he operates in interstate or local commerce. The quest for certainty is at the bottom of the present revolt. As Martin Luther King, replying from an Alabama prison to the statement of local white religious leaders that the Birmingham demonstrations were "unwise and untimely," put it:

"I guess it is easy for those who have never felt the sting of darts of segregation to say 'wait.' But when you take a cross-country drive and find it necessary to sleep night after night in the uncomfortable corners of your automobile because no motel will accept you; when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the fact that you are a Negro, living constantly at tiptoe stance never quite knowing what to expect next, and plagued with inner fears and outer resentments; when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of 'nobodiness'—then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait."

The Supreme Court has the task of completing the reaffirmation of human dignity. The time has come to persuade that Court once more to reexamine the Civil Rights cases of 1883. The Court should be urged to overrule that decision, reinstate the Civil Rights Act of 1875 and grant an immediate remedy to Negroes who are excluded by private persons from public places of business. For Congress today has no more power than it had in 1875 when it passed the act. The Civil Rights cases were based upon the same fallacious reasoning as that which produced the Plessy case, now discarded, and the dissent of Mr. Justice Harlan in those cases was just as sound as his dissent in Plessy and which is now the law.

As to Federal legislation, President Kennedy has told the Nation that he plans to seek legislation from Congress in three areas: Public accommodations, voting rights, and the power of the Attorney General to bring suits to enforce compliance with school desegregation. These are steps in the right direction, but they are fragmentary and inadequate to deal with the crisis in its present form. They cannot stem the "tide of rising discontent," nor will they appease those who think there should be no legislation at all.

A minimum program of Federal legislation at this stage should include the following measures:

1. A public accommodations law which amends or reenacts the 1875 Civil Rights Act, grounded in the 14th amendment as well as in the interstate commerce clause, along the lines of Senate bill 1591 recently introduced by Senator COOPER prohibiting discrimination by any person "acting as a proprietor, manager, or employee of any business activity affecting the public which is conducted under a State license," or which is in commerce or affecting interstate commerce. Such a law would give the broad coverage necessary to meet the present turmoil in this area of human rights.

2. A Federal Fair Employment Practices Act, also grounded in the 14th amendment as well as the interstate commerce clause to permit the broadest possible coverage.

3. A Federal fair housing law.

4. A law requiring all schools affected to promulgate plans for immediate school desegregation, whether North or South.

5. A law making the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights a permanent administrative body, empowered to enforce federally protected civil rights through procedures which include conciliation, persuasion, and education as well as orders enforcible in the courts.

6. A law strengthening voting rights which effectively meets the problems of evasion by local officials.

7. A law empowering the Attorney General to initiate actions and procedures to enforce all federally protected civil rights.

8. Serious consideration should be given to the proposal recently made by the National Urban League that a "radical new approach" in the form of a massive program similar to that of the Marshall plan be put into operation in order to close the social, economic, educational, and cultural gaps between Negroes and others in the Nation. Such a program would help to rebuild the sense of positive worth and cultural participation which has so long been denied to Negroes. If the United States can spend billions of dollars in foreign aid to help bring the less developed countries abreast of the modern age, it can at least offer comparable assistance to a deprived sector of its own citizenry. We need an "Operation Bootstrap" which engages in a massive national effort to raise the hopes and the standards of that forgotten part of our population which includes both Negroes and whites. Thus, I would broaden the Urban League Proposal to reach underprivileged citizens whatever their race, color, sex, religion, national origin, and so on.

Many of these proposals are not new and are in bills already introduced in Congress. What is new is the promise by Negro leaders and the determination of Negro citizens that a filibuster in Congress will be met by the most massive acts of civil disobedience all over the Nation this country has known. This is not the Negro's fight alone; it vitally affects the welfare and safety of every American. Congress will act when the Nation is resolute. And the Nation means you and me.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I have, on many occasions, spoken out on the problems which confront a large segment of our population, the denial of rights and privileges guaranteed to all American citizens by our Constitution. Discrimination against any citizens because of race, color, religion or national origin is an evil which we must not condone through silence. It behooves every person who believes in the principles on which this Nation was founded to speak out and let his voice be heard.

The eyes of the world are on us who loudly proclaim the right of all people to be free, to participate in the Government, to have equal access to the many opportunities in our great Nation, and to generally enjoy "the American way of life." We are a showcase, but we must surely hide our faces in shame at some of the spectacles which have been on display in that showcase—brutality to citizens because of their color, malicious bombings of homes and churches, and denial of many moral rights simply because of race.

I am privileged to again raise my voice in support of equal rights for all citizens. While it is true that we cannot legislate the conscience of the individual, we must do everything within our legislative power to secure the constitutional rights of all.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 15, the lives of four innocent Negro girls were snuffed out in one of the most heinous crimes against humanity in the annals of American history. No one can question the wantonness of the bombing of the little church that Sunday morning in Birmingham, Ala., or that it was a coldly calculated and thoroughly premeditated act of murder for which justice generally demands the supreme penalty, and the people of the Nation have reacted with righteous indignation that the culprits remain at large despite the diligent efforts of the FBI to ferret them out.

Certainly those individuals who physically planted the dynamite that destroyed the lives of those four girls are guilty of criminal murder in the strictest sense, but in the broader sense, each and everyone of us who has for years tolerated the "for white only" signs that constitute an affront to the human dignity of civilized beings—who have witnessed the incessant humiliations to which Negroes around us have been subjected every day of their lives—each and everyone of us is a party to that crime and must share in the guilt.

In the larger sense, too, each and everyone of us is also the victim of that crime, for whites and Negroes alike suffer equally from the resentment, hostility, hatred and bitterness which inevitably feed upon segregation and racial bigotry.

Justice Harlan more than 60 years ago made this prophetic and profound observation in his dissenting opinion in the case of Plessy against Ferguson:

> The destinies of the two races in this country are indissolubly linked together, and the interests of both require that the common government of all shall not permit the seeds of race hate to be planted under the sanction of the law.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress enacts a truly meaningful civil rights bill, assuring Negroes full political equality, acceptance and participation in the life of his community, then the message of the timely and dramatic parable which took place in Birmingham on September 15 will have reached the American conscience. If on the other hand, this Congress fails to enact an effective civil rights bill, I submit, then, that these girls shall have died in vain.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, our remarks on the civil rights question seem especially timely this afternoon. Events of the present week suggest that we shall be voting on this legislation before another month has passed.

The bill finally coming to us from committee may be less than what some Members had hoped for, but it will still be a strong bill, a bill responsive to the Nation's mood of crisis.

It will be argued through the next 12 months whether this administration and whether we individually have been helped or hurt, politically, by what we do on civil rights. Such discussion makes interesting speculation around the cracker barrel—but it is without meaning. Some decisions require us to rise above consideration of political effect. Our decision on civil rights will be one of these.

There will be pressures for further weakening of the public accommodations section of the bill. But this section goes to the very heart of the problem we seek to meet. It deals with the

most painful grievance of all that is suffered by Negroes and other racial minorities—the humiliation and inconvenience to which they are constantly subjected by business establishments refusing to serve them. The result is not only insult, but often demonstrable injury as well. Whatever else the civil rights bill may do or fail to do—it must end this particular evil.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as has been indicated by my colleagues here in the House this afternoon, probably the most important and pressing issue before the Congress at this time, and indeed the entire country, is civil rights.

There has been much talk about what must be done and what should be done, and what provisions should be included in any civil rights legislation. I was therefore particularly pleased with the action of the House Judiciary Subcommittee in reporting out such a strong bill. It is a sorry note, however, to learn that passage of such strong and necessary legislation does not appear to be possible, and that a weakening of the bill seems to be in order if we are to insure its passage.

As I have said many times before, there is a moral issue involved here, and if we are to live without pangs of conscience, we must extend to each and every citizen of this land, regardless of his race, color, creed, or national origin, the rights and privileges guaranteed by our Constitution, including true equality and freedom.

Our people have risen up before in protest against oppression and despotism. That is why we fought the Revolution. It is in the oldest and finest of American traditions to protest a wrong and to demand that right be done, and we acknowledge the fact that our Negro citizens are most certainly within their rights in calling for peaceful demonstrations against discrimination of any form.

I urge the Members of this House to enact strong meaningful civil rights legislation, which will guarantee without question the protection of his life, property, and civil rights to each of our citizens. It is morally right that freedom apply equally to all Americans, and if we are to continue to uphold the highest standards of justice, we have no alternative but to approve a bill which will show the world that we are more than equal to our mighty heritage of freedom, and worthy or our responsibilities of leadership.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], in speaking out today in opposition to those elements of our society who find it necessary to use violence to perpetuate a racist philosophy the course of which—if allowed to continue—can only lead to disaster.

The latest demonstration of the tenets of this philosophy that has been presented to us was the recent tragedy in Birmingham where four children were murdered while attending church.

It is easy for those of us in the integrated North to talk of civil rights. In most of our communities the rights of our citizens, regardless of race, creed or color, are respected by each and every other citizen of the community and the responsible groups in the community, such as city and State governments, religious organizations, business and fraternal groups see to it that those rights are not abridged. We as a nation can no longer permit any section, any State, or any city to enforce or to allow to continue by complacency, a policy that discriminates against anyone.

It is certainly the feeling of this body, without exception I am sure, that what happened in Birmingham must not happen again. Complacency is the greatest enemy of the civil rights movement; we must not allow it to continue. Apathy erodes justice; we must not let it start.

I wish to commend the gentleman from the 20th District of Texas for his stand today. His stand is particularly commendable for one who represents an area in the Deep South.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member of the House so desiring may have 5 legislative days in which to include their remarks and extraneous matter in connection with this matter under discussion.

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

There was no objection.

RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORTS—A PURELY POLITICAL ISSUE

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago, Mr. John K. Evans, executive director, Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, Inc., Washington, D.C., addressed the Rotary Club in Augusta, Maine. Speaking in the capital city of that great State in the congressional district of my friend and colleague, STANLEY TUPPER, Mr. Evans forcefully and forthrightly spelled out the burden which residual oil quotas place on New England's economy.

As a member of Rotary, I am pleased with his complimentary remarks concerning that great organization. As a Member of Congress, I am pleased to know that the true story of residual oil quotas is now being widely told. My colleagues, the gentlemen from Maine, Congressman MCINTIRE and Congressman TUPPER, have joined with me and many other Members in the House, in calling attention to these outrageously unfair quotas which are so damaging to both industry and consumer.

Because of increasing and widespread interest and concern regarding oil quotas I am calling my colleagues' attention to Mr. Evans' perceptive remarks, which follow:

RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORTS: A PURELY POLITICAL ISSUE

Mr. Chairman and members of the Augusta Rotary Club. Before I proceed with my talk may I say that I have been an admirer of your association for many years—I tried for several years to join the Washington Rotary and finally gave up in despair and joined another service club. Yours is a truly international organization—you even have a chapter in my birthplace, a little one-horse town in Wales. From my personal experience yours is an informed and sophisticated membership devoted to fighting for issues and causes that are for the best interests of all our citizens.

Our country is heading into squally and rough trade waters. No State or citizen of our Nation can disregard the storm signals because every one of us will eventually feel the impact of the tempest that lies ahead. The State of Maine is no exception. The administration is in the middle of a battle royal with our Western allies over chickens—and this is an important issue to Maine producers. But let's bring this issue into perspective before we throw verbal brickbats at our European friends—don't get me wrong, I am not excusing or condoning the Common Market group for their negative trade action. Four years ago the previous administration placed restrictions on the importation of crude oil and residual fuel oil. These restrictions are costing the Maine consumer countless millions each year. Further, these restrictions are imposed on an item which constitutes 11 percent of our total imports trade, which is roughly $16 billion—no dollar volume comparison with the $46 million of chicken exports to the Common Market. While the Europeans have a poor case to justify their action we had no economic case to justify our own regarding residual fuel oil imports 4 years ago other than that of domestic politics created by a multimillion dollar propaganda campaign by the coal mineowners and the United Mine Workers. Under our international agreements on trade we can only place import controls on a commodity through the escape clause or if imports are endangering our national security, and oil is the only commodity restricted for this latter reason. Earlier this year the Office of Emergency Planning study in residual oil imports was released and the findings were that national security was not imperiled by these imports and further that the troubles of the coal industry were not caused by these imports—coal mining areas are in trouble because automation has increased coal production while reducing the manpower needed, a coal miner today produces over 15 tons per day against 6 tons a decade ago. Let's not forget too that today he is the highest paid industrial worker in America—or the world for that matter. Steel and auto workers are well behind. But I don't, of course, begrudge him his wages.

What am I getting at? Simply this, the State of Maine has no indigenous source of either coal or oil. In fact, your State is far removed from any domestic source of these vitally needed forms of energy and if Maine is to remain competitive and progress industrially at an equal pace with the rest of the States, she must get fuels at the lowest possible competitive prices. Further, it is imperative to Maine's exporters of chickens, pulp, paper, etc., that our country's hands are clean if our trade negotiators are to be in a strong bargaining position at the upcoming Kennedy round of GATT trade negotiations with the other member countries of the free world.

I just returned from a European visit and whenever I criticized my European friends for their action on chickens inevitably their retort was "How can you criti-

cize us when you prevent, for purely political reasons, the flow of residual fuel oil into your country—you started all this and further because you restrict these fuel imports you have created problems for our coal industry since the residual fuel oil that you need but will not allow to enter the United States is diverted to Europe where it is creating a serious trade problem for us." And there you have it, one negative action brings a negative reaction and there is no knowing where this particular snowball will lead or end.

I titled this talk "a purely political issue" since the decision to place import controls was decided on the basis of politics since if economics had ruled there would have been no controls. It is a nonpartisan issue—controls were adopted by the previous administration and have been continued by this one—a plague on both their houses. Your State's representatives prove its nonpartisan flavor since you have a Republican and a Democratic Senator, both of whom have voiced their objections to this program. But since politics governs, the voices of your representatives in Washington are drowned out by the loud cries of the highly vocal and well heeled opposition—the coal mine owners spend over $2 million each year on their Washington operations aimed at perpetuating this outrage. The vocal, selfish, dishonest few can always conquer the silent, honest majority. This leads me to the main purpose of my visit to Maine. I want to alert this audience to the fact that Maine industry cannot afford to continue to pay homage to the coal industry and somehow the residents of Maine must be made aware of this fact and awakened out of their lethargy into action.

What are the facts? Imported residual fuel oil has merely supplemented but never supplanted domestic production of this product. Imported residual fuel oil is not the cause of the coal industry's troubles—I repeat, residual fuel oil is not the cause of the coal industry's troubles.

Imported residual fuel oil is essential for the economic production of power, both utilities and commercial industrial consumers, in the State of Maine since you have no indigenous supplies other than that of hydroelectric power. The present program of controlling an economically unjustified system of restricting the importation of this low cost energy has eliminated competition by creating a form of monopoly cartel with the consumer tied to one supplier. Any system involving quota import allocations is unfair and inequitous since an import license is a blank check for the lucky importer who can then bludgeon his captive consumers into submission. This program is no exception and the Maine consumer is paying millions in tribute to the coal mine owners each year. Under the present quota system prices have no relation to economic factors since the method of cutting the import allocation pie is the final decisive price factor.

What can you do about the problem since you have the biggest stake in this issue?

It is a political issue and until the grassroots rise up in honest wrath and make known their views in Washington nothing will happen. The loud voice of the voter is the deciding factor and the group that squeaks the most gets the most grease. You cannot expect your representatives in Washington to do this job alone—they must have your help in this fight. The President and his administrative staff are well aware of the facts of the case but it is up to you consumers, and every one of us is a consumer of power that contains an incremental excess charge due to these import restrictions, to give the administration the power and incentive to act on behalf of the interests of all consumers.

The association with which I am connected, the Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, has been fighting virtually alone to get relief for its members since they cannot continue to survive in the marketplace under the present program. We have blunted our sword in our efforts to get controls removed. An objective evaluation of the scene has forced us to admit to ourselves that since the consumer is always the last to be heard from and galvanized into action, we had better fall back and start a different mode of attack that will take into account the political realities of life. By this I mean that we are now going to concentrate on a compromise that is attainable; namely, the changing of the ground rules of import regulatory controls whereby the present system of end use energy control, no consumer freedom of choice of supplier, and no competition for the consumer's business, is eliminated and replaced by a system of controls that returns competition for the energy consumer's dollar to the marketplace. We want an import system that gives to the consumer the benefit of a low fuel cost via the free enterprise competitive system and this can only be accomplished by the elimination of quotas assigned to eligible importers and instead the establishment of a system whereby if a supplier gets the customer he automatically gets the right to import the residual fuel oil needed and satisfy that customer's fuel requirements. This one simple change would result in savings of several millions of dollars each year in the fuel costs of Maine consumers. It would return your fuel economy to the traditional system of a free competitive market.

Finally, what can you do to help? All of you should go on record collectively through your chapters in Maine and individually by registering your protest to your elected State and Federal representatives as well as to the President of our country. You should get all your customers and friends as well as those with whom you do business to also act accordingly. You should use every means and channel of communication to get all who have a direct or indirect vested interest in the welfare of Maine to bring political pressure to bear on the focal point of action; namely, Washington.

Finally, I'll close with a quote from a letter I received recently from A. R. Schiller, president of the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, since I hope that Maine businessmen will adopt the same policy, "You may rest assured that we shall continue in our efforts just as long as we believe that the imposition of artificial and unnecessary import restrictions continue to contribute to the fact that fuel costs in New England are the highest of any region." Unless all of you who have a direct vested interest in this issue get into this fight for the right, nothing will happen because without you, the consumer, in the battle we have lost without firing a shot.

FEED GRAIN PROGRAM OF 1963 AN INCREDIBLE WASTE

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this year taxpayers spent an alltime record amount—nearly a billion dollars—trying to persuade farmers not to grow corn. Despite this outlay, corn production will break all records.

The Department of Agriculture has announced the 1963 corn crop will reach 4,009 million bushels—also an alltime high.

The program is intended to cut back production of feed grains, of which corn is the major item. Before the program started, annual production was 152.6 million tons (average of the program's base years, 1959–60). Production this year is officially estimated at 152 million tons—down only 600,000 tons.

Expressed in corn equivalent, this means a cutback in production of only 21.4 million bushels.

Payments to farmers and other direct costs of this year's program total $924.5 million.

Therefore, taxpayers are shelling out $43 for each bushel cutback in production. This is a fantastic price to pay for not growing a bushel of corn worth about $1.

In opposing the 2-year extension of this program last spring on the House floor, I predicted each bushel cutback in production this year would cost $27. Several Congressmen tried to ridicule my estimate, but it proved to be very much on the conservative side.

We have now had 3 years experience with the feed grains program. We are spending more than ever and getting less results.

This program costs taxpayers nearly one-fourth the value of the entire feed grain crop.

Last spring the Congress authorized this same billion-dollar boondoggle for 1964 and 1965. This action should be repealed, in order to prevent further repetition of this incredible waste.

DISARMAMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a significant resolution which I am sponsoring and which is being introduced today in the other body by Senator JOSEPH CLARK and 15 other Senators. I have introduced in the House this resolution which states the following:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President should be supported in his efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament under legally effective controls and to develop international institutions capable of keeping the peace during and after disarmament.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to formulate as speedily as possible specific and detailed proposals for the implementation of the foreign policy objectives of the United States regarding the establishment of an international authority to keep the peace under conditions of general and complete disarmament effectively guaranteed by adequate inspection and controls. In formulating such proposals, the President is requested to consider whether the development of effective international machinery for the supervision of disarmament and the maintenance of peace, including (1) an international disarmament organization; (2) a permanent world peace force; (3) world

tribunals for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes not settled by negotiations; (4) other international institutions necessary for the enforcement of world peace under the rule of law; and (5) appropriate and reliable financial arrangements for the support of such peacekeeping machinery, may best be achieved by revision of the Charter of the United Nations, by a new treaty, or by a combination of the two.

SEC. 3. The President should make such proposals available to the Congress and to the public generally.

SEC. 4. The President is requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the heads of government of all of the nations of the world and to urge them to initiate within their governments studies of matters germane to this resolution and to formulate and make generally available recommendations based upon such studies.

Mr. Speaker, on September 25, 1961, the President in his magnificent address to the United Nations stated:

Today, every inhabitant of this planet must, contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness.

Although the test ban treaty has been signed, the President's statement is as valid today as it was in 1961. The test ban treaty is the first step toward the day when the nuclear sword of Damocles will no longer hang over our heads. However, we must realize that, although "a journey of 1,000 miles must begin with a single step," that journey will never be completed unless the first step is followed by many others. The road to be traveled if the world is to know peace and security is clear. It is the road toward disarmament under effective international control. As long as nations retain nuclear weapons with their capacity to destroy civilization, we will remain threatened by extinction. For, as the President so eloquently has pointed out, the danger from "accident or miscalculation or madness" will not be removed until disarmament under effective international control is achieved.

The realization that "the weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us" led to the "U.S. Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." This proposal, which was introduced in 1961 at the 16th session of the United Nations General Assembly, defined the objective of the United States as:

A world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The resolution introduced today will move us toward that goal. It is a constructive step forward toward the establishment of the only genuine security system for the United States and the world—disarmament under effective international control. I urge all my colleagues to join with me in support of this resolution.

VOICE OF SANITY

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the recent news reports in the communications media concerning the military coups of the Morales government in Honduras and the Bosch government in the Dominican Republic indicated a grave concern over a worsening situation in Latin America.

Our able and distinguished colleague, ARMISTEAD SELDEN, who as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs has access to the essential information to form a constructive judgment, has expressed his opinion in an excellent speech before this House on the military coups in Latin and Central America, and has shown his concern over the relationship between the United States and the new governments in Honduras and the Dominican Republic. It would be good for members of the executive branch of our Government to recognize Congressman SELDEN's opinion and carefully watch the future developments in those countries before setting policy advocating strong action against their new governments.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD, the October 11, 1963 editorial from the Evening Star that commends Congressman SELDEN's views as a "Voice of Sanity":

VOICE OF SANITY

Representative SELDEN's remarks in the House this week on coups, dictators, and democracy didn't attract much attention. This is too bad. For what he said made sense—a great deal more sense than some of the overly excited commentators who would have us believe that the end of the world is heralded by the upsets in the Dominican Republic and Honduras.

Mr. SELDEN, who comes from Alabama, is chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. In this capacity he has access to the information essential to an informed judgment.

He says there is no doubt that the best interests of the United States lie in the existence of a democratic and economically stable Latin America. But he doesn't believe that our interests would be served by dispatching gunboats and the marines to the Caribbean every time a military coup is staged. It is strange, as Mr. SELDEN points out, that so many people who recoil in horror from the prospective use of force against a Castro are eager to smash the military regime which ousted Juan Bosch in Santo Domingo. And it is also foolish.

Mr. SELDEN thinks we do not really know as yet whether the events in Santo Domingo and Honduras are not in fact serving the long-range interests of the people of those countries. And it follows that we do not really know whether our own long-range interests are being served.

Both Mr. Bosch and President Villeda Morales were guilty at least of temporizing in the face of internal Communist threats. They did not head strong governments. As Mr. SELDEN aptly put it, "democracy was doomed in the Dominican Republic and Honduras not by its strong enemies but by its weak servants."

Now that these weak regimes have been toppled, the United States must make a decision. We are suspending aid and diplomatic acceptance, presumably pending an evaluation of the intentions of the military people who have taken control. Aid and diplomacy can properly be used to obtain maximum democratic concessions from them. But they cannot bring back a Bosch or a Villeda Morales.

This being the case, is it in our interests to squeeze hard enough to induce the collapse of the existing governments? We do not think so, for the alternative would very probably be Communist governments on the Castro pattern.

Mr. SELDEN summed it up this way: "Let me put it bluntly—a dictatorship is odious. But if driven to a choice I prefer a dictatorship seeking our support and friendship rather than a Communist dictatorship capable of furnishing missile emplacements to those who would bury us."

This last may be a bit on the rhetorical side. But the basic thesis should appeal to anyone in his right mind.

MONTICELLO COLLEGE, ALTON, ILL.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I address the House today. Tomorrow, Friday, October 18, marks the formal dedication of the new $2 million theatron of Monticello College for Women at Godfrey, Ill. Hatheway Hall, as it is to be known, has been made possible through a private gift. It is the largest single donation ever received by a junior college in the United States. This building realizes the combining of facilities for cultural, academic, and athletic activities, and represents the continuing strides of Monticello in meeting the challenges of the future.

Long known as one of the outstanding 2-year colleges for women, Monticello College is in its 128th year. Founded in 1835, and known as the Monticello Female Seminary until 1935, the school has continued to expand its physical plant without impairing its reputation as an educational institution of first order. Noted for its curriculum and faculty, Monticello has compiled an enviable academic record throughout its history. It is indeed fitting that Monticello College has been cited many times as a leading private educational institution.

From the original class of 16 to the present student body of 350, Monticello has been able to meet its needs solely through private enterprise. Hatheway Hall is but one more example of this, and is further indicative of Monticello College's contribution to the well-being of its students and the community.

The following article from the October 12 edition of the Alton (Ill.) Evening Telegraph relates the history of Monticello College:

THE MONTICELLO STORY

The first year for Hatheway Hall marks the 128th year for Monticello College. Opening Hatheway Hall is another milestone in the history of the college, providing a place for educational, cultural, and athletic events under one roof.

Monticello College, founded in 1835 as Monticello Female Seminary, is one of the

oldest institutions for the higher education of women in the United States. It was founded by Capt. Benjamin Godfrey, a retired sea captain, born in Chatham, Mass., in 1794. Godfrey made a fortune in Mexico, which he lost to bandits.

He made another fortune, came to New Orleans, then to St. Louis. He settled on the prairie 4 miles north of Alton (Monticello, Ill., later Godfrey, Ill.).

Godfrey had eight daughters for whom he wished the kind of education which would make them better wives and mothers. He described the beginning of his idea for the education of women in a letter * * * "One morning while lying in my bed somewhat indisposed, my wife came into the room, and as she went out, made some comment. One of our little children, who had just begun to lisp a few words, caught the remark, and repeated it over and over for some time. This led me to reflect on the powerful effect of a mother's example on the minds, manner, and habits of their offspring and the not less powerful influence that females have over the society at large."

In the mind of another man about this time was the idea of bringing education to the West. He was Theron Baldwin who traveled to Illinois in 1829 with the Yale band, a group of young men planning to "plant churches, form Sabbath schools, found a college, establish academics, male and female, and encourage common schools, in short: promote Christian education in all its departments."

SEEKS HELP

Baldwin's words tell of his meeting with Godfrey and the proposal presented to him: "While (pursuing) a missionary tour in southern Illinois, the night of the 17th of December 1834, we spent at the house of the founder. He then stated that he had come to the conclusion to spend some $10,000 in the (erection) of a female academy and desired me to take the superintendence of the institution and devote myself permanently to its interests."

Baldwin was hesitant in accepting the responsibility of such an undertaking, because he felt it would take his time away from his missionary work. However, he finally decided to undertake the work of helping establish the seminary.

After helping Captain Godfrey select a site for the schoolbuilding, he traveled east to confer with the heads of other female institutions concerning the curriculum to be set up. He visited with Mary Lyon, founder of Mount Holyoke and says of the visit: "The larger portion of several days was devoted to a discussion with her on the whole subject of female education."

During the tour he also visited female seminaries at Rochester, Auburn, Clinton, Albany, Middlebury, Ipswich, Castleton, and North Hampton. Baldwin decided that in order to be left at liberty to promote general education throughout the State, it would be necessary to have a female teacher that would act as principal and become responsible for the management and the character of the institution.

Consequently through correspondence with Miss Mary Cono, of Warren, Ohio, a graduate of Ipswich Female Seminary, and a teacher at that institution, agreements were made for her to be the first principal. Miss Cono, however, declined the title of principal in preference to being head of a department.

CAMPUS OPENS

A road was built from the Mississippi River to transport the stone for the building. After some delay in finishing the building, the seminary opened on April 11, 1838, for the first classwork. The first meal was breakfast prepared by Mrs. Baldwin and served by the faculty. Each girl had to bring her own napkin, ring, fork, and spoon. They had hard-boiled eggs, bread and butter, griddle cakes, and coffee.

Attending were Mr. Theron Baldwin, Mr. Enoch Long, Miss Philena Fobes, Miss Mary Cono, Mrs. Enoch Long, and Mrs. Baldwin. After a few remarks for the occasion the school was opened with prayer. There were 16 pupils present.

By 1890 the campus had grown to 30 acres. In 1896 the south wing was added which contains the entertainment hall and gym with money which was a gift of Mr. and Mrs. Reid. In 1898, Reid Memorial Chapel (now the library) was built in memory of Eleanor Irwin Reid.

The Evergreens, home of the president, was given to the college by Miss Haskell. It was built in 1850.

In 1960 Fobes Hall was built. The connecting corridor where the sun parlor and conservatory are and the swimming pool was built this same year. By this time the campus had expanded to 250 acres.

Wade Memorial Building is connected with the other buildings by a passageway above the porte-cochere entrance. It was built in 1926 in memory of Edward Pierson Wade, a member of the board of trustees from 1884 to 1920 and is dedicated to the fine arts.

The Benjamin Godfrey Memorial Chapel, built in 1854, has been a landmark for a century. Photographs of the chapel are preserved in the Library of Congress.

NAME IS CHANGED

Alden House is the faculty residence located just north of the Evergreens. The log cabin given by the class of 1921, has been enlarged to twice its size since then. The Highlands (stable and riding ring) were completed in 1952, a gift of a Monticello alumna.

The name of Monticello Seminary was changed in 1935 by unanimous vote of the board of trustees to Monticello College, although it had been a recognized and full accredited 2-year college since 1917. A description of the "accommodations" from the catalog of 1842:

"A building of stone has been erected 110 by 44 feet, and 4 stories high, including basement. The two upper stories together contain 40 rooms, 9 or 10 by 16½ feet, including a convenient clothes press and each designed to accommodate two young ladies.

"The rooms were furnished with a double bedstead, mattress, or strawbed, table and chairs. All additional furniture must be provided by the occupants, such as bedding, wash-stand, bowl, and pitcher. The building is principally warmed by a hot-air furnace, fires are not allowed in the sleeping rooms.

"The second story is divided into schoolrooms, recitation and family rooms. The basement into kitchen, dining hall and chapel. The seminary grounds consist of about 8 acres, spacious yard in front and a garden in the rear. It was deemed of the highest importance to have the buildings so constructed and the grounds so arranged that all associations connected with them shall be agreeable."

FAILURE PREDICTED

From an anniversary address given by Theron Baldwin, June 27, 1855, we have a general description of the educational program of the institution: "The education furnished should be substantial, extensive, and practical. In other words, that it should develop harmoniously the physical, the intellectual, and moral powers and prepare its subjects, not for an imaginary state of existence, but for the sober realities and duties of actual life."

None under 14 years of age were admitted to the seminary and it was stated in this early catalog that the site for the seminary was chosen "for a regard to health and freedom from the bustle and temptations common to a large town."

Some persons felt that the seminary would not succeed because it was built in the country and would not have the patronage and support that a town could give it. Godfrey said that if it did not succeed as a school, it could be used as an orphanage.

Miss Philena Fobes was principal from 1843 to 1866. An article in the Alton City Directory of 1858 states that a fourth story had been added to the original building at a cost of nearly $30,000 and that the school can accommodate 150 pupils. The grounds have grown from 8 acres to 16 acres.

Monticello has been fortunate in having executive leaders of long tenure, high ability and determined courage.

NEW ERA AHEAD

Miss Philena Fobes succeeded Theron Baldwin in 1845, after serving as an instructor and faculty leader in the school from its beginning. She retired in June 1865. Miss Harriet Newell Haskell, a graduate of Mount Holyoke College, was head of the institution for the 40 years from 1867 to 1907. Catherine Burrows was acting principal from 1907 to 1910. Miss Martina Erickson became principal in 1910 and served until 1918, when she was succeeded by Miss Harriet Rice Congdon who served from 1918 to 1935.

Dr. George Irwin Rohrbough was president from 1935 to 1945. On June 15, 1945, Dr. John Ripley Young became Monticello's seventh president. Russell Thornley Sharpe served as eighth president of Monticello College from March 1953, until November 1, 1958.

In the fall of 1958, the board of trustees of the college elected Duncan Wimpress as ninth president of Monticello. Dr. Wimpress received his bachelor of arts degree in journalism and his master of arts in journalism and political science from the University of Oregon. He earned his doctor of philosophy from the University of Denver.

PLANNING FOR PEACE RESOLUTION

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to join several of my colleagues in both House and Senate in sponsoring a "planning for peace" resolution.

The recent ratification of the limited test ban treaty has given each of the two major powers of an harassed world a "time-out" from its compulsive, hazardous efforts to achieve that will-o'-the-wisp—complete military security and dominance.

During this pause that, I hope, redirects as well as refreshes, it is a propitious time to give attention to additional efforts toward additional relaxations of tensions.

I do not know just how "détente-ish" the Soviet Union is. However, I would hope that the U.S. Government would exploit the moment at hand to create new and improve existing international organizations designed to submit the world to peace-through-law. This resolution calls upon the President to consider such possibilities as creating a permanent world peace force, an international disarmament organization, and tribunals to settle differences among Nations that

cannot be resolved by negotiations, and to determine more satisfactory methods of financing the U.N. and auxiliary organizations.

In closing I want, Mr. Speaker, at this time to express my warmest congratulations to Senator CLARK for his leadership in the sponsoring of this resolution. This is another example of repeated instances in which Senator CLARK has displayed high purpose and statesmanlike qualities in the area of domestic and foreign problems. His example should be an inspiration to Members of both the House and Senate because he typifies the concept of the dedicated and courageous public servant.

Whereas the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States, in the interests of each and of all mankind, have concluded a treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, which over 100 nations have signed; and

Whereas the adoption of this treaty, which constitutes a small but significant first step in reducing the risk of war, has enhanced the prospect for the negotiation of further international agreements based upon mutual interest and calculated to advance the cause of world peace; and

Whereas the basic purpose of U.S. foreign policy is the achievement of a just and lasting peace, which cannot be attained without the development of the rule of law solution of this problem"; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly, at its 14th session, unanimously adopted "the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control," and called upon governments "to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem"; and

Whereas President Eisenhower stated on September 22, 1960, to the 15th General Assembly, "Thus, we see as our goal, not a superstate above nations, but a world community embracing them all, rooted in law and justice and enhancing the potentialities and common purposes of all peoples"; and

Whereas President Kennedy stated on June 10, 1963, that "our primary long-range interest" is "general and complete disarmament—designed to take place by stages, permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which would take the place of arms"; and

Whereas the U.S. program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, introduced at the 16th session of the United Nations General Assembly, defined the objective of the United States as "A world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control" and the "institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations" and called for the creation of an International Disarmament Organization to insure compliance with disarmament obligations, a United Nations Peace Force to keep the peace during the period of disarmament and thereafter, and improved processes for the peaceful settlement of international disputes; and

Whereas President Kennedy, in addressing the 18th session of the United Nations General Assembly on September 20, 1963, called for the revision of the Charter of the United Nations to permit the development of that body into "a genuine world security system," and declared that the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations must be strengthened by the adoption of sound financial arrangements and the maintenance of standby peace force contingents by member nations, and that resort to special missions for the conciliation and adjudication of international disputes be increased; and

Whereas the realization of these goals through international negotiations, United Nations Charter revision, or otherwise, is a matter of urgency because (1) the increasing number and destructive capabilities of nuclear weapons at the disposal of individual states and groups of states threaten mankind with the catastrophe of all-out war; and (2) the increasing cost of the arms race is preventing human needs from being met in all the countries of the world; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly, during recent sessions, has resolved to keep in being the Committee on Arrangements for the purpose of reviewing the charter, and has further resolved to ask the committee to submit periodic reports, with recommendations, to future sessions of the General Assembly; and

Whereas the achievement of an international accord for general and complete disarmament under effective controls and the development of international peacekeeping machinery require not only the support of the Congress, but also an informed public opinion in the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President should be supported in his efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament under legally effective controls and to develop international institutions capable of keeping the peace during and after disarmament.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to formulate as speedily as possible specific and detailed proposals for the implementation of the foreign policy objectives of the United States regarding the establishment of an international authority to keep the peace under conditions of general and complete disarmament effectively guaranteed by adequate inspection and controls. In formulating such proposals, the President is requested to consider whether the development of effective international machinery for the supervision of disarmament and the maintenance of peace, including (1) an International Disarmament Organization; (2) a permanent World Peace Force; (3) world tribunals for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes not settled by negotiations; (4) other international institutions necessary for the enforcement of world peace under the rule of law; and (5) appropriate and reliable financial arrangements for the support of such peacekeeping machinery, may best be achieved by revision of the Charter of the United Nations, by a new treaty, or by a combination of the two.

SEC. 3. The President should make such proposals available to the Congress and to the public generally.

SEC. 4. The President is requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the heads of government of all of the nations of the world and to urge them to initiate within their governments studies of matters germane to this resolution and to formulate and make generally available recommendations based upon such studies.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. EDWARDS (at the request of Mr. GONZALES), for 60 minutes, on October 21, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DENT in two instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. EDMONDSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCLOSKEY.

Mr. MCCLORY.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 102. An act to provide for additional commissioners of the U.S. Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 649. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 920. An act to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may issue authorizations, but not licenses, for alien amateur radio operators to operate their amateur radio stations in the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico provided there is in effect a bilateral agreement between the United States and the alien's government for such operation by U.S. amateurs on a reciprocal basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

H.R. 7544. An act to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 724. Joint resolution to provide additional housing for the elderly.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of Senate procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 21, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1305. A letter from the Surgeon General, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of the Second National Conference on Public Health Training, held August 19–22, 1963, pursuant to section 306(e) of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1306. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication "All-Electric Homes, Annual Bills, January 1, 1963", which includes the first comprehensive compilation of annual bills for electric power consumption for all-electric homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1307. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend Public Law 88–72 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 8853. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the admissions tax shall not apply in the case of certain athletic games held for the benefit of nonprofit hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 8855. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 8856. A bill to bring the Government Printing Office within the purview of the act of September 26, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay and other matters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 8857. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 8858. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 8859. A bill to accelerate, extend, and strengthen the Federal air pollution control program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.J. Res. 777. Joint resolution to designate Columbus Day, the 12th day of October in each year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H. Con. Res. 224. Concurrent resolution relative to planning for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 8860. A bill for the relief of Ernester Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 8861. A bill for the relief of Henry J. Van Arsdale; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 8862. A bill for the relief of Nazzarena Scarsella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 8863. A bill for the relief of William S. Perrigo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H. Res. 550. Resolution providing for sending the bill (H.R. 8767) for the relief of Algonac Manufacturing Co. and John A. Maxwell, president, individually, with accompanying papers, to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to passage of H.R. 6237, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hon. Francis E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished career of Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, ended May 31 of this year, when he died at the age of 69. Those of us who knew Congressman Walter most intimately lost a great and dear friend and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Nation lost an energetic and fighting patriot.

My words in memory of a valued friend, come from years of respected association with him. He was a true, longtime friend and I shall never forget the loss of his influence for good government. I shall always treasure my personal contacts with Congressman Walter. Never was he too engaged to lend a hand to me when I needed his guidance.

It was a very gratifying and rich experience for me to represent Northampton County in the Pennsylvania State Senate and to know that Northampton County was a part of Francis Walter's congressional district. I learned firsthand of his effective work in behalf of the citizens of our Commonwealth in the areas of flood and pollution control, power, navigation, recreation, and so on.

At the time of Congressman Walter's death, one Pennsylvania newspaper very appropriately stated:

He was a fearless defender of principles and never lacked the fortitude to stand up for what he believed to be right, regardless of criticism or controversy. Francis E. Walter served his constituents, his State, and his country with extraordinary distinction.

For 30 consecutive years he served in the U.S. Congress. He possessed unwavering devotion to his duties as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Attesting to his influence in Congress and his ability as a legislator and orator was the fact that during his tenure as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, since January 1955, the House always supported his requests for the necessary operating funds. It was at Mr. Walter's suggestion that a set of rules and hearing procedures were devised that he considered fair to all witnesses.

The late Congressman not only knew our Government well, but he had great faith in our kind of government. He will long be remembered as the coauthor of the Walter-McCarran Act and it was with deep pride and conviction he upheld the merits of this law. He never flinched when criticism was handed him, nor when obstacles were placed in his appointed path. His unbroken service in the Congress of the United States since the inception of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration serves as tribute to his tenacity and integrity. He never deserted his beliefs.

We recall that Francis Walter's service in the Congress also included ranking

membership on the House Committee on the Judiciary and chairmanship of its Subcommittee on Immigration and its Special Subcommittee on Administrative Procedure; membership on the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy; chairmanship of the Democratic Caucus; and chairmanship of the House Democratic Patronage Committee. He was elected Speaker pro tempore in the 81st Congress and appointed Speaker pro tempore in the 87th Congress. He had profound faith in the principles of his Democratic Party, but he was first of all a loyal American.

In the minds of many people Congressman Walter set a standard for Americanism, not only in his fight against Communists and subversive influences, but in his determination to preserve our constitutional form of government. He resolutely fought against any move which would have abandoned some of our great constitutional principles. He not only demonstrated his faith in his fellowmen, but also in the form of government which enabled him to rise to membership in one of the greatest deliberative bodies of the world. He never doubted the ability of Americans to solve their problems without forsaking their freedoms.

I shall forever be grateful for his counsel as a great legislator and as a trusted friend. It is with profound humility and honor that I now represent the congressional district served by Francis E. Walter.

Opening of Carmel High School, Mundelein, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a significant event occurred recently in the 12th Illinois District which I have the honor to represent, when Carmel High School was officially opened in Mundelein, Ill.

This cooperative institution, providing high school education for boys under the sponsorship of the Carmelite Order and for girls under the sponsorship of the order of the Blessed Virgin Mary, provides a unique and much needed facility for secondary education in Lake County, Ill.

It is reported to me that Carmel High School is the first of its kind in the Midwest with its separate educational opportunities for young women under the well-known Catholic religieuses, respectfully known as BVM, and for the young men under the equally well-known Carmelites, or White Friars. The two groups combine for certain scientific and educational instruction and for the use of the library facilities which are outstanding in capacity and content.

Recently, I was privileged to present a flag to Carmel High School which had been previously flown above our National Capitol in Washington and which was accepted in an appropriate ceremony by Sister Mary Cecil, BVM, who is principal of the girls high school, and Father David J. Murphy, O. Carm., who is principal of the boys high school. Other guests attending this ceremony were Rev. Father Brian McCulloch, O. Carm., Superior Carmelite Monastery, Mundelein, Col. Benjamin Chapla, U.S. Army, Post Commander Fort Sheridan, and Lt. Gen. W. H. Arnold, U.S. Army, retired.

Also presented at this ceremony were autographed photographs of public officials including Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Senators EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and PAUL H. DOUGLAS, and all members of the Illinois delegation to the U.S. House of Representatives, Gov. Otto Kerner, of Illinois, and other elected officials of the State including Charles F. Carpentier, secretary of state. President John F. Kennedy sent a photograph with a letter wishing success to the new institution. Secretary Carpentier presented a State of Illinois flag for the library.

Members of the advisory board of the Carmel High School include some of the most distinguished citizens of the northern Illinois area: Lt. Gen. William H. Arnold, U.S. Army, retired, Messrs. Martin T. Burns, William J. Carney, Wallace E. Carroll, Michael Cudahy, Arsene J. Denoyer, Frank Flick, and Richard F. Kennedy.

The AID Investment Guarantee Program Fosters Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, advocates of the free enterprise system will be pleased to know that the Agency for International Development has accomplished a great deal in promoting private investment in underdeveloped countries through its investment guaranty program. This very important and well-considered activity of our foreign aid program has helped to project the activities of our private businessmen and corporations into foreign countries in demonstration of a system which has contributed much more to the strength of our own country than direct intervention of government.

An agreement recently reached with Ecuador marked the 21st investment guarantee agreement by AID in 12 months. The bilateral agreement such as that reached with Ecuador permits AID to insure U.S. investors against inability to convert local currency into dollars; against loss due to expropriation, war, insurrection and revolution, and against certain commercial and political risks of an extended nature. Fees are charged for this insurance. Since 1948, when the program was started, the United States has signed agreements with 70 countries.

The new agreement with Ecuador amends one dating from 1955 by adding protection for investors against the hazards of war, insurrection and revolution and extended risks. The previous coverage provided protection only against inconvertibility of currency and loss from expropriation.

As of June 30, 1963, AID enjoyed a profit from this insurance program. As of that date AID and its predecessors had issued $1,192,675,600 worth of guarantees to private investors. Fees collected totaled $12,417,917.88. Only three claims have been made, totaling $667,547.

No new guarantees have been issued for Europe since 1959. The current emphasis is on underdeveloped countries and dependencies. In the fiscal quarter, April 1 to June 30, 1963, guarantees were issued to 23 applicants, totaling $7,637,924. As of June 30, AID had on hand 1,137 applications totaling $4.5 billion. Of these, 665 were for Latin America, representing a total of $2.8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope that those who have opposed our foreign aid program in the belief that its activities contravene our private enterprise system will take note of this accomplishment of AID.

Special Report—Taxes, Troubles, and Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, periodically, I report to the people in my district. It appears lately that my heavy mail has been dealing with "Taxes, Troubles, and Tariffs."

The report follows:

SPECIAL REPORT—TAXES, TROUBLES, AND TARIFFS

Taxes: The administration's tax cut bill, which recently passed the House, now rests in the Senate. Action by the Senate is expected sometime in November. A great deal of criticism has been aimed at those who voted for the tax cut because they did not pass a shotgun budget cut at the same time.

Most Members of Congress would welcome an opportunity to vote for both proposals at one time. However, even the proponents of budget cuts know that they must come by piecemeal action rather than by a wholesale cut without a reasonable explanation and logic for eliminating certain services and specific governmental operations.

The tax cut bill, as it now stands, would give a worker with a wife and two children paying a tax of $877 a tax reduction of $191, depending upon the exact income and the number of dependents. Workers within the $4,000-to-$10,000 bracket would receive tax cuts ranging from $78 to $354. However, tax deductions would be generally lower within this same income bracket for workers who submit their tax returns with itemized deductions.

The tax proposal, according to the President, is designed to stimulate economic growth and reduce the Nation's level of high

unemployment. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, who, incidentally, spoke in Westmoreland County on the 24th of October, said, "The tax proposal represents an approach to the problem of unemployment and inadequate growth which meets the need for greater consumer purchasing to stimulate investment and plant production."

The present tax structure was designed to raise high revenues and prevent inflation during World War II. During the Korean war it had the same purpose, and since then it has been maintained to enable us to finance our responsibilities of world leadership. The economy has grown substantially in the last 20 years. Indexes in recent years demonstrate that inflation is no longer a threat. However, the tax structure is exercising an adverse influence on the economy, holding back its growth.

In spite of arguments to the contrary, any tax cut is bound to help the economy since it will give more money to be spent in the marketplace. The only danger is that because of our idiotic trade policy, the extra dollars may be spent to buy foreign-made goods which, in turn, will not help our industries but will give an added impetus to automation so that American producers can compete with low wage products coming into the country. This in the end, will negate the tax cut benefits.

If we are to get the benefits of this tax cut, American shirtmakers will have to buy American-made cars and American autoworkers will have to buy American-made shirts. This applies to all American-made products.

Your Congressman voted for the tax cut and is only sorry that he didn't have more cuts to vote for, since he believes that taxes on individuals and individual incomes are the greatest detriment to marketplace growth. Unless the market can absorb the goods produced by labor there will be no need for production and this results in unemployment. Westmoreland County knows full well that in spite of statistics, we still have a chronic unemployment problem. The present day crop of Government economists seem to believe that production will cure unemployment. They better revise their thinking. Consumption is the key to prosperity. Production and wages, profits and investments provide consumption and consumption feeds the economy in an industrial complex.

Troubles: This Nation has spent billions of dollars all over the world on the premise that we were building good will while helping other nations to become self-sufficient by providing the necessary funds for some nations to rehabilitate themselves after World War II, as well as the emerging nations being freed from the shackles of colonialism that had stifled their growth for the past centuries. We have spent something like $105 billion in this process. Only a fool would say that we have not done some good. In the main, however, it appears that so far we have not made a good bargain in building good will or a peaceful coexistence among all people.

All over the world there are flareups that are causing this Nation to be mixed up in the affairs of independent countries to the extent that every internal situation becomes our business. There are more countries in a state of internal revolution and disruption than at any time in world history. How can it be otherwise—when you take, for instance, a nation like Liberia with a total collection of revenue amounting to $35,500,000 in 1 year—while, at the same time, this Nation puts aid into the country in all forms, amounting to $39,800,000. In many instances our money has more than equaled the amount of money in the total budget of some of these nations. In some countries the leaders keep the Treasury in their pockets.

It is even rumored that in some instances, the takeovers and coups are generated by the influx of U.S. dollars. Today we witness a situation that a few years ago, or even a few months ago, would have caused a storm of protest. However, in this day's atmosphere, American people appear to be accepting, and the newspaper editorials appear to be pressing the sale of wheat to Red Russia. It is not the sale of the wheat, but the principle behind this transaction that is disturbing.

Secretary Dillon places the entire transaction on a financial and economic footing by stating that it will help our balance of trade. Others say that it will create good will with the Russian people. All of them seem to forget what was said by officials of this country and other spokesmen over the years in this aspect of trading with the enemy, and I quote: "Doing business with an enemy that wants to kill and bury us is treason in its own right, and those who carry on this traffic should be subject to the penalties that attach to treason."

Congress passed an amendment in the late 1950's which bars this country from selling any subsidized agricultural products to any Communist nations, and yet it appears as though we intend to sell surplus wheat to all Communist nations except Cuba. Our excuse for not selling to Cuba is that it is close to our border, and we therefore plead with our friendly allies not to sell to Cuba. We seem to forget that the Communist nations of Europe are close to our allies' borders; therefore, we can't expect anything except what we are getting—our friends and allies are all trading with Cuba.

We, in a roundabout way, have also been trading with Russia over the years. Let me quote from a newspaper in up-State New York: "Ten days ago four carloads of Russian cotton crossed the border from Montreal destined for a textile concern in New Jersey. Reason for shipping through Montreal is that maritime workers in the port of New York refused to unload the stuff. They have some naive notion that when Washington says this Nation is in a death struggle with communism, something other than talk should be done about it."

One wonders if the main reason for trading with Russia is to balance our trade deficit and the balance-of-payments account. Then why don't we sell Russia any other products that they may desire. If we are trying to build good will with the Russian people why don't we mill the wheat here (at least get the labor for our flour mills), and send them the flour in gift packages under the Red Cross to be given to the Russian people since our chances of getting paid for the wheat in cash is remote. In the Canadian deal, which is a forerunner to our deal, the President demanded and received concessions which will allow their products to be sold in Canada under the favored-nation concept. If we secretly, or otherwise make this same deal, then we will be getting Russian watches, for instance, which now have to come into the United States through Jamaica, and other free zone ports, at a price that will push every other watch off the market.

One doesn't mind so much the deal whether selling, giving, or trading wheat, except that we ought to be honest about it and admit that it is a commercial venture and that trade, as always, when broken down to its final and ultimate end, is nothing but an attempt or an effort to convert goods into cash. It is even humorously rumored that our desire to get to the moon first is to tie up a concession to sell our surplus wheat.

If we have to help the Russians live out their bad farm policies which have deprived them of their wheat crop (along with a drought) then why don't we put Uncle Sam's picture on one side of the 25 pound flour bags with our Declaration of Independence printed on the other side and pass the flour out to the needy Russian and satellite people. We should help the needy but not the greedy. We can cover up all we want but the truth is still plain to see, we're engaging in a lot of double talk when we say private vendors are selling the wheat, not our Government, who owns the wheat.

I'm sure the President took the best advice and counsel he could get on this deal, however, for those of us who have been voting against trading with the enemy, it makes little difference whether other countries deal with Russia or not. It's what we've been told over the last generation that makes this deal a little hard to swallow. The Veterans of Foreign Wars have passed very strongly worded resolutions against trading with the enemy, including wheat. Perhaps they feel that "plowshares can be forged into swords" if you don't need the plowshares.

Already the Russians are saying that they need tobacco, and the same trading profiteers in this country are now ready to sell anything to anybody, not excluding our American way of life. One of these representatives of foreign exporters had the gall to publicly state that it was our fault that Santo Domingo fell to a military junta recently because we stopped Santo Domingo cement from being dumped into the United States, and as he put it, deprived them of a much needed market, which hurt their economy, and caused President Juan Bosch's government to fall. All we said to Santo Domingo was that they could not dump their cement into the U.S. market below their own domestic price. This U.S. profiteer wants trade no matter what price we pay in unemployment.

The grasping, profiteering group in internal trade will use any alibi, any excuse or any logic—sound or unsound—to push profiteering trade. For instance, the Japanese have just signed a new textile agreement with the United States, an agreement which your Congressman is analyzing and preparing for presentation to the Congress showing the attitude of the Japanese in their demanding position that a set percentage of our market belongs to them. Our trading profiteers in this country would have us believe that they are doing it to help the Japanese people as well as other textile producing countries and yet the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows:

"The average wage in the textile industry in the United States as of last December was $1.69 per hour. Meanwhile the average textile wage in Japan was 16 cents an hour, in Italy it was 27 cents, France 51 cents, Germany 46 cents, England 68 cents."

These U.S. export-import profiteers have the U.S. press, public, and politicians sold on humanitarianism as a basis for their free trade promotion when even a kid knows it's the almighty dollar they're after.

How can any textile plant in the United States compete with the Japanese labor at 16 cents an hour, or even the highest wages—those paid in England, 68 cents an hour—while at the same time we subsidize quota exports by selling to our competitors for $42.50 a bale of cotton less than what we charge American textile mills.

At this point I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 13, 1963:

"As I have pointed out before, the issue here is not trade with other nations, because the increase in trade with other nations of good will and cooperative spirit will continue to be a desirable goal of this Nation.

"The real issue is whether we conduct our foreign trade in such a way so as to harm, injure, and ultimately cause the collapse of many of our industries and the employment opportunities of millions of our fellow Americans.

"There can be no doubt that the increase in cheap imports coming into this country definitely constitutes huge, additional economic aid to the countries sending in these imports. This fact is the negation of the

slogan 'Trade, Not Aid,' since under the present situation—we have every reason to believe that under present trade laws, the challenge of cheap imports undermining American industry may grow more threatening day after day and we have both 'trade and aid'—the first at the expense of the American industry and its faithful employees and the second at the expense of all the taxpayers of the United States."

Recently I received a letter from James P. Hobbs, Niland, Calif. I would like to have you read this letter to show you that the basic problem in this country, from steel to mushrooms, to tomatoes, to glass, and to every other consumer item, stems from a complete misunderstanding of the economics of an industrial complex, and I quote from the letter from James P. Hobbs:

"DEAR MR. DENT: The tomato industry in Imperial Valley is dead in all areas. This is the worst year in history, pricewise, and Mexico has complete control of the tomato market at any time.

"Today we are well aware of one thing: No American industry can compete with slave labor.

"I wish you could be here to really see this community, to see the idle land, the vacant sheds, and rusting machinery. Most of all I would like for you to talk to my people. There is where the true story lies.

"You can get a financial statement on the property loss, but the destruction of spirit and morale of these people cannot be figured. You would see a grammar school where 90 percent of the children depend on the produce business for livelihood. These children will grow up on relief. There are homes where children are being farmed out so they can eat.

"All these people have come to me, the farmer, the trucker, the union packers, in fact all people connected with this industry, to see what can be done. This area is already lost, and in the near future other communities will also go.

"As you know, I testified before you for a tariff. We were turned down because we were just a few, but now there are many.

"I want to know if there is any way for just a common man and citizen to get on one of these boards or panels that decide the fate and future of thousands of American citizens. We feel it is high time to mix a few facts with all the theory. I have a B.A. degree with a major in economics and a minor in religion. Also I think I can qualify for a Ph. D. in the hard school of experience, by fighting foreign imports of produce grown by slave labor.

"I have told my people here that Mr. DENT is a friend of labor and education, and anything you can do to help us we will deeply appreciate."

(I assured Mr. Hobbs I would keep fighting so long as I remain in Congress and had a voice.)

Incidentally, to show the doubters who disbelieve that our trade policies are the most serious threat to the economic growth of this country, let me quote from the Spinner, Pawtucket, R.I., which shows that back in 1790 the textile industry at that time was haunted by the import fallacy problem in Slater's time and is still with us.

"The imported fallacy. When Samuel Slater completed his feat of construction of a water-powered machine for spinning yarn, at Pawtucket, R.I., in 1790, he made secure in this country's history his place as the 'father of American manufacturers.'

"But immediate recognition and appreciation of the American textiles his accomplishment produced were not his from matrons of the era. They sought imported fabrics for wearing apparel. In their insistence on British broadcloth and French silk, they were not above inquiring of a salesperson, 'Are you sure it is not American?'

"So states George S. White, biographer, in his 'Memoir of Samuel Slater' published in 1836. Thundered White, in comment, that women's 'monstrous destitution of patriotism' in regard to fabrics discouraged the growth of infant textile manufacturing concerns in America.

"The shadow of the charm of the imported label, for the American woman, still hovers over the U.S. textile industry. * * *"

Every American student of economics knows that if the U.S. Congress had not passed the first protective tariff act immediately following the War of 1812 this Nation would never have achieved the status symbol of being the world leader.

"Iron Age" recently stated, and I quote from Errol Derby's article:

"* * * General recovery in steel production in this country, which slumped during the summer months following negotiations of a new union contract, is now being hampered by a record level of steel imports."

In face of all facts to the contrary, the Tariff Commission continues to find no injury to American industry by imports. This is only because they look at the picture on an industrywide basis, and on a gross national product percentage. What they fail to realize is that 5 percent of a total industry may well be 100 percent to a single manufacturer within that industry, and so when that plant shuts down in a community because of imports, it may only affect one-half of 1 percent of the total industry, however, in that community, and to the jobholders, it represents 100-percent loss. No recovery is possible in this Nation until we look at all trade the way Mr. Dillon is looking at the wheat trade; for the money that is in it. Trade is strictly a commercial venture. Charity is one thing; trade is another and "never the twain shall meet," except in a breadline.

Late flash: The Tariff Commission right now is debating this question of glass tariffs. Just a year ago an increase in tariff was granted the glass industry after 30 years of fighting and right before the vote on the tariff bill in Congress. Now the Belgians, Japanese, and other glass exporters are proving that it hurt their economies. You guessed it. We are supposed to shut our plants down, so they can open theirs.

The First Amendment: Long May It Wave—The First Amendment Represents the Last Bastion of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the foundations of democracy set up the freedom of the press. American newspapers were at that time and have become the saviour of the past, the promise of the future, and the hope of the present.

America ultimately rests upon the truth of the press rather than the exaggeration of the administration-backed news management media.

I would like to reiterate to my constituents the ideas of our Founding Fathers. They felt that they were the personification of democracy and of our American Republic, but they have been wrong.

For the final answer is with the ideas of the people. Thanks to the first amendment, the newspapers—as personified in my district by the Rock Island Argus, Moline Daily Dispatch, Galesburg Register-Mail, Kewanee Star-Courier, Canton Ledger, and the Monmouth Review-Atlas—contain the last grain of sand and the last hope of righteousness in the battle between what is correct and what is the dream of the brothers three and the sisters two for domination of 180 million of those untrammeled by blood and unaffected by political party. All hail our press—long may they wave.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege recently to testify before the Senate Commerce Committee in support of the quality stabilization bill. In order to give wider circulation to the facts about this important legislation, under previous permission, I am setting forth the text of my testimony at this point:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS M. PELLY IN SUPPORT OF S. 774 BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON QUALITY STABILIZATION OF THE SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to testify in favor of the enactment of S. 774, the so-called quality stabilization bill.

In this connection, may I mention my background before coming to Congress. From 1937 to 1952 I was the president and general manager of Lowman & Hanford Co. with retail stationery stores in Seattle and other similar stores in Olympia, Spokane, and Wenatchee, Wash. This experience should qualify me as a witness on this legislation. Furthermore since I no longer have any financial interest, direct or indirect, in this or any similar business, I think I can qualify further on the basis of objectivity.

In addition, for more than a quarter of a century, I was extremely active in the Seattle Retail Trade Bureau, as a board member of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce and the National Stationers Association.

Lowman & Hanford Co., for years operated under fair trade agreements, and I found that such arrangements were a protection for the consumer, but did not eliminate competition between similar merchandise lines.

It was then and still is my contention that the greatness of this country depends on initiative, integrity, and decision of the individual with an opportunity to compete and a chance to make a fair profit.

That kind of opportunity has not only been challenged in recent years, but the challengers have created a chaos that is killing the independent small retail stores of our country. A precise, simple, and fully honest bill is before Congress that can lend protection to small business through protection of the brand name. It is entirely optional and applies only where the brand name is in open competition with similar products in the market. It is called the quality stabilization bill.

In my six terms in Congress, I have never witnessed such relentless, coldblooded blindness to fact as that of the opposition to the quality stabilization bill.

Resorting to false slogans and imaginary dragons of price increases, they consistently sidestep the recognition of fact—that there is a killing disease racing through the bloodstream of America's free enterprise system. By so disregarding the very evident disease, they therefore do not feel called upon to offer an alternative to quality stabilization. Rather, they resort to the Hitlerian plan of repeating a falsehood long enough to make it sound like fact. They ignore facts. We are here in Congress to deal with facts.

Personally, I deplore not only their continued waste of time and money, but also the very laxity that allows Members of Congress to be duped by them.

To me the enactment of the quality stabilization bill is a matter of right or wrong. In this context I believe the quality stabilization bill is right. It is simple. It does not force anybody to do anything. It takes Government out of business. It is, if studied without prejudice, meticulously written for full protection. In no way does it tend to raise prices. In every way it does tend to increase healthy competition. It is not price fixing. Rather than fair trade, it is necessitated by the failure of fair trade. It is no panacea, no attempted cure-all. It hurts no one, not even the discounter if he too wishes to compete pricewise against a brand name, not as a brand name to obscure and confuse price. It sets a standard of values by which the consumer can judge a bargain, and by his purchases cast his vote. At no time ever does it, as the opponents try to make you believe, force any price raising on competitive products in free and open competition.

A representative of the Department of Commerce appeared before House Commerce Committee hearings in opposition. He significantly did not refer to a release by his own Department, stating over 395,000 business failures in the previous year, over 1,200 per day—50 an hour—10 while I am talking to you. What is right in this decadent marketing? Is it professional speculation or is it fact? What is our position in Congress? Is it to deal in a constant ping pong game of words or to recognize fact?

A few labor writers are waging a campaign against the bill which would have you think all union members are against it. Yet, at the very same time they are decrying the multimillion unemployment problem; they are right now using their lobby, the most powerful in all American history, to shorten work week hours. They are totally ignoring fact for theory by side stepping as they criticize instead of construct. They ignore President Kennedy who says shorter work weeks will not increase employment. Are they not aware that we are in overproduction right now here at home, because an ever-increasing percentage of our factories are moving branch plants to foreign countries, there to use the same tools and dies, the same know-how and creative ingenuity, but with native labor at a fraction of the hourly cost? And can't they see those products are being sent back to the prostituted bargain marts of America for cheap, cheap pricing? Can't they possibly see that the workers of America are the largest group of consumers of foreign, nonunion, falsely advertised, cheap products? Can't they possibly understand that an economy cannot possibly hold up unless it is profitable to all concerned? After all, the high American labor standard of wages is linked with the ultimate sale of brand name, quality, and integrity merchandise.

Some of the opponents to quality stabilization here in Congress, are at the same time vehement advocates of "urban renewal." I quote here from an AP release of September 27, 1963: "Tacoma gets big urban renewal grant." Tacoma, a city in my State of Washington, is just 30 miles south of my home, Seattle. Its economy is the same as Seattle. The news report states that the Urban Renewal Administration gave a grant of $4,544,708 and a loan of $6,660,515 for quote "renewal of its central business district." Let's talk truth, not fancy.

Downtown Tacoma is today a virtual graveyard. The empty stores all along Broadway, Pacific Avenue and Commerce Street attest to failure, heartbreak, and a diseased economy. The Tacoma Retail Trade Bureau, after careful study of the quality stabilization bill, became a unanimous and avid proponent. Why?

Well, does anyone for a minute think a fancy new store front with higher rent and maintenance is going to bring the retailer back for another race to bankruptcy? Give him a chance to protect his precious brand name product, to fulfill his service pledges and he will come back—come back to build his own new store without Government subsidy. Give him a chance to compete and he will. Putting him in a more beautiful ambulance isn't going to save his life or make his death any happier. Let's be realistic. What is right? What is wrong?

Our democracy is based on equal rights for all. It is to protect minorities by giving them an equal opportunity.

What about equality protection for the shrinking minority—the independent store owner—the man who contributes to and works for the Community Chest, the man we see with his family in church, whose kids go to school with our kids, who is the mainstay of a chamber of commerce, a service club, and all the things that make society good and make America great? All he is asking is a chance—a chance to compete. He asks no subsidies. He asks for no Government help, nor for high-priced Government supervision. He just wants a chance to compete his brand name quality products against just "bargains"—to try to demonstrate to consumers that he has a better value for them. By such he can still go broke—but he won't have died economically due to misrepresentation by merchants who have neither any interest in the integrity of a brand name except as bait, nor any interest in the community except to exploit it.

The Kiplinger letter of September 27, 1963, warns against "stripped down" stores that operate on skinny margins, sell merchandise only, no service, no credit, no deliveries, no sales clerks.

The discounters themselves are accurately quoted, I am told, as predicting that within 10 years all retailing will be controlled by less than 100 companies.

I cannot believe anyone wants to do away with small business or to eliminate the small stores. The only alternative I know of is quality stabilization. Yet this is called price fixing and evil.

Price fixing? What is price fixing? By such description for quality stabilization it must include others.

It should include the printed price on a postage stamp. That too would be price fixing.

What do those who oppose this bill say?

Do they pay a fixed rent? Price fixed.

Do they work for unionized wages? Price fixed.

Do they carry any insurance? Price fixed.

Do they travel by cab, bus, train, or airplane? Price fixed.

Has a redcap carried your bags recently? The tip is price fixed.

Do they have a telephone? Price fixed.

Do they buy a magazine or newspaper? Price fixed.

Do they ever place any advertising in a magazine or newspaper? Price fixed.

Do they elect a Congressman or Senator? His salary is price fixed.

Do they farm? Here they are price fixed not to farm.

Do they borrow money at interest? Price fixed.

Do they pay taxes? Price fixed.

Do they have running water in their homes? Price fixed.

Do they have electricity or gas fixtures? Price fixed.

You can add to this list as long as you want. Now why don't these critics admit this? Why don't they also admit the bill asks no price fixing at all? Why don't they say it is entirely optional and only on a product price leveled by consumer acceptance in free and open competition?

The public must be protected; otherwise it would mean the right to dicker with the driver on your cab ride home tonight, or to the busdriver. Otherwise, that would mean that any one of us with an airplane could start hauling passengers for any price we could get from the rider. It would mean the end of minimum wage laws. It would mean an oriental bazaar sort of existence for everything and everyone including perhaps political candidates who might offer themselves to the voters at competitive bargain prices.

Or would it mean instead the Government taking over everything? Is that what these people want? If so, let them say so.

Millions of words have been carefully written and spoken to answer every question or accusation in commonsense and substantiated proof. It seems thus far that all has been in vain in the face of misrepresentation and totally false slogans repeated and repeated without any reason except to fool people.

The quality stabilization bill is no panacea nor cure-all. It is, in simple fact, a precisely written bill of absolute fairness, and as an emergency to keep alive our way of life until at least something better is devised.

The week of October 7 saw the 62d anniversary convention of the National Electrical Contractors Association. With its objective this year being the theme "Let's All Make a Profit," more than 3,500 electrical men were in attendance. Key speaker was the Honorable Donald L. Jackson, former Congressman from California. His address titled "Challenge to Action" urged the electrical industry to consider and take prompt and effective action to meet the challenge to free enterprise hurled down by those who have little faith in the economic system but have served to make this Nation the most powerful in the history of mankind. He pointed out that the American economic system rests upon the profit motive in business and in industry and that lacking that motive, there is no foundation upon which our traditional system of free enterprise can stand.

What he said is plain commonsense. It was said in the understanding of what is right and what is wrong.

The opponents to the quality stabilization bill, I feel certain, are well intended. But I here submit that if so, they are in this case being unrealistic, are ignoring the fundamental need of this bill being enacted immediately as a salvation of our precious system and the small businesses of this Nation.

Certain union labor leaders condemning this bill is as unrealistic as were businessmen and capital in the successful fight of organized labor for decent wages and hours. If quality stabilization, in any sense, is price fixing, then so very definitely were any and all wage and hour agreements.

The agricultural argument against the quality stabilization bill is perhaps even more unrealistic—in a demand to see the independent store owner, their own counterpart in trade, go out of business—as farm interests have successfully legislated for subsidies and acreage controls to keep from growing products on their farms.

I have read newspaper editorials against this bill, but not one of them premised on

research or the fact that there is a chaotic situation in the marketplace. Such editors ignore the fact that their price and advertising rates are established and printed in Standard Rate and Data and meticulously followed. That, then, is real price fixing. Here is a bill which is mandatory on no one—allows a manufacturer of a competitive product in free and open competition to make up his own mind toward protection of the brand name in such competition. How in the name of simple right and wrong can such newspapers, living under their own price fixing call names and bite the hand that feeds them?

The majority of Congress and therefore supposedly the people of this country are in favor of protection. Doesn't that mean protection for all? Why in the name of right and wrong should the little businessmen of America be the only—I repeat only—ones left out of a protection of any kind?

It is basically right that as our country meets continually changing times, the ground rules be groomed to meet those changes. I certainly think that if our way of life is to continue, we must conform the necessary changes to the principle held sacred that there be a fair and even chance for each citizen to pick his own career and to prove himself to himself and to society, and that there be opportunity and incentive for profit to all. The entrepreneur—the man who desires to own his own business—is the backbone of such a conception that all men are born free and equal. And that is the backbone of this country.

Base predatory greed on the part of individuals has always been and under our form of government always will be a choice of the individual—like his right to pick his own career. But that greed, spread out to society, will surely be a fatal disease. Such disease is cursing the land today.

To those who oppose quality stabilization, I say—first admit to yourself that there is a weakness in our enterprise system. I urge you to read—read carefully—and without prejudice for the time it takes, this quality stabilization bill. No one has proposed any better immediate alternative, and I feel strongly it must be enacted if only as a tourniquet to stop the flow of retail lifeblood in the American streets—and until someone else has found a surer permanent cure.

To my colleagues in the Congress I say in all sincerity that herein is contained the right and wrong we learned in kindergarten and Sunday school. We will be remiss in our duties to our constituents and to our Nation and to ourselves if we do not enact this bill as an emergency measure in the interest of small retail business.

International Trade for Profit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, each passing day proves beyond a reasonable doubt that international trade has been, is now and always will be for profit until the day is reached where need and not greed motivates the exchange of goods.

Trade in the beginning was a means of exporting your goods to other countries that needed what you had in surplus and importing the things you needed from their overabundance.

However, since the production of goods in all areas of production, farming, mining and manufacturing has become worldwide and no longer exclusive outside of a few minerals and some tropical products the motive for trade has become increasingly mercantile.

Those amongst us who profess the brotherhood of man as their aim in free trade seem to have little concept of world markets, world production and worldly greed.

One would be led to believe that when we trade with a nation by sacrificing our high economy production we do so because we create good will on one hand and we gain jobs, profits and economic well-being on the other.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The facts are to the contrary, our job ratio to population and consumption shows a decline and our balance of payments is so out of line we not only broke all past policies on trading with the enemy but we are even now considering all-out trading with Russia just as the Canadians have had to agree to, on a favored nation basis.

Without debating the merits and demerits of the wheat deal with Russia, the point I want to emphasize is that in the vast majority of our cases before the Tariff Commission for relief from the flood of cheaper produced, low waged products the Tariff Commission has found some lame crutch to lean on in denying relief to U.S. industry.

For instance under the new trade bill, which I worked against because of its lack of protection and safeguards for U.S. workers and the U.S. economy, all new charges of dumping by foreign countries into the U.S. market have been lost by U.S. petitioners.

It could not be otherwise since the Tariff Commission uses the escape clause procedures rather than the facts on dumping.

Each decision that I have had an opportunity to study simply denies the U.S. petition on the grounds that "no injury" has been caused by the foreign product. The law does have as one of the provisions of the antidumping section, title II, the question of injury, however, if the board were as interested in protecting the U.S. economy as they seem to be on wrecking it they would read this section as an escape for U.S. industry rather than for the profiteering foreign exporter and U.S. importer.

In my humble opinion this section of the antidumping provisions of the act was put there to give the Tariff Commission a leg to stand on if foreign products were sold at a price equal to their home market price it could still be judged "injurious" to U.S. industry under the antidumping law.

The facts and scorecard to date shows the opposite of this reasoning to be the rule under which the Tariff Commission operates.

When the proof clearly shows that dumping is taking place the Commission simply falls back on "one single paragraph" in the antidumping law and finds for the foreign country and against the U.S. petitioner.

This, then, is the reason for my special order today. The longsuffering glassworker is again sitting beneath the sword of Damocles.

The following information on the glass industry tells its fears of adverse "assistance" under the new trade bill. It is a case of having been bit by a snake, the industry fears every rope.

Both management and labor are disturbed by what can happen. Their only hope is that the voices from abroad and their mouthpieces here may be silenced by an early indication of the position to be taken by our Government in the coming round of trade talks.

This is essential and in a sense urgent. I therefore appeal to the Members of the House to come to our side and give us their support in our appeal for equitable treatment at the trade table.

What does it matter to the unemployed glassworkers to be told that they are building prosperity for other peoples by their sacrifice of a job.

The most important economic benefit that a man can get from his Government is an opportunity to earn his living, to have an earned income and to be protected in that job opportunity by his Government against privateers and profiteers both at home and abroad.

Every Member of Congress knows the long hard fight that has been carried on for generations in this Nation to protect a man in his right to work free, to better his conditions of labor, to share in the good life he helps to create with his labor.

How can we now in this generation fail to see the threat to his well-being.

Free trade is a luxury this country cannot afford, yet. There may be a day when it won't matter whether you have a job or whether you are on relief but that day has not arrived yet, I pray it never will. Until that day does come a worker needs protective covenants in our trade deals to protect his economic well-being just as surely as he needs military protection for his property and physical well-being.

To a worker out of employment for so long that he has to turn to public relief, the economic atom bomb has already struck, his family is forced to live in a different everyday world than their neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, the fears of the glassworkers are real, they are born of experience, they learned the hard way.

The glass industry is sitting in the hot seat of doubt and fear, the sword hangs over its head. The Tariff Commission can cut the string or the President can remove the sword. The situation is as follows:

SHEET GLASS: PRESIDENTIAL ESCAPE CLAUSE PROCLAMATION

On September 27, 1963, the Tariff Commission, pursuant to section 351(d)(1) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, released its first annual report relating to the sheet glass escape clause action taken by the President on March 19, 1962. This is the first report issued by the Commission regarding sheet glass since its supplemental report to the President of January 10, 1962.

The Tariff Commission report does not support or warrant a reopening for formal review of the President's action at this time nor any modification of the President's action. On the contrary, the reported developments establish the necessity for maintenance of the President's action to prevent serious and harmul economic effects on the domestic sheet glass industry.

I. THE PERIOD COVERED BY THE TARIFF COMMISSION'S REPORT IS TOO SHORT A PERIOD FOR SOUND ASSESSMENT OF THE ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF THE INCREASED DUTIES ON SHEET GLASS, AND WAS AN ABNORMAL PERIOD IN THE SHEET GLASS INDUSTRY

The President's escape clause action has now been in effect only 15 months. The President's proclamation increasing the sheet glass duties was issued March 19, 1962, but the original effective date of April 18, 1962, was delayed and the increased duties did not go into effect until June 18, 1962. Foreign producers took full advantage of this situation by increasing their imports to the maximum amount. As a result, during the first 6 months of 1962, the sheet glass imports were abnormally high. This caused the importers to have abnormally high inventories. Furthermore, this resulted in U.S. producers' inventories being at an alltime high at the end of 1962. These huge inventories had to be used before new glass could be sold.

In addition, there was a longshoremen's strike at the end of 1962 which extended into early 1963; this strike curtailed the importation of glass into this country in the early part of 1963.

Even though imports were relatively low during the first half of 1963, they took a sudden jump in July. In fact, July of 1963 is the biggest month for imports since June of 1962—the effective date of the tariff increase. Interestingly, the Tariff Commission had originally announced June as the date for publishing its report.

All of the above factors contribute toward making the period under analysis an abnormal one.

Not only has the period been abnormal, but it has been far too short. A longer period is essential to make a proper judgment if the domestic industry has, in fact, reached a level of satisfactory operation which could be maintained in the face of the intense competition, which continues to exist under the present increased duties, and which would certainly be greatly intensified if such remedial action were withdrawn. The question here is not if the industry along with imports shows some natural favorable response to improved economic conditions, but rather if it would again be subject to greater and more serious injury if economic conditions declined, or if the increased duties be withdrawn.

The escape clause investigation by the Tariff Commission included a study of the effect of imports into the United States for an 11-year period—1950–60—and other economic developments for a period of 6 years—1955–60. The investigation by the Commission continued over a 14-month period not including the prior intensive study under the peril point investigation proceedings. Additionally, after completion of the Tariff Commission investigation, there was a critical study by other executive departments to assist the President, lasting for a period of 60 days.

The carefully considered action, by the President, based on this long and painstaking study and evaluation of all factors involved, must not be lightly brushed aside or sought to be reexamined on the basis of the experience of such a short, abnormal period of time.

II. CONDITIONS IN THE DOMESTIC SHEET GLASS INDUSTRY, DESPITE SOME IMPROVEMENT IN THE PAST YEAR, REMAIN STILL DEPRESSED

Operations of domestic producers have been unsatisfactory during the 1960's. This is clearly shown by the indexes of operations in the industry which follow:

Trends in the U.S. sheet-glass industry

[1959=100]

Year	Production	Shipments [1]	Inventories	Production	Ratio of operating profit to sales
1959	100	100	100	100	100
1960	79	80	118	84	(2)
1961	76	81	86	80	(2)
1962	92	91	135	91	3
1963 (January to June)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	16

[1] Based on reports by companies accounting for about 80 percent of the domestic industry's shipments.
[2] Deficit.
[3] Not available.

Source: Derived from data contained in the Report to the President (No. TEA-IR-7-63), U.S. Tariff Commission.

As the above data shows, the domestic sheet glass industry has not shared fully in the economic recovery following 1960. In fact, it is questionable if the fundamental downward trend in the industry really has been reversed. Production, shipments, employment, and profits were low through 1962 while inventories were at an alltime high. Production was lower in the first half of 1963 than in the first half of 1962.

Earnings have continued to be low through the first half of 1963. Some idea of how acute this situation is can be gained from a comparison of changes in operating profits of all manufacturing industries with those of the sheet glass industry. The pertinent indexes of operating profit ratios to sales follow:

[Index (1959=100)]

Year	Sheet glass [1]	All manufacturing [2] industries
1959	100	100
1960	(3)	91
1961	(3)	87
1962	3	93
1963 (January to June)	16	95

[1] Based on reports from producers accounting for about ⅔ of domestic sheet glass shipments.
[2] See "Financial Report for Manufacturing Corporations," Federal Trade Commission.
[3] Deficit.

Notwithstanding low earnings and a discouraging level of sales the industry has probably expended well over $20 million since the beginning of 1960 to keep itself efficient. This has not only kept plants up to date but has perforce tended to increase their capacity somewhat. Low production levels, however, reduced the ratio of capacity employed in 1962 probably to less than 65 percent as compared with the not impressive level of 74 percent in 1959. In 1963 the ratio has continued to be well below the 1959 level. This continued low output, increased inventories, and increased wages and other items have resulted in overall increases in costs of production.

The recent price increases for sheet glass, which came at a time when demand was exceedingly brisk, may enable the domestic producers to recapture some of the increased costs which they have been forced to absorb over a sustained period.

III. IMPORTS HAVE MAINTAINED A SUBSTANTIAL SHARE OF THE U.S. MARKET AND RECENTLY DEMONSTRATED A SHARPLY INCREASING TREND

The Tariff Commission report unanimously finding injury to the domestic industry was issued May 16, 1961. Following its supplemental report of January 10, 1962, its findings were approved and proclaimed by the President on March 19, 1962, to be effective April 18, 1962. On March 27, 1962, the President directed that the effective date of increased duties be deferred to June 17, 1962. Foreign manufacturers and importers, therefore, had something more than a year's notice of the possible application of duties and 3 months' specific notice following the proclamation by the President giving effect thereto. This period of grace was utilized fully by them.

Reference to the monthly statistics of imports demonstrates that during this period the greatest volume of shipments in history poured into the United States. In the quarter April, May, June 1962 alone, such imports totaled 136 million pounds from reduced rate countries alone, equivalent to 30 percent of apparent domestic consumption. This tremendous import volume served to fill the distribution pipelines in the United States. Inevitably, therefore, imports volume dropped in the months immediately following the effective date of the increased duties. Recently, imports have resumed a sharp upward trend.

The table on page 19828, showing a comparison of domestic shipments, imports, and ratio of reduced duty imports to apparent consumption, demonstrates the heavy stockpiling engaged in by importers in the period immediately preceding the effective date of the President's proclamation, and reflects the resumption of an upward trend in market participation by reduced duty imports.

Every indication based on the trends evidenced by the table is that the portion of the American market controlled by imports will continue to increase under the existing schedule of tariff duties in both absolute and relative terms and, indeed, it is not improbable that such imports before long will exceed any share of the American market heretofore enjoyed by foreign producers.

IV. THE EFFECT OF THE RECENT FHA RULING

The Tariff Commission has stated in its latest report that a recent FHA ruling will tend to reduce the share of U.S. consumption of sheet glass supplied by imports in 1963. This statement does not appear to take into account all existing facts.

Since April 1, 1963, the FHA has required that all glass installed in FHA-financed homes has had to meet designated minimum thickness tolerances for certain size lights of glass; moreover, the glass in most sliding glass doors has had to be tempered or laminated, or contain wire reinforcing, and all installed mirrors have had to be made of plate glass. A proper analysis of the effects of such FHA rulings demonstrates that such rulings will have almost no adverse effect upon the foreign producers.

Traditionally, the domestic producers have manufactured 19-ounce single-strength glass while the foreigners have manufactured both 18- and 19-ounce single-strength glass. In addition, the domestic producers have manufactured 26-ounce double-strength glass while the foreigners have manufactured both 24- and 26-ounce double-strength glass. Superficially, there appears to be a marked difference between the domestic and the foreign glasses, but a careful analysis clearly demonstrates that it is actually impossible to discern any difference between the domestic and foreign glasses without the aid of measuring instruments. This means that the naked eye cannot ascertain whether a piece of glass is 18 or 19 ounce or whether it is 24 or 26 ounce.

Sometimes, also, the measuring instruments are unable to tell the difference because the tolerances overlap. For example, 18-ounce glass has a tolerance of from 2 millimeters to 2.4 millimeters, while 19-ounce glass has a tolerance of from 2.16 millimeters to 2.54 millimeters. This means that heavy 18-ounce glass is actually light 19-ounce glass, even when it is measured with instruments.

Sheet glass: Domestic shipments, imports, apparent consumption, and ratio of imports at MFN [1] (reduced) rates of duty to apparent consumption

Period	Domestic shipments excluding exports	Imports for consumption			Apparent consumption	Ratio of imports at MFN [1] rates to apparent consumption (percent)
		MFN [1] rates of duty	Full rates of duty	Total		
	Million pounds					
July–September 1959	428.9	125.0	4.9	129.9	558.8	22.4
October–December 1959	404.7	101.2	4.6	105.8	510.5	19.8
January–March 1960	303.0	99.6	4.4	104.0	407.0	24.5
April–June 1960	276.6	103.6	4.6	108.2	384.8	26.9
Total	1,413.2	429.4	18.5	447.9	1,861.1	23.1
July–September 1960	322.4	99.6	6.1	105.7	428.1	23.3
October–December 1960	357.1	88.6	4.0	92.6	449.7	19.7
January–March 1961	252.7	70.7	5.3	76.0	328.7	21.5
April–June 1961	294.2	79.0	6.8	85.8	380.0	20.8
Total	1,226.4	337.9	22.2	360.1	1,586.5	21.3
July–September 1961	355.6	100.1	6.5	106.6	462.2	21.7
October–December 1961	371.8	100.2	6.8	107.0	478.8	20.9
January–March 1962	374.2	123.7	10.0	133.7	507.9	24.4
April–June 1962	305.5	135.5	6.6	142.1	447.6	30.3
Total	1,407.1	459.5	29.9	489.4	1,896.5	24.2
July–September 1962	366.3	90.7	12.7	103.4	469.7	19.3
October–December 1962	392.6	85.1	6.2	91.3	483.9	17.6
January–March 1963	317.6	68.6	2.5	71.1	388.7	17.5
April–June 1963	370.3	96.1	2.7	98.8	469.1	20.5
Total	1,446.8	340.5	24.1	364.6	1,811.4	18.8

[1] Most favored nation.

Source: Adapted from tables 3 and 4 of report to President (No. TEA-IR-7-63) under sec. 351(d)(1).

The same analogy is true in regard to double strength glass; 24-ounce glass has a tolerance of from 2.75 millimeters to 3.2 millimeters, while 26-ounce glass has a tolerance of from 2.92 millimeters to 3.4 millimeters. Since it is extremely difficult to ascertain the difference between the thickness of domestic and foreign glasses, it will be almost impossible to enforce the new FHA ruling regarding sheet glass. Obviously, it is impractical, if not impossible, to actually measure each piece of glass that is placed in a new home with a micrometer. But even if the FHA inspectors were to measure each piece of glass some 18-ounce glass would fall within the acceptable tolerances for 19-ounce glass, and some 24-ounce glass would fall within the tolerances for 26-ounce glass. It follows that foreign 18- and 24-ounce glass will not be eliminated from use in FHA homes. Furthermore, the foreigners could solve their entire problem by merely making all of their window glass 19 ounce and 26 ounce instead of 18 ounce and 24 ounce. Such being the case, the foreign producers' ability to sell 19- and 26-ounce glass at prices sufficiently below those of U.S. producers as suggested by the Tariff Commission, becomes solely an academic question. Their ability to do so has been amply demonstrated.

The new FHA ruling will require the usage of more tempered glass in sliding glass doors. But this ruling does not adversely affect the foreign producers because substantial quantities of foreign sheet glass have been and are now being imported into this country and tempered here. Several domestic companies, including one large domestic automotive manufacturer, are presently engaged in tempering imported sheet glass.

The new FHA ruling requires that all installed mirrors be made of plate glass. This ruling will not adversely affect the foreign producers because only an infinitesimal amount of foreign sheet glass has been utilized in the manufacture of mirrors in the United States.

V. WHAT RESULT DID THE PRESIDENT INTEND TO ACCOMPLISH BY INCREASING THE TARIFF DUTIES ON SHEET GLASS ON JUNE 17, 1962?

The action taken by the President to increase tariff duties on sheet glass was taken primarily to alleviate and prevent continued serious injury to the domestic industry. Such action was not taken, as might be inferred from representations that have been made to the Tariff Commission and to other Government agencies, to permit foreign manufacturers to maintain or increase their market participation in the United States.

Conceivably, even a somewhat smaller future participation could be envisioned as necessary to abate the continuing injury sustained by the domestic industry. Certainly, a modest decline in import volume or market participation by foreign producers—whether or not temporary—cannot be viewed as a reason for withdrawal of the remedial action. If such remedial action has, in fact, slowed the pace of expansion of foreign glass in the U.S. market, this would appear to be the least that might have been anticipated and, indeed, a reason which motivated the action by the President.

CONCLUSION

As demonstrated by all the foregoing, the sheet glass industry in the United States is still far from the full measure of recovery sought to be attained by imposition of increased duties proclaimed by the President. Foreign producers and importers of sheet glass have importuned the Tariff Commission repeatedly to reconsider its well-matured recommendation to the President which was approved and implemented by the President after long, careful, and thorough deliberation.

The zeal of foreign manufacturers for hasty reconsideration and withdrawal of the President's action indicates, perhaps, a fear that the enlarged penetration of the U.S. market indicated by the recent trend of imports might result in a competitive situation even less favorable to

their claims than that which presently and transiently prevails.

Mr. Speaker, I also attach hereto a report of the Belgian glass industry proving our contention that the tariff increase did not injure the Belgian industry since the Belgian wage rates still gives their industry a great handicap in world trade in the U.S. marketplace:

EXCERPT FROM SOCIETE GENERAL DE BELGIQUE

REPORT 1962: GLASSMAKING—CRYSTAL BOTTLEMAKING—TABLE GLASSWARE

The flat glass industry in Belgium developed on very satisfactory lines during 1962.

In the external markets, the chief event of the year was the raising of the import duties on window glass in the United States. The new duties, which came into effect on June 18, 1962, are almost double the old ones. Despite this unilateral action by a country which is a big user of Belgian glass, total exports continued expanding with sales handsomely supported by continued building activity in Europe and overseas. The exports, indeed, practically reached the 1960 levels which were exceptionally high.

Our colleague, the Honorable THOMAS MORGAN, from my neighboring district in Pennsylvania has shown his concern in this situation and I ask that his letter be made part of the RECORD at this point.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to express my concern and to urge that nothing be done to rescind the sheet glass escape clause action taken by the President on March 19, 1962, on which the Tariff Commission reported on September 27, 1963. An examination of this report by the Tariff Commission discloses absolutely nothing that would warrant a reopening for formal review or modification of the President's action. On the contrary, the content of the report actually supports the maintenance of the President's action.

My cause for concern is an awareness of the pressures being brought to bear by foreign manufacturers of sheet glass, and importers, to reopen this matter. Requests to have new hearings and get further consideration are not warranted, and a decision to yield to such demands and hold hearings would make our domestic industry and its labor force subject to continued harassment and would create serious and harmful economic effects. My study of this problem has shown that to reopen this matter would result in costly and time-consuming preparations that could only disrupt management planning and cause labor insecurity in many distressed areas of our country.

The domestic sheet glass industry has been under continuous investigation from May 1960 to the present time. During this period the foreign glass companies presented their arguments before the Tariff Commission and the administrative branches in a complete, forceful and competent manner. Subsequent to the President's action of March 19, 1962, increasing tariff rates, the foreign manufacturers' participation in the domestic sheet glass market continued at approximately the same ratio as prior to the increase. Recent import shipments indicate the foreign manufacturers are increasing this ratio. I have noted a statement in the Report of the Societe Generale de Belgique of 1962, which said:

"In the external markets, the chief event of the year was the raising of the import duties on window glass in the United States. The new duties, which came into effect on June 18, 1962, are almost double the old ones. Despite this unilateral action by a country which is a big user of Belgian glass, total exports continued expanding with sales handsomely supported by continued building activity in Europe and overseas."

I believe that to reopen this question for further consideration would result in eventual confirmation and sustaining the President's original action. At the same time, the apprehension and uncertainty that a reopening would inevitably bring to labor and management in our domestic industry could only result in grave economic consequences.

I wish to most strongly urge that there be an immediate decision that the escape clause action be not reopened. A prompt decision to this effect would eliminate existing tension and make it possible for management and labor to resume the necessary long-range planning and sound operations which are essential to the future of our domestic glass industry.

Sincerely yours,

_____,
Chairman.

Vice President Johnson Speaks at Georgetown Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on October 12 an outstanding address was delivered in New York City by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The occasion was a dinner marking the first major event in New York in connection with the 175th anniversary of one of America's great educational institutions, Georgetown University.

A distinguished alumnus of Georgetown, Vice President JOHNSON, was the featured speaker at the dinner, which was attended by hundreds of Georgetown graduates and former students from all over the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the full text of the Vice President's address follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF SUCCESS

I am highly honored to participate in this observance. But I am honored beyond my due to be identified as an alumnus of Georgetown University. While I did attend the school of law, I earned only a B.A. degree—for brief attendance.

Georgetown and the Government of the United States both came into being in 1789. There has been a close affinity ever since—Harvard notwithstanding. Georgetown's first graduate went to Congress—but many others went up in the world. As clergymen, teachers, physicians, attorneys, scientists, and public servants, Georgetown alumni have rewarded Bishop Carroll's vision 175 years ago.

The first Catholic college in the United States, the first college to be chartered by act of Congress, the first to originate a school of foreign service, the first to sponsor its own school of language and linguistics—Georgetown University has exerted an influence far beyond its campus and classrooms upon our national life and public affairs.

The record is, by every test, a proud record of success.

For any institution, success itself is both the ultimate and most exacting challenge. Georgetown today—and henceforth— is challenged by the success of its first 175 years. In a far broader sense, that same challenge faces the Government of the United States and the American people who are served by it.

It is of this challenge of success that I would like to speak tonight.

PECULIAR RELUCTANCE

For a people who exalt success so highly as we do, Americans are—and have always been—peculiarly reluctant to acknowledge the success of their own political institutions. John Adams in 1813 complained to Thomas Jefferson that—

"No sooner does one party discover or invent an amelioration of the condition of man or the order of society, than the opposite party belies it, misconstrues it, misrepresents it, ridicules it, and persecutes it."

If the Nation's first and second Vice Presidents could sit where I sit now—and hear the debates I hear—I am sure they would marvel at how little American politics have changed. We make our national issues, we turn our national debates, we conduct our national discussions on the premise that our Government has failed or is about to fail in every undertaking.

To the extent this reflects a healthy suspicion of government and a vigilant jealousy of our rights and liberties, this trait is good—although that is not a widely held view of the party in power.

But when the prolonged exaggerations of national debate finally come to obscure the realities of national success, the result is not healthy. A very real danger arises that such an obsession with failure will impair the ability of the people to determine what is wisdom and what is folly in their public policy.

At this season in our affairs, it is of utmost importance that we not lose this ability. In just the last year, since the grim October of 1962, there has begun an historic turning in many long-running tides of history. We cannot know—we do not pretend to know—what the consequences will be. But we can know—and we must understand—that this turning has begun as the consequence of purposeful and successful policies fashioned and implemented by ourselves and our allies.

FALSE IMAGE

The image of ourselves—the image so popular for so long—as being outwitted, outmaneuvered, outlasted by other systems and other governments has seldom been so false or so dangerous.

We have met the aggressor at every turn and stayed his march.

We have engaged him in every challenge of his own choosing and neutralized his threat.

We have, moreover, held to the initiative in the long view of history—and it is the pressure of our examples, far more than the pressure of his threats, which is shaping this century.

Nearly fifty nations have come into being since World War II. Not one has elected to join the Communist bloc. Yet many of them have elected to pattern their systems, word their constitutions and define their liberties directly after ours.

The revolution which began here in 1776 still runs—throughout the world. The worldwide drive for independence, the aspirations for development, the explosion of expectations for better health, housing, education and opportunity—all the forces which move and shake our times—have the power they do because of the example of success offered by our American system.

NOT SELF-SERVING

For an American to say this is not parochial, not myopic, not self-serving. On the contrary, it is parochial, it is myopic, it is self-serving for Americans to deny and refuse to acknowledge the success of America's works and leadership in the world.

It is parochial to preach that America's position is eroding.

Where? Not in Greece, not in Turkey, not in Iran where we took our stand 16 years ago. Not in West Berlin where Americans stand tonight. Not in Western Europe or southwest Asia. Where we have committed our support, show windows of freedom are shining brightly. Where communism has committed its support—in Cuba, in North Vietnam, and elsewhere—curtains are kept drawn on windows of failure.

It is myopic to insist that America is retreating.

Where? From none of the lines we have drawn against aggression. Yet the most conspicuous retreat of the cold war occurred only a year ago in the withdrawal of communist missiles from Cuba.

It is self-serving to argue that American assistance to other free nations has been money wasted, money down the drain.

Sixteen years ago the people of France had only two slices of bread a day. England had no coal for heating homes. Germany faced the awesome burden of 10 million refugees. Guerrillas were taking the countryside of Greece—within 20 miles of Athens. Communists dominated a 40-percent coalition from Italy's voting.

Today the countries of Western Europe, Canada, Japan, and Oceania are contributing to world development capital aid nearly equal to ours—and have 14 times more technicians in the field.

Of the 41 major aid countries under our programs, 14 have achieved growth rates over 1.5 percent yearly for 5 successive years and are receiving no assistance. Ten more have reached that rate, are cutting back assistance and will soon be off of it. Still nine others are advancing rapidly toward the designated goal.

These are achievements of a successful program. These are national successes—neither partisan triumphs nor partisan failures. But unless we can recognize our successes, unless we can accept the wisdom of our course, we shall risk the folly of abandoning the moment of opportunity toward which our national effort has been directed.

This opportunity is the opportunity to pursue peace. In our 175 years since Washington's first inaugural, we have had frequent occasions to prosecute wars. Until now, we have not had so serious, so hopeful an opportunity to pursue peace—with so full a storehouse of the strengths peacemaking requires.

SUMMIT OF SUCCESS

Our agriculture is abundant. Profits are high. Wages and income are at new peaks. We are free of the bitter conflicts that plague the world—between capital and labor, between religions. We are freeing ourselves of the burden of racial discriminations. Our technology leads the world in peaceful and practical uses of space. Our guiding programs nationally are the works of both our parties.

We stand not on a precipice of failure but at the summit of success.

If ever a people were prepared, ready, and able to pursue peace, it is we, of this generation of Americans. This is the challenge of our success. We must accept that challenge. We must keep the initiative for peace.

If we are to do this, we must turn away from those who counsel that the works of peace represent failure.

It is war that is failure, war that is surrender, war that is the final weakness of men and governments.

Communism tells us now there can be no ideological coexistence.

With that, we agree, and we accept the challenge. We shall continue the ideological offensive of freedom to the farthest corner of the world—and we shall not rest until freedom prevails among all mankind.

One hundred and seventy-five years hence, when the class of 2138 graduates from Georgetown University, Harvard may have been buried and Texas may have been silenced—although either eventuality seems remote. But freedom will not have been buried and neither the members of that class—nor any of their forebears—will have worn the chains of communism. Long before that time we can hope and today more confidently expect that the world will have come to an age of universal peace, universal justice, and universal freedom.

Address of Congressman Roman C. Pucinski, of Illinois, Before the Association for Computing Machinery, University of Maryland, October 17, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier today it was my great privilege to address an estimated 600 participants in a seminar on data processing arranged by the University of Maryland and the Association for Computing Machinery.

This annual technical symposium had as its theme: "Information Processing in the Nation's Capital, 1963."

As chairman of a subcommittee which is now conducting hearings on a proposal to establish a better method of exchanging resourceful information within our scientific community, I found today's invitation to address this group particularly stimulating, for these indeed are the men and women who have as their principal responsibility, the difficult job of charting a more effective course for the exchange of resourceful information.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include the text of my remarks to the Association for Computing Machinery. I hope it will make some contribution toward a better understanding of this entire difficult subject.

My remarks, Mr. Speaker, follow:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, OF ILLINOIS, BEFORE THE ASSOCIATION FOR COMPUTING MACHINERY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, OCTOBER 17, 1963

I am delighted to have the opportunity to address this audience of outstanding scientists, in this distinguished institution of learning, the University of Maryland, and it is a particular pleasure to be here today in the company of men and women who are making such imposing contributions in the field of computer technology.

I am told the rate of growth of Maryland University in size and academic stature is almost comparable to the rate of growth of scientific information.

When I was asked to deliver this address, I wasn't sure if it had to be in Algol, Cobol or Fortram. Fortunately, your able chairman graciously consented to let me speak in English.

There is a story circulating in the Soviet Union about the latest Russian breakthroughs in computer application to information retrieval. You can imagine how delighted the Russian scientists must have been when the computer, after being queried on ancient Russian history, replied that Adam and Eve were Russian. This reply prompted the Russian scientists to pursue the question further. "How do you know?" they asked the computer. And the computer faithfully replied: "To begin with, Adam and Eve had nothing to wear; they had only one apple between them; and in spite of all this, they still believed they were in paradise. Therefore, they must have been Russian."

During the last several months, it has been a rich experience for me, as chairman of the ad hoc Subcommittee on a National Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center, proposed in my bill H.R. 1946, to learn a great deal about some of the problems and solutions associated with data processing and information retrieval.

I am sure this audience is well versed in the staggering statistics on the production of scientific data, as well as the hopeless task our scientists are faced with in attempting to secure pertinent information from the flowing torrents of scientific documents.

As a Member of the Congress of the United States, I am deeply concerned about the future direction of our national effort in the area of data processing and information retrieval. The reasons are obvious:

First of all, my responsibilities to my constituents make it imperative that the mounting government costs in research are, in fact, spent for new and expanded research and not for a duplicate effort contained in some document drowned in an ocean of inaccessible information.

Secondly, it is my firm belief that unless our scientists are given better, faster, and more accurate information wherever and whenever needed, their valuable training and creative energies will be diluted to the level of insignificance.

Third, the emergence and advancement of scientific and technological competition from many countries makes it crystal clear that this Nation, in order to insure its economic survival, no longer can afford to ignore the development of its most important national asset: Scientific information.

We must recognize that some of the problems with which we are faced, although formidable, are not insurmountable.

Indeed, with the vision, dedication, and ingenuity which are so characteristic of our scientific achievements in the past, we shall succeed in our effort to meet this enormous challenge and develop our most neglected assets of scientific and technological information.

It is to our great benefit that the overwhelming majority of those engaged in scientific pursuits are becoming increasingly aware that a more effective method for the exchange of research data must be found: that scientific accomplishments and significant breakthroughs must be made quickly available to the entire scientific community to avoid unnecessary waste and duplication.

There is mounting concern, both in Congress and out of Congress, about the high cost of scientific research. There are those who would impose severe restrictions upon scientific research programs. It is ironic, and may be even ominous, that in the centennial year of the National Academy of Sciences, Congress has cut the National Science Foundation appropriation almost 50 percent.

I confess that I do not consider myself capable of sitting in judgment upon the efforts of any scientist. Nor do I believe that the overwhelming majority of those in the legislative and executive branches of the Government are capable of prejudging the merits of scientific research. Indeed, to attempt to do so would, in my judgment, be to engage in a space-age Scopes trial.

Yet, the mounting debate over research expenditures is a symptom of our times. It dramatizes concern over what some would call waste in the scientific effort.

I, for one, can think of nothing more disastrous to America and its struggle for survival than to place any controls and restrictions whatsoever upon the scientific community. Instead, it is my hope, as chairman of a congressional subcommittee, to help chart through Congress a program which will establish the most efficient method possible for making all scientific data and research quickly available to any scientist in the United States and throughout the world who may wish such information.

I am convinced that when we make scientific research data readily available to every scientist, the scientists themselves will then impose their own discipline against waste and duplication. It is difficult to imagine any scientist with any respect for his own ability who would wantonly and willfully duplicate research once he has discovered that this aspect of his research has already been developed by someone else.

If, indeed, there is duplication in scientific research, it is only because the scientific community does not have at its disposal adequate means for quick retrieval of research already accomplished.

I submit this is where research data processing and information retrieval through electronic aids come into play.

As I see it, this country will sooner or later have to establish a giant network of research information services throughout the United States, each dealing with its own particular scientific discipline, and each tied together by coaxial cable, closed circuit television, facsimile and other electronic devices to one central command post which, through the use of electronic computers and retrieval machines, will keep a constant inventory of what is being done, where and by whom, in this Nation's widespread scientific community.

This command post quickly would provide to any scientist a complete record of the scientific research being sought so that he would have at his fingertips all the work previously done in a given field. Through a highly developed system of abstracting and digesting, the information would come to the scientist in capsule form so his own reading time would be kept to a fractional minimum. He could then exert his own intellectual capability toward tying together the loose ends and exploring new concepts.

Make no mistake. What I propose here is no sport for men of narrow vision. It will be vast and perhaps costly, but its complete integration of the scientific effort will pay mankind dividends never before imagined possible.

How, then, can we accomplish this? We do not have, as yet, all the answers to this question. Nor can we wait until we do have all the answers.

Is H.R. 1946 the complete answer? Not at all. But it would provide a beginning for some of the operations, and their scope, which ultimately would be assumed by a national research data processing and information retrieval center.

H.R. 1946 is just the beginning, but as President Kennedy said recently, a journey of a thousand miles requires a first step.

Before I proceed further, let me hasten to point out to you briefly what this Center would not do.

It is not the purpose of the proposed National Information Center to carry out under one roof all the operations of collecting, processing, abstracting and coding scientific information. Clearly, this is physically impossible and operationally impractical at the present time.

For this purpose, we have hundreds of excellent documentation and abstracting services throughout the Nation, specializing in specific areas of science. As a matter of fact, our excellent network of abstracting societies gives America a clear-cut advantage in the field of abstracting, digesting and codifying scientific data. It would be a tragic mistake to dump them into a single monolithic intellectual compound.

The basic philosophy behind the National Information Center can be summed up in the following maxim:

Centralization without autonomy for decentralized satellite operations is blind: decentralization without central coordination is dead.

This maxim is a synthesis of corporate history in the free enterprise system. It is the elan vital behind the concept for a National Information Center.

I wish to stress that the purpose of the National Information Center is not to eliminate any of the existing indexing, abstracting and translating services, but rather to obtain their final work products in coded or other formalized form and make them available to the technical and business community.

Thus, the Center will gather data from all existing private and public sources wherever available. It will urge their expansion where necessary. The Center will also encourage the establishment of additional satellite centers wherever a need appears to exist.

For example, there is no abstracting service now available in the United States for the science of astronomy. What is even more appalling is the fact that the Russians do have an abstracting journal for astronomy. With an annual budget of $5 billion for space exploration, we can hardly afford to be without abstracts in this vitally important science.

It is planned that there ultimately would be a single, completely integrated index for the entire body of scientific and technical literature. However, the center would begin operation with all of the diverse indices which now exist, but with the important advantage that all such indices would be located in the same place and would be readily available for documentalists familiar with all of them.

Gradually, these diverse indices will be coordinated and integrated until the ideal of one master index is achieved.

As new advances in automatic documentation take place, the National Information Center will provide a base for augmenting the evolutionary growth and capability for rendering information retrieval services to the scientific community.

It is readily apparent that modern science no longer recognizes the boundaries of various scientific disciplines. What happens in biology may be important to the theory of information, as indeed it is. What happens in physics may be important to a chemist, geologist, astronomer, or biologist.

In short, the cross applications of various scientific disciplines provides a treasure house of important information. It is equally apparent that only a coordinating center in scope and function outlined here can hope to capitalize on and capture the cross-fertilization of scientific ideas and facts.

This will be possible through permanent communications links between the National Information Center and various satellites of specialized information centers.

The communications links will constantly provide the National Information Center with the latest scientific data processed in the various satellite centers. The center, in turn, will provide various services, including: 1. retrospective searches on any specific subject, 2. current awareness profiles, and 3. copies of references on request.

I am aware that to discuss this project in its entirety, we cannot ignore the fact that much remains to be done in development of methodology for more effective data processing and information retrieval.

But this is not to infer that much already is not being done. My committee has had the privilege of taking testimony from some of this Nation's most outstanding scientists.

Dr. Emanuel Piore, vice president of research engineering for IBM disclosed to my committee the fantastic gains by scientists in this country in the computer sciences.

I was particularly impressed by Dr. Piore's unequivocal statement that the state of the art in computer development today makes possible a significant start toward a national research data retrieval system.

I have described this central clearinghouse which would handle literally billions of bits of significant scientific data at one time or another.

Is this just a dream?

Not at all, according to Dr. Piore's professional judgment. Dr. Piore inspired the committee with his disclosure that IBM is developing storage capacities capable of handling a trillion bits of information with unheard-of speed.

Mr. Lee Johnson, vice president of Univac, also gave our committee a new sense of assurance when he described a most significant breakthrough by his company in the development of a low cost, rapid intercommunications computer which, in my judgment, could well serve as an integral part of our national retrieval systems by making this compact computer available to each of the supporting satellite activities scattered throughout the country.

Univac demonstrated that American industry already is tying together, through computers tied together by leased lines, information scattered in various cities of the country. We saw the speed with which this information can be exchanged between the independent outposts in each city through the central clearinghouse.

Perhaps even more reassuring to my committee was Univac's demonstration of the present state of the art in associative memories.

Those two actual demonstrations, plus a tremendous volume of other information being assembled by my committee leads me to the conclusion that those who would say we are not ready to start on the establishment of a national scientific research retrieval system are men of little faith and vision.

To stimulate greater activity in development of techniques, I have proposed the National Science Foundation make an annual award, to be known as the "Vannevar Bush Award," of $50,000 for the most important contribution in data processing and information retrieval.

This will, I hope, provide recognition and the incentive of stimulating and directing more scientific talent toward the solution of some of our most pressing problems in data processing and information retrieval.

I have described briefly some of the functions and concepts upon which the National Information Center would be based. These concepts are by no means exhaustive, nor final. But we do have to begin somewhere. We do have to mold a national image for the foundation upon which to develop our most important national resource: scientific information.

It is my fervent hope that the ACM Organization, through its exemplary pioneering efforts in the field of information retrieval will play an important role through its leadership in the establishment and guidance of the formative phases of the National Information Center.

It is my hope that other organizations, like the American Documentation Institute, Engineers Joint Council, American Federation for Information Processing Societies, and others will lend their valuable experience in a cooperative spirit to this great challenge.

It is my further hope that ACM and the other societies will actively participate in

the resolution of problems in: First, referring and selecting research papers for publication in primary journals; second, publishing abstracting journals; third, indexing research papers; fourth, publishing critical review journals and perhaps even news-type periodicals and, most important, I would hope it would provide informative interdisciplinary guides and standards for authors of scientific papers.

The question is no longer are we going to do it? The question now is how soon we are going to realize it? The answer to the latter will depend on the efforts and dedication of all of us. I have no doubt that the efforts of my committee and the support and cooperation from this audience of outstanding scientists and professional societies will make it possible to plunge this Nation into the 21st century's challenge of research retrieval at least three decades early.

If I had the omnipotent power to move mountains to permit the light to shine through, I would use it to convince our American scientific community that America can no longer delay development of a more effective national system for research data processing and information retrieval.

Virtually every major nation of the world is developing today some form of national retrieval systems—Russia, France, England, Poland, West Germany, the Scandinavian countries, Italy, India; and even in Santiago, Chile, a national information center is being built with our foreign aid funds.

Will it take another Soviet breakthrough like sputnik in 1957 to wake this Nation out of its lethargy in research retrieval?

I hope not.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 15, 1963)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., 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:

O God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come: Grateful for that help and that hope, bowing in the peaceful stillness of this Chamber, a citadel of freedom where, in the yesterdays, fateful decisions have molded the life of the Nation. We beseech Thee to guide by Thy wisdom the pending legislation of this body, entrusted with power so vast that it awes and solemnizes our hearts.

Consecrate anew, we pray, these servants of the Republic, that they may be ministers of Thy will for this troubled generation heaving with the yeast of changing patterns.

Make plain to our understanding, as we read the signs of these times, that legal enactments in themselves are utterly futile to bring social salvation unless they are undergirded by inner integrity and reliance on spiritual resources, without which all else we may attempt are as bending props against a decaying house that the Lord hath not made.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, House bill 6143, the so-called higher education bill, on which there is a limitation of debate and controlled time.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6143) 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 VICE PRESIDENT. The committee substitute is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is listed as controlling a part of the time, whereas, when the request was made, it was made in behalf of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I ask that the name be changed accordingly.

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

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the majority leader.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement, there be a brief morning hour, not to exceed 15 minutes in length, during which time resolutions and memorials may be submitted, bills may be introduced, and Senators may speak for not to exceed 3 minutes, and also that a conference report may be considered in the meantime.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 17, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 18, 1963, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 123) to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of "Senate Procedure" and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 170)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit the seventh annual report on the operation of the trade agreements program. The report covers the year in which the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1958 expired and the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 took effect.

During this period of transition:

Free world trade continued to expand with exports climbing to a record of $124 billion and with U.S. exports alone reaching a new high of $20.9 billion—$4.5 billion more than our imports;

There was further freeing of trade in agriculture, helping U.S. farm exports to hold their own at the $5 billion mark;

The needs of the less-developed countries in their trade relations received more attention than ever before.

The advent of the Trade Expansion Act was followed almost immediately by actions described in this report (and others that have since taken place) to put its provisions into effect. These actions have gone forward on schedule despite the temporary setback in the movement toward European economic unity.

A new round of trade negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has now been scheduled. The negotiations can lead to an expansion of free world trade in all products and in all directions. They can help deal with the problem of agricultural protectionism and the dilemma of hunger and glut. They can turn trade into a more effective tool of economic growth for the developing nations.

This report tells of barriers to U.S. trade that have been eliminated or reduced in the past year. It also describes some that still exist and new ones that have been created. Every nation maintaining old barriers or imposing new ones has a reason for doing so, but all nations, including our own, will benefit more from the expansion of trade than from restrictions that curtail trade.

The United States will continue to press for the removal of all restrictions that hinder our exports. It will also continue to follow a national policy of self-restraint in the use of restrictions and of confidence in the intentions of our trading partners to do the same. This is the policy laid down by the Trade Expansion Act. Our adherence to it is essential to the maintenance of the upward course of free world trade described in this report.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 21, 1963.*